Grasp Academy

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Grasp Academy

3101 JUSTINA ROAD, Jacksonville, FL 32277

http://www.duvalschools.org/grasp

Demographics

Principal: Annessia Powell

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School 1-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	83%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2020-21: No Grade 2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade
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

Grasp Academy

3101 JUSTINA ROAD, Jacksonville, FL 32277

http://www.duvalschools.org/grasp

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)
Combination School 1-8	No	%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Alternative Education	No	%

School Grades History

Year	2015-16
Grade	F

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.

GRASP, Instructional Model, provides a diverse set of teaching strategies and approaches based on Orton-Gillingham principles to address the needs of struggling readers (learners) focusing on students with dyslexia, dyscalculia, and dysgraphia. The school incorporates Florida State Standards with project-based learning and enrichment strategies in a prescriptive format. Classroom instruction utilizes a variety of structured learning approaches, containing multisensory, sequential, cognitive, prescriptive, language-based, direct instruction that is emotionally sound.

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

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
Powell, Annessia	Principal	The GRASP Leadership Team (Instructional Implementation Team) consists a of Principal, Assistant Principal, Lead ESE teacher, elementary reading teacher & Guidance Counselor. The team meets weekly to discuss instructional practices, review and analyze assessment data and determine Professional Development needs for Staff. They also conduct paired walk-throughs or team walkthroughs at least 2x per month to build a shared understanding of strengths & needs within our school. At least two members from the leadership team will lead weekly PLCs with the teachers. These sessions are driven from the data & walk throughs. The topics will include professional development, review of student artifacts, student data analysis and support. This PLC model communicates, and leads the staff in the instructional focuses developed by the leadership team. The leadership team also has representation on the Shared Decision Making Team which meets at least monthly. Administration is responsible for monitoring and following up on the transferring of the professional development into the classroom setting through informal coaching & the evaluation system.
Smith, Kristin	Assistant Principal	Once a month, during the PLC time, the AP will lead grade level data discussions to look at student response to intervention. They will utilize classroom progress monitoring data, student work samples, grades, and school wide progress monitoring tools/data to determine student progress. Discussions and documentation will also center around research based interventions that are having an impact in the classroom for Tier 2 or for Tier 3 interventions. The leadership team will also look at data monthly regarding both academic & behavioral data to determine that school wide we are intervening with the right students. We will review students receiving multi-tiered support to determine if the student is able to move back into Tier 1, continue with Tier 2 interventions, or move to Tier 3 with intensive support. During the meeting there is also discussion of new students that have been identified during data review of needing additional support. We are also focusing on monitoring students who have shown low growth on previous state and district assessments. Students needing more support than currently can be provided within our model, may continue on to

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		the formal Response to Intervention/Progress monitoring Team for formal tracking of data and review to see if they need a more formalized plan. Data and the intervention needs will inform the leadership team and school accountability team of budgetary or staffing needs that are beyond our current structure. They will look at reallocating current needs, or seeking additional funding sources (support from the district level, grants, business partners, etc.) This includes overseeing the day to day operations of the school.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/1/2019, Annessia Powell

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.*
1

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.*
18

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
30

Total number of students enrolled at the school
266

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
8

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
5

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	0	5	13	32	32	40	47	64	46	0	0	0	0	279
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	4	8	11	19	27	15	11	0	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	0	0	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	23	24	38	25	22	0	0	0	0	151
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	22	25	39	40	40	24	0	0	0	0	190
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	25	29	30	40	58	20	0	0	0	0	202

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	20	23	25	40	33	28	0	0	0	0	169

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	2	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	3	3	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	12

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/1/2021

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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
						Grade Level								
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
						Grade Level								
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
						Grade Level								
Number of students enrolled	0	6	19	25	30	47	64	47	43	0	0	0	0	281
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	4	8	11	19	27	15	11	0	0	0	0	96
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	26	0	0	0	0	0	26
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	19	23	40	42	26	24	0	0	0	0	174
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	22	25	47	64	45	42	0	0	0	0	245

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
						Grade Level								
Students with two or more indicators	0	5	12	16	17	26	29	22	19	0	0	0	0	146

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
						Grade Level								
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	6	5	3	1	0	0	0	0	15

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					54%	61%		51%	60%
ELA Learning Gains					56%	59%		53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile					53%	54%		50%	52%
Math Achievement					57%	62%		57%	61%
Math Learning Gains					57%	59%		55%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile					52%	52%		50%	52%
Science Achievement					50%	56%		52%	57%
Social Studies Achievement					76%	78%		78%	77%

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	11%	51%	-40%	58%	-47%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	6%	52%	-46%	58%	-52%
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
05	2021					
	2019	29%	50%	-21%	56%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
06	2021					
	2019	8%	47%	-39%	54%	-46%
Cohort Comparison		-29%				
07	2021					
	2019	9%	44%	-35%	52%	-43%
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
08	2021					
	2019	14%	49%	-35%	56%	-42%
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	20%	61%	-41%	62%	-42%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	4%	64%	-60%	64%	-60%
Cohort Comparison		-20%				
05	2021					
	2019	32%	57%	-25%	60%	-28%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
06	2021					
	2019	15%	51%	-36%	55%	-40%
Cohort Comparison		-32%				
07	2021					
	2019	20%	47%	-27%	54%	-34%
Cohort Comparison		-15%				
08	2021					
	2019	0%	32%	-32%	46%	-46%
Cohort Comparison		-20%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	51%	49%	2%	53%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	5%	40%	-35%	48%	-43%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	24%	69%	-45%	71%	-47%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	38%	57%	-19%	61%	-23%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The data recorded for grades 3-5 is from the district level progress monitoring assessment given three times a year. I-Ready reading and math data has been used for grades one and two.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6	6	6
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6	6	6
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	19	19	19
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	19	19	19
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	25	25	25
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	9	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	9	0
	English Language Learners	0	4	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	25	25	25
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	1	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30	30	30
	Economically Disadvantaged	11.11	6.2	0
	Students With Disabilities	4.7	10.5	0
	English Language Learners	9	10	6
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	30	30	30
	Economically Disadvantaged	5.6	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	5	0	5
	English Language Learners	2	1	2

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	47	47	47
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	5	5.5
	Students With Disabilities	22.2	22.8	55.5
	English Language Learners	2	9	8
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	47	47	47
	Economically Disadvantaged	5.5	5	0
	Students With Disabilities	8.8	11.3	2.7
	English Language Learners	6.6	8.7	1
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	47	47	47
	Economically Disadvantaged	5	5	1
	Students With Disabilities	14	12	7
	English Language Learners	15	15	7

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	64	64	64
	Economically Disadvantaged	2.7	2.7	0
	Students With Disabilities	6.9	0	3.2
	English Language Learners	4.6	0	2.2
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	64	64	64
	Economically Disadvantaged	2.7	2.7	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	3.6	2
	English Language Learners	0	6	14

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	47	47	47
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	6.9	0	3.2
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	47	47	47
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	6.9	0	3.2
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	43	43	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	5.5	5.5	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	6.8	4.5	4.8
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	43	43	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	2.5	0	0
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	43	43	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	3.7
	English Language Learners	2.2	2.3	4.7

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	12	41	51	18	49	47	34				
ELL											
BLK	7	35	52	7	26	32	21				
HSP	15	50		12	50						
WHT	18	46	59	28	66	65	40				
FRL	11	45	67	10	46	55	28				
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	9	39	50	14	28	28	25	26			
BLK	4	39	65	8	27	28	21	18			
HSP	11	27		16	13						
WHT	17	45	46	23	36	36	27	26	33		

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
FRL	6	38	57	8	23	21	14	30			
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

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	37
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	258
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
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	0
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	
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	26
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	46
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	37
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?

The 4th grade math data showed the lowest performance scores at proficiency. Contributing factors to this decline include; high teacher turn over rate, lack of professional development in the area of math and dyslexia. (Not Comp)

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

The 2018-2019 math data showed a decrease in grades 4th-grade math as well as 8th grade ELA both decreasing by 16% in each cohort. Factors contributing to this decline include teacher retention, absence of a math coach to support new teachers as well as a systematic instructional plan.

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

As an alternative school with below-level students, our students have academic gains in Math and ELA below the state comparison with scores below 60% in the 4th-grade cohort. Contributing factors include the lack of systematic and systemic intervention implementation and research-based instructional strategies, lack of academic vocabulary as well as professional development in the area of mathematics, that are focused not just on proficiency but on student gains/growth towards closing gaps with peers.

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

The 2018-2019 5th grade ELA showed the most improvement with a 20% growth in this cohort. The following actions contributed to this growth; teacher retention, professional development in Orton-Gillingham, coaching in the Orton-Gillingham model.

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

Reflecting on the EWS data indicated an increase in class 2 referrals, resulting in an increase in ISSP and OSSP as well as a decrease in restorative justice practices.

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

1. Standards-based instruction
2. Professional development in Reading and Math as it relates to dyslexia
3. Supportive environment
4. Ambitious instruction

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.

Teachers and leaders will participate in professional development in standards based instruction, structured language, math and reading interventions as well as positive behavior management.

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

Title 1 funding will be used to provide a reading interventionist to support teachers with appropriate reading and math intervention.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We looked at the data for each of the five subgroups and found that we need to focus on all subgroups in the areas of reading and math. These subgroups include: Students with disabilities have obtained a federal index score below 41% for two consecutive years. The current federal index is 27%. Black/African American students scored below 41% for two consecutive years on the Federal Index scoring 26% using this index. Hispanic Students scored below 41% for two consecutive years on the Federal Index scoring 17% using this index. White Students scored 32% on the Federal Index which is below the 41% benchmark. Economically Disadvantaged Students have obtained a federal index score below 41% for two consecutive years.
Measurable Outcome:	The current federal index is 25%. Measureable Outcome: Students with disabilities will show growth from a federal index score of 27% to a federal index score of 42% using the state achievement test in grades 3-8 in both reading and math. White students will show growth from a federal index score of 32% to a federal index score of 42% as indicated by state achievement test data in the areas of reading and math. Black/African American students will show growth from a federal index score of 26% to a federal index of 41% using the state achievement test in grades 3-8 in both reading and math. Hispanic students will show growth from a federal index score of 17% to a federal index of 42% using the state achievement test in grades 3-8 in both reading and math. Economically Disadvantaged Students will show growth from a federal index score of 25% to a federal index score of 42% using the state achievement test in grades 3-8 in both reading and math.
Monitoring:	The leadership team will review building level data three times a year using district designed PMA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Annessia Powell (powella1@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Small group instruction using Orton-Gillingham structured language instruction in grades 3-5 to address decoding and fluency.Website: www.ortonacademy.org Small group instruction using Corrective Reading instruction in grades 6-8 to address fluency and comprehension https://www.nifdi.org. Small group multisensory instruction based on Orton-Gillingham in grades 1-5 to address math deficient. Instruction in Math 180 in grades 6-8 based on datahttp://teacher.scholastic.com/products/math180/research-results/mathintervention-validation.htm
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	GRASP purposefully accepts students we believe our interventions and teaching strategies can address their educational gaps. Students are often over age, reading 2-3 years below grade level, identified as a student with a learning disability, experiencing limited educational success. Characteristics such as inaccurate and labored decoding affecting comprehension; however

since the student is bright he/she gets the "gist", miss the details or specifics; nonlinear thinker with difficulty following directions, poor memory for sequence, facts and information that has not been experienced, anxiety, low self-esteem, lack of confidence, bright, compliant, and compassionate flies under the radar not seeking help or self-advocating for their learning needs.

Gaps are addressed using project-based learning and enrichment strategies in a prescriptive format. Utilizing a variety of structured learning approaches, multisensory, sequential, cognitive, prescriptive, language-based, direct instruction that is emotionally sound. Orton-Gillingham principles, the only research methods to show results with students meeting the dyslexic profile.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional development in multi-sensory math.

Person Responsible   Kristin Smith (smithk4@duvalschools.org)

implement an intervention schedule through the MTSS process for students who are currently struggling in math and reading.

Person Responsible   Kristin Smith (smithk4@duvalschools.org)

Reading interventionist to help support the implementation of Orton-Gillingham paid for out of Title 1

Person Responsible   Annessia Powell (powella1@duvalschools.org)

Purchase of MindPlay to support reading skills including, decoding, fluency, comprehension and vocabulary

Person Responsible   Annessia Powell (powella1@duvalschools.org)

Purchase of Measure Up materials to align student work with state standards.

Person Responsible   Annessia Powell (powella1@duvalschools.org)

Multisensory math instruction using Touch Math

Person Responsible   Kristin Smith (smithk4@duvalschools.org)

Purchase and implementation of Write Score to support ELA this includes materials needed for in class instruction

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

#2. Leadership specifically relating to Instructional Leadership Team	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The area of ambitious instruction has been identified as an area of focus but the leadership team after reviewing the data in the 5Essentials survey. Ambitious instruction looks like, clear, well-structured, and encourages students to build independence and apply knowledge. The data from the 2020 5Essentials reported this as an area of weakness scoring a 37 out of 100 with no change from the 2019 report.
Measurable Outcome:	In the area of Ambitious instruction, GRASP Academy will increase from 37 to 50 in the 2021 5Esentials report.
Monitoring:	Ambitious instruction will be monitored using the 5 Essentials survey given annually.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Annessia Powell (powella1@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Well-defined and clear expectations for students in all subject areas (rubrics). Multi-sensory, project-based instruction to build and apply concepts. I do-we do-You do strategies to build student independence.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	GRASP purposefully accepts students we believe our interventions and teaching strategies can address their educational gaps. Students are often over age, reading 2-3 years below grade level, identified as a student with a learning disability, experiencing limited educational success. Characteristics such as nonlinear thinker with difficulty following directions, poor memory for sequence, facts and information that has not been experienced, anxiety, low self-esteem, lack of confidence, bright, compliant, and compassionate, fly under the radar not seeking help or self-advocating for their learning needs. These strategies will help provide a systematic way for students to find success. Gaps are addressed using project-based learning and enrichment strategies in a prescriptive format. Utilizing a variety of structured learning approaches, multisensory, sequential, cognitive, prescriptive, language-based, direct instruction that is emotionally sound.

Action Steps to Implement	
Professional development in project-based learning	
Person Responsible	Kristin Smith (smithk4@duvalschools.org)
Professional development in graphic aids to support independence	
Person Responsible	Kristin Smith (smithk4@duvalschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The administrative team has chosen Assessing Student Learning, as the area of focus. The data reviewed from the standards-based walkthrough dashboard showed a rating of 2.3 out of 5.0 in the area of Student task alignment to standards based assessments. Additional data from the 5Essentials survey showed weakness in the area of ambitious instruction. The two data points support the rationale for focusing on assessing student learning.
Measurable Outcome:	The administrative team will report that assessments of student leaning align to the standard 4 out of 5 times observed.
Monitoring:	Administration will monitor, end of unit test, PMA as well as teacher designed assessments focusing on assessment alignment with the posted standard.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Annessia Powell (powella1@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional development on the learning arc and standards based alignment.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to the Opportunity Myth, students showed 1.7 more months of academic progress when they had access to better assignments and were assessed appropriately.

Action Steps to Implement	

Professional development in the standards walkthrough model/rubric and the expectation of standards-based instruction and aligned assessment.

Person Responsible	Kristin Smith (smithk4@duvalschools.org)

Design the building level schedule to allow for weekly extended PLC times, moving from 45 min once a week to 60 min once a week

Person Responsible	Kristin Smith (smithk4@duvalschools.org)

Conduct 5 walkthrough observations collaboratively weekly and provide specific timely feedback to teachers.

Person Responsible	Annessia Powell (powella1@duvalschools.org)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Parent involvement in school is the area of focus that has been identified by the leadership team using the 5essentials data. Parent involvement impacts student achievement "When parents are involved at school, the performance of all the children at school, not just their own, tends to improve. The more comprehensive and well planned the partnership between school and home, the higher the student achievement." Henderson, A.T., and Nancy Berla. 1995. A New Generation of Evidence: The Family Is Critical to Student Achievement. Washington, DC: Center for Law and Education, 14–16.
Measurable Outcome:	GRASP scores week in the area of parent involvement, scoring 39 out of 100, according to the 2020 5-Essential survey.
Monitoring:	Parent involvement will be monitored using sign in sheets from parent-teacher conferences, volunteer sheets as well as participation in school events. Parent involvement will increase to a score of 50 on the annual 5-Essentials survey.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kristin Smith (smithk4@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Parent Report Card: A Self-Assessment for Parents Parent Teacher Conference Tip Sheets Supporting SMART Goals with Family and Student Engagement
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Harvard family research project reports that family engagement is a dynamic, interactive process that provides a pathway to student success. The rationale for selecting these specific strategies came from research from the Harvard research project. These strategies were recommended by the University of Chicago who developed the 5essentials survey

Action Steps to Implement

Monthly family involvement opportunities from September to March with light refreshments paid for out of Title 1

Person Responsible	Kristin Smith (smithk4@duvalschools.org)

Professional development in how to hold an effective parent-teacher conference

Person Responsible	Kristin Smith (smithk4@duvalschools.org)

Development of a family engagement resource room with materials purchased out of Title 1 funds
index cards, paper, games, books.....

Person Responsible	Kristin Smith (smithk4@duvalschools.org)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on 2020-21 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. 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 96%, 4th grade is 83%, and 5th grade is 85%. 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%
Measurable Outcome:	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. *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.
Monitoring:	Our school leadership team, district content specialist support, and Supplemental Instructional APs will review ELA data from district assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Annessia Powell (powella1@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	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. 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. Progress Monitoring: Ensuring whole group lessons, interventions, and assessments are done with fidelity. Checking effectiveness from student data.

	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-intobig- 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-progressmonitoring- 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-teachingstrategies/

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   Annessia Powell (powella1@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   Annessia Powell (powella1@duvalschools.org)

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

Person Responsible   Annessia Powell (powella1@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

A review of the discipline data from the 20-21 school year indicated two areas of concern. The first, failure to adhere to safety consideration, reported 5 times at the school level. The second, physical attach on district employee, reported 3 times at the school level. The 8 infractions are included in the recording in the state report under, other major offenses. When data was compared at the district level, combination elementary & secondary schools, GRASP Academy scores far below the district average.
GRASP Academy is a Positive Behavior Intervention Support School (PBIS) with a core belief that students learn best in an emotionally sound environment. We achieve this through a systemic and systematic implementation of PBIS interventions and strategies; restorative justice, small group social skills instruction, individual mentors, calm classroom curriculum.
The PBIS team consists of administration, guidance, dean, as well as classroom teachers from all grade levels. The team holds monthly meetings, reviewing data, and adjusting expectations and reward systems as needed. The PBIS facilitator is part of the leadership team, the Shared Decision Making (SDM) team as well as the school improvement team (SAC) team and reports monthly to these committees.
The PBIS team also holds several family events yearly to support positive interactions between the school community and the families they serve some of which are in conjunction with Title 1 parent engagement and some Title 1 funding.

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.

GRASP Academy is a Positive Behavior Intervention Support School (PBIS) with a core belief that students learn best in an emotionally sound environment. We achieve this through a systemic and systematic implementation of PBIS interventions and strategies; restorative justice, small group social skills instruction, individual mentors, calm classroom curriculum.
The PBIS team consists of administration, guidance, dean, as well as classroom teachers from all grade levels. The team holds monthly meetings, reviewing data, and adjusting expectations and reward systems as needed.

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

The PBIS facilitator is part of the leadership team, the Shared
Decision Making (SDM) team as well as the school improvement team (SAC) team and reports
monthly to these committees.
The PBIS team also holds several family events yearly to support positive interactions
between the school community and the families they serve.