

Duval County Public Schools

Arlington Heights Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 17 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 22 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 22 |

Arlington Heights Elementary School

1520 SPRINKLE DR, Jacksonville, FL 32211

<http://www.duvalschools.org/ahe>

Demographics

Principal: Katrice Scott

Start Date for this Principal: 7/28/2019

| | |
|--|---|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2020-21 Title I School | Yes |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: D (40%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Northeast |
| Regional Executive Director | Cassandra Brusca |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 17 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 22 |

Arlington Heights Elementary School

1520 SPRINKLE DR, Jacksonville, FL 32211

<http://www.duvalschools.org/ahe>

School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2020-21 Title I School | 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School PK-5 | Yes | 100% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 81% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | | B | B | C |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Every student is inspired and prepared for success in college or a career, and life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To provide educational excellence in every school, in every classroom, for every student, every day.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|--------------------|----------------|---------------------------------|
| Scott, Vondeira | Principal | |
| Sedgwick, Kimberly | Math Coach | |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/28/2019, Katrice Scott

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

15

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

22

Total number of students enrolled at the school

246

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

2

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

2

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 48 | 33 | 28 | 49 | 45 | 41 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 244 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 19 | 16 | 7 | 19 | 13 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in Math | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 18 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 1 | 6 | 12 | 31 | 18 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 1 | 8 | 11 | 32 | 15 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 91 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/24/2021

2020-21 - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

2020-21 - Updated**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 28 | 35 | 43 | 47 | 41 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 239 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 22 | 17 | 33 | 25 | 27 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 147 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in ELA | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in Math | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 18 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 16 | 18 | 36 | 29 | 33 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 163 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data Review**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

| School Grade Component | 2021 | | | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | | | | 39% | 50% | 57% | 31% | 50% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 51% | 56% | 58% | 50% | 51% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 36% | 50% | 53% | 48% | 46% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 64% | 62% | 63% | 46% | 61% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 78% | 63% | 62% | 49% | 59% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 67% | 52% | 51% | 44% | 48% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 43% | 48% | 53% | 55% | 55% | 55% |

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 39% | 51% | -12% | 58% | -19% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 38% | 52% | -14% | 58% | -20% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -39% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 35% | 50% | -15% | 56% | -21% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -38% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 67% | 61% | 6% | 62% | 5% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 69% | 64% | 5% | 64% | 5% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -67% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 52% | 57% | -5% | 60% | -8% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -69% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 37% | 49% | -12% | 53% | -16% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

i-Ready Reading & Math, District Progress Monitoring Assessments

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 5% | 29% | 38% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 6% | 25% | 41% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0% | 29% | 17% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 0% | 50% |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 3% | 11% | 58% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 6% | 9% | 58% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0% | 0% | 33% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 50% | 50% |
| | | | | |
| Grade 2 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 24% | 24% | 35% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 15% | 14% | 30% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| | English Language Learners | 50% | 50% | 33% |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 16% | 25% | 26% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 12% | 18% | 23% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0% | 33% | 0% |
| | English Language Learners | 50% | 50% | 0% |
| | | | | |

| Grade 3 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 26% | 26% | 33% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 18% | 21% | 28% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 11% | 9% | 20% |
| | English Language Learners | 20% | 05 | 20% |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 28% | 36% | 55% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 26% | 33% | 50% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 33% | 20% | 44% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| | | | | |
| Grade 4 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 23% | 36% | 34% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 22% | 32% | 30% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0% | 17% | 14% |
| | English Language Learners | 33% | 25% | 0% |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 23% | 31% | 36% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 18% | 28% | 35% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 17% | 17% | 14% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 0% | 25% |
| | | | | |

| Grade 5 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 28% | 28% | 33% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 28% | 23% | 36% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 38% | 17% | 14% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 33% | 25% |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 35% | 34% | 27% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 41% | 33% | 25% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 25% | 17% | 29% |
| | English Language Learners | 33% | 0% | 0% |
| Science | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 23% | 24% | 18% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 26% | 23% | 20% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 25% | 50% | 17% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 0% | 0% |

Subgroup Data Review

| 2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD | 21 | | | 32 | | | | | | | |
| ELL | 25 | | | 38 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 20 | 19 | | 49 | 38 | | 17 | | | | |
| HSP | 32 | | | 32 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 45 | | | 60 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 24 | 23 | | 46 | 35 | | 19 | | | | |
| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 19 | 41 | 29 | 35 | 56 | 56 | 29 | | | | |
| ELL | 27 | 44 | | 62 | 65 | | 15 | | | | |
| BLK | 38 | 50 | 40 | 61 | 73 | 59 | 44 | | | | |
| HSP | 39 | 58 | | 74 | 80 | | 27 | | | | |

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| WHT | 38 | 52 | | 59 | 91 | | 55 | | | | |
| FRL | 43 | 56 | 42 | 65 | 76 | 62 | 47 | | | | |
| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD | 16 | 47 | | 26 | 41 | | | | | | |
| ELL | 7 | 44 | 47 | 31 | 48 | 45 | | | | | |
| BLK | 22 | 44 | 50 | 35 | 43 | 54 | 31 | | | | |
| HSP | 36 | 56 | | 47 | 36 | | 73 | | | | |
| WHT | 42 | 50 | | 65 | 66 | | 64 | | | | |
| FRL | 32 | 50 | 43 | 45 | 52 | 50 | 50 | | | | |

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 38 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | YES |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 5 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 54 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 267 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 94% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 27 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 39 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | |

| Native American Students | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 29 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 32 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Pacific Islander Students | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 53 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 29 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Our Students With Disabilities showed the lowest performance and is an area of focus. In 2018-2019, we had 19% scoring a Level 3 or higher on FSA ELA assessment. This is an increase from 16% proficient in 2017-2018. This subgroup has historically performed lower than any other group at the school. A major contributing factor is the below grade level reading for these students. On the FSA Math assessment, the same group of students showed an increase from 26% in 2017-2018 to 35% in 2018-2019.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Reviewing grade level raw data in comparison to the state's average, the greatest gap is in ELA for all grade levels. In 3rd grade, the school state comparison is -19%, 4th grade is -20% and 5th grade is -21%. Our school achievement for ELA has improved but the increases are small. This school year teachers received professional development on deepen their understanding of standards based instruction and planning standardsbased lessons with the reading and math coaches. This was common practice this year during common planning. Common planning has been consistent over the past few years but the focus on standards based instruction was a priority this year.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

We saw a decline in ELA learning gains for our SWD from 47% in 2017-2018 to 41% in 2018-2019. Additionally, our learning gains from our bottom quartile students' declined from 48% in 2017-2018 to 36% in 2018-2019. Historically, these students display reading deficits and they require more intensive reading instruction.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Our math data for all grade levels showed the most improvement from 2018 to 2019. In 3rd grade, we increased 31%, 4th grade increased 26% and 5th grade increased 1%. The school-state comparison for this year was 5% for 3rd and 4th but -8% for 5th. The increases moved us closer to the state's average for 3rd and 4th but not for 5th grade math.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

This year all 3rd-5th grade students were involved in Acaletics for 30 minutes a day. Monthly scrimmages were administered to the students and this data was monitored by administration and coaches. During common planning, teachers planned lessons with the math coach, that were aligned to the standards as well as included differentiated tasks and assessments.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

We will continue our work with constructing tasks and assessments that are aligned to the standards. The administrative team will conduct daily classroom walk-throughs to ensure implementation of standards based instruction is occurring.

We will also focus on improving attendance for all students. The leadership team will start the year with those students who had chronic absences in the prior school year. Each team member will be assigned a grade level and they will monitor those students as well as any other students who may exhibit attendance issues. The leadership team will report absences to the principal weekly and this team will meet monthly to discuss next steps.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

During professional learning communities and common planning sessions, the administrative team and the instructional coaches, will conduct professional development using the learning arc protocol to ensure lessons created have tasks and assessments that are aligned to the standards. Frequent progress monitoring of student progress will also be a point of focus to drive instructional delivery of the teachers.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Ensure our students with disabilities and our English-Language Learners are receiving scaffolded core instruction in order to participate in grade level instruction. In addition this, interventions will be implemented to monitor students who were referred to AIT from school year 2020-21.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | The majority of the classrooms lacked standard aligned instruction with comparable experiences to the standard. This observational data established a correlational relationship between standard-aligned instructional and proficient students. |
| Measurable Outcome: | 90% of our current core teachers will engage in successful standards aligned instruction, tasks, and assessments. |
| Monitoring: | Daily classroom walkthroughs will be conducted using the Standards Walk-through Tool. Immediate feedback will be provided to teacher for instructional improvement. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Vondeira Scott (scottv2@duvalschools.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Instructional delivery ensure that students are exposed to standards aligned instruction, tasks, and assessments. Based on Standards Walkthrough Tool, our team can measure classrooms that have aligned standards and experiences in core classes. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | As expressed in the Opportunity Myth, schools need to ensure students are getting standards-aligned and grade appropriate instruction, so that they are prepared to face the assessments designed by the state along with the following year's progression of standards. |

Action Steps to Implement

Reading and Math Coaches, along with School Administration, will facilitate common planning sessions with teachers that will focus on unpacking the standards to ensure there is standard aligned instruction, tasks and assessments.

Person Responsible Vondeira Scott (scottv2@duvalschools.org)

The Administrative Team will use the Classroom Walk-through Tool to determine alignment of the instruction, tasks, and assessments to the standards, according to the Learning Arc. According to the observational data, adjustments will be made to the instruction, tasks and/or assessments to ensure there is alignment to the standards.

Person Responsible Vondeira Scott (scottv2@duvalschools.org)

Classroom observations will be conducted by teachers together with administrators after planning of a lesson for further professional development.

Person Responsible Vondeira Scott (scottv2@duvalschools.org)

Various field trips (FSCJ Artist Series, Jacksonville Symphony, Museum of Science and History, Jacksonville Zoo, Crayola Experience) are planned to reinforce the academic concepts and skills taught in the classroom thereby increasing student achievement. In addition, supplemental instructional materials, such as document cameras, will be used to support and enhance student achievement. Moreover, academic tutors will support instruction by meeting with students to remediate reading and math skills. Supplies such as copy paper, student composition books, pencils, pens, printer ink, etc... will be used by teachers to further assist with classroom instruction.

Person Responsible Vondeira Scott (scottv2@duvalschools.org)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Monitoring:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Monitoring:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | <p>Based on 2021-22 data, ELA was identified as a critical need. Students at our school need support with learning the foundational skills of how to read and also understanding the content they are reading. As an Area of Focus, student success in ELA progress will also increase student achievement in other subject areas.</p> <p>o The percentage of students in grades 3-5, below Level 3 on the 2021 statewide, standardized English Language Arts assessment are as follows: 3rd grade is 69%, 4th grade is 81%, and 5th grade is 79%.</p> <p>o The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2020-2021 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized grade 3 English Language Arts assessment is as follows: 1st - 80% and 2nd - 73%</p> |
| Measurable Outcome: | <p>K-5 data: *Increase percentage of K-2 students scoring "At Grade Level" or above by 3-4 percentage points. Decrease number of "Below Grade Level" students by 3-4 percentage points.</p> <p>*Increase percentage of 3 -5 grade students scoring Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized English Language Arts assessment by 3-4 percentage points. Decrease number of "Below Grade Level" students by 3-4 percentage points.</p> |
| Monitoring: | <p>Our school leadership team, district content specialist support, and Supplemental Instructional APs will review ELA data from district assessments.</p> |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | <p>Vondeira Scott (scottv2@duvalschools.org)</p> <p>Data Driven Lesson Planning: Understanding where students are with mastery of standards, using data from informal and formal assessments, planning clear objectives, implementation, and checking for understanding when lesson planning.</p> |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | <p>Small Group/Differentiated Instruction: Based on data, breaking groups of students into smaller groups to ensure Tier II support is given. Not all students are on the same level, but all standards must be mastered. Small group instruction will allow teachers to meet students at their level to support their needs.</p> <p>Progress Monitoring: Ensuring whole group lessons, interventions, and assessments are done with fidelity. Checking effectiveness from student data.</p> |

Instructional Reviews with Action Plans: Collecting data from classrooms in real time and providing immediate and clear feedback for teachers and school leadership teams to work together to ensure effectiveness.

Data-driven Lesson Planning: Effective lesson planning requires teachers to determine three essential components such as the objective, the implementation, and a reflection. <https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/howto-plan-effective-lessons>

Small Group/Differentiated Instruction: Small group instruction is the key to data-driven results and is the gateway to meeting the needs of all learners. <https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/turn-small-reading-groups-into-big-wins>

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Progress Monitoring: Student progress monitoring helps teachers evaluate how effective their instruction is, either for individual students or for the entire class. <https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/how-student-progress-monitoring-improves-instruction>

Instructional Reviews with Action Plans: The implementation review is a plan designed to 1) recognize accomplishments, 2) track actions, 3) measure implementation impact, 4) evaluate the plan, 5) determine next steps. It may be used by the school alone or with the assistance of the support lead. <https://institutionalresearch.syr.edu/what-we-do/student-ratings/creating-an-action-plan/action-plan-teaching-strategies/>

Action Steps to Implement

Ensure teachers are equipped and comfortable with all four strategies listed above. Professional Development during Early Release Days and Common Planning will be essential for Leadership to support teachers. Based on observational data and teacher feedback, PD topics will be set before each Early Release and Common Planning.

Person Responsible Vondeira Scott (scottv2@duvalschools.org)

During Common Planning and individual teacher data chats, specific data pertaining to ELA reading and student success will be discussed and analyzed to ensure we are monitoring progress.

Person Responsible Vondeira Scott (scottv2@duvalschools.org)

Give immediate feedback on any observations/walkthroughs conducted by state support, school leadership, district content specialists, and district leadership.

Person Responsible Vondeira Scott (scottv2@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

N/A

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

The school uses various strategies and best practices of the PBIS model. Positive Recognition Referrals are given to students that display specific attributes that reflect positive school citizenship, academics, and behavior. In addition, a student from each homeroom is recognized each month for demonstration the CARE-acter trait for the month. The school has a Student Recognition Committee. The goal of this committee is to ensure systems are in place to provide a supportive and fulfilling environment for all students. Various activities are planned with the student in mind to ensure positive relationships are fostered among students-adults, student-to-student. These activities include but are not limited to, lunch-bunch with the teacher or school counselor, school field trips (learning experiences), Red Ribbon Week, Calm Classroom strategies, Wellness Wednesdays, School Spirit Day, Honor Roll Recognition, and Achieve the Green Recognition (Acaletics).

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

The PBIS Team will serve to assist teachers, students, and parents with promoting a positive culture and environment.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

| | | | |
|---|--------|---|--------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems | \$0.00 |

| | | | |
|--------|--------|---|--------|
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |