

Duval County Public Schools

Englewood High School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 20 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 25 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 26 |

Englewood High School

4412 BARNES RD, Jacksonville, FL 32207

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

Demographics

Principal: Marleny Ch IR Ino

Start Date for this Principal: 7/19/2021

| | |
|--|--|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | High School 9-12 |
| 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) | 92% |
| 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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (48%) 2016-17: C (53%) |
| 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 | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 20 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 26 |

Englewood High School

4412 BARNES RD, Jacksonville, FL 32207

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

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| <p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">High School 9-12</p> | <p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">Yes</p> | <p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">92%</p> |
| <p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p> | <p>Charter School</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">No</p> | <p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="font-size: 1.2em;">78%</p> |

School Grades History

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

Our MISSION at Englewood High School is to maintain a culturally diverse community of students, parents and staff, dedicated to creating a highly successful educational environment in which each student is empowered to reach his or her full academic, social and emotional potential in every class, every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our VISION at Englewood High School is to nurture and celebrate a culturally diverse environment highly regarded for its educational excellence, preparing all students for a successful transition into a collegiate journey or career path.

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 |
|----------------------|---------------------|---|
| Chirino, Marleny | Principal | Oversight of all areas and an emphasis on ELA and reading department. |
| Johnson, Stacey | Assistant Principal | APC, Guidance, Math, ESE |
| Bridwell, Jennifer | Assistant Principal | PBIS, Student Services/Behavior and Deans, Technology, Biology |
| Wrye, Sue | Reading Coach | ELA teacher and student support |
| Martinez, Jennifer | Graduation Coach | Graduation, Seniors (in specific at risk seniors), ACT/SAT monitoring and sign up |
| Gaspard, James | Assistant Principal | Facilities, CTE, Social Studies |
| Burke-Mccloud, Kerry | Instructional Coach | Standard based instruction support, new teacher support |
| Boyd, Chanthony | Dean | PBIS, restorative justice, and student behavior |
| Turner, Bryan | Dean | PBIS, restorative justice, and student behavior |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/19/2021, Marleny Ch IR Ino

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.*

0

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

102

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,935

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

18

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

7

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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 602 | 553 | 480 | 298 | 1933 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 245 | 289 | 216 | 226 | 976 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | 85 | 77 | 59 | 321 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 262 | 221 | 231 | 178 | 892 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 164 | 111 | 91 | 21 | 387 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 262 | 222 | 233 | 183 | 900 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 291 | 197 | 18 | 99 | 605 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 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 | 345 | 285 | 218 | 177 | 1025 |

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 | 104 | 167 | 132 | 23 | 426 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 20 | 25 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/28/2021

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 | 684 | 663 | 490 | 371 | 2208 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 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 | 0 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 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 | 0 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 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 | 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 | 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 | 0 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 684 | 663 | 490 | 371 | 2208 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 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 | 0 | 0 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 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 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 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 | 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 | 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 | 0 | 0 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

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 | | | | 32% | 47% | 56% | 29% | 47% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 42% | 48% | 51% | 38% | 49% | 53% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 34% | 42% | 42% | 31% | 42% | 44% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 39% | 51% | 51% | 34% | 51% | 51% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 51% | 52% | 48% | 60% | 55% | 48% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 44% | 47% | 45% | 39% | 50% | 45% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 49% | 65% | 68% | 50% | 61% | 67% |
| Social Studies Achievement | | | | 55% | 70% | 73% | 54% | 67% | 71% |

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 |
| 09 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 29% | 48% | -19% | 55% | -26% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 10 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 29% | 48% | -19% | 53% | -24% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -29% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|--|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State | |
| 2021 | | | | | | |
| 2019 | 47% | 67% | -20% | 67% | -20% | |

| CIVICS EOC | | | | | | |
|------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|--|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State | |
| 2021 | | | | | | |
| 2019 | | | | | | |

| HISTORY EOC | | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|--|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State | |
| 2021 | | | | | | |
| 2019 | 50% | 68% | -18% | 70% | -20% | |

| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|--|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State | |
| 2021 | | | | | | |
| 2019 | 25% | 57% | -32% | 61% | -36% | |

| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|--|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State | |
| 2021 | | | | | | |

| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
|---------------------|---------------|-----------------|--------------------------------------|--------------|-----------------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 47% | 61% | -14% | 57% | -10% |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Data utilized for progress monitoring:

For ELA grades 9 and 10- PMA data from Fall, Winter, Spring

grades 11 and 12- ACH 3000 from Fall, Winter, Spring

For Math all grades Algebra 1 and Geometry PMA data, averaged

For Biology and Social studies- you will notice lower percentages for ELL Bio and USH overall due to very few to no 9th and 10th grade level not being tested/scheduled into that course.

| Grade 9 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 28% | 25% | 17% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 28% | 24% | 16% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 22% | 21% | 12% |
| | English Language Learners | 6% | 7% | 4% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 42% | 61% | 56% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 41% | 58% | 55% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 38% | 75% | 30% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 0% | 50% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Biology | All Students | 55% | 49% | 73% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 61% | 52% | 75% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 80% | 80% | 75% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| US History | All Students | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |

| Grade 10 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 20% | 24% | 20% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 17% | 23% | 18% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 6% | 10% | 5% |
| | English Language Learners | 3% | 3% | 1% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 21% | 30% | 18% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 16% | 30% | 18% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 24% | 14% | 12% |
| | English Language Learners | 12% | 25% | 10% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Biology | All Students | 41% | 40% | 47% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 35% | 33% | 38% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 27% | 35% | 50% |
| | English Language Learners | 11% | 36% | 29% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| US History | All Students | 42% | 59% | 82% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 26% | 55% | 80% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |

| Grade 11 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 28% | 18% | 18% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 27% | 19% | 17% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0% | 3% | 10% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 21% | 36% | 16% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 20% | 34% | 14% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 10% | 29% | 13% |
| | English Language Learners | 21% | 48% | 18% |
| Biology | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 28% | 25% | 20% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 26% | 23% | 18% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 19% | 29% | 14% |
| | English Language Learners | 11% | 13% | 13% |
| US History | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 31% | 43% | 45% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 33% | 43% | 50% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 37% | 21% | 26% |
| | English Language Learners | 13% | 29% | 36% |

| Grade 12 | | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | | 21% | 20% | 19% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | 27% | 27% | 17% |
| | Students With Disabilities | | 33% | 20% | 8% |
| | English Language Learners | | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | | 23% | 36% | 5% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | 23% | 33% | 4% |
| | Students With Disabilities | | 14% | 14% | 0% |
| | English Language Learners | | 29% | 38% | 8% |
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Biology | All Students | | 23% | 24% | 0% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | 20% | 18% | 0% |
| | Students With Disabilities | | 0% | 50% | 0% |
| | English Language Learners | | 13% | 15% | 0% |
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| US History | All Students | | 45% | 19% | 34% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | 40% | 19% | 32% |
| | Students With Disabilities | | 0% | 17% | 33% |
| | English Language Learners | | 25% | 0% | 13% |
| | | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |

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 | 19 | 22 | 29 | 16 | 33 | 34 | 42 | 20 | | 91 | 52 |
| ELL | 5 | 24 | 28 | 14 | 35 | 42 | 19 | 23 | | 88 | 76 |
| ASN | 17 | 33 | 42 | 29 | 37 | 42 | 33 | 43 | | 100 | 79 |
| BLK | 22 | 26 | 29 | 17 | 27 | 31 | 28 | 38 | | 94 | 67 |
| HSP | 16 | 28 | 29 | 22 | 39 | 40 | 30 | 39 | | 85 | 73 |

| 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 |
| MUL | 20 | 29 | | 6 | 15 | | | | | 92 | 75 |
| WHT | 32 | 36 | 38 | 26 | 39 | 43 | 49 | 53 | | 91 | 75 |
| FRL | 20 | 28 | 34 | 20 | 33 | 36 | 29 | 38 | | 90 | 72 |
| 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 | 12 | 31 | 38 | 23 | 46 | | 41 | 38 | | 97 | 33 |
| ELL | 9 | 30 | 26 | 25 | 36 | 38 | 24 | 27 | | 86 | 68 |
| ASN | 36 | 34 | 22 | 51 | 57 | | 44 | 53 | | 90 | 65 |
| BLK | 28 | 40 | 42 | 32 | 49 | 32 | 46 | 53 | | 92 | 52 |
| HSP | 25 | 41 | 31 | 37 | 42 | 32 | 47 | 41 | | 88 | 67 |
| MUL | 47 | 58 | | 31 | 47 | | 54 | 57 | | 100 | 62 |
| WHT | 41 | 44 | 37 | 48 | 67 | 81 | 58 | 72 | | 93 | 63 |
| FRL | 28 | 40 | 34 | 36 | 46 | 39 | 49 | 49 | | 90 | 54 |
| 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 | 15 | 25 | 21 | 20 | 57 | | 30 | 38 | | 79 | 30 |
| ELL | 3 | 31 | 29 | 21 | 55 | 30 | 19 | 20 | | 87 | 75 |
| ASN | 22 | 36 | 20 | 49 | 70 | | 52 | 56 | | 97 | 77 |
| BLK | 26 | 37 | 30 | 30 | 54 | 35 | 41 | 42 | | 85 | 51 |
| HSP | 23 | 39 | 36 | 30 | 63 | 44 | 51 | 53 | | 82 | 74 |
| MUL | 42 | 42 | | 50 | | | | 62 | | 60 | |
| WHT | 40 | 39 | 23 | 36 | 59 | 40 | 59 | 66 | | 88 | 63 |
| FRL | 28 | 37 | 33 | 32 | 58 | 29 | 46 | 53 | | 82 | 58 |

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 | 41 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 6 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 31 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 446 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 11 |
| Percent Tested | 88% |
| 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 | 35 |
| 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 | 43 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 37 |
| 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 | 40 |
| 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 | 40 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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 | 39 |
| 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?

Two subgroups continuously show the need for support- including our ESOL sheltered and ESE. We had a drop in all areas across the board. This was greatly linked with truancy for all subject areas and a large amount of our denominator for Geometry and English 2 in Duval Homeroom where they did not receive the same support as in person students with pull outs and remediation with district specialists and instructional coaches.

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

Our largest need for improvement is within our proficiency rates. Our goal is to focus on standards based instruction, linking the questioning and question stems to the state assessment, providing equivalent experiences with question types, and monitoring common assessment data throughout the year to revisit standards as necessary with a focus on ALDs.

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 have had a change in process for our Attendance Intervention Team to increase the amount of safety nets revolving around attendance.

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

There were no areas of improvement.

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

There were no areas of improvement.

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

Instructional walkthroughs and calibrations with administrators, interventionists, and coaches. Our calibrations will lead to finding common trends and next steps for each content area. We have calibrations as an instructional team weekly and meet for instructional meetings biweekly. This will then frame the work that takes place in our individual PLCs for each content area that we have weekly.

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.

Lesson studies on engagement and student talk in ALG and GEO; utilizing discovery edu in USH; providing timely feedback with the use of colored stamps in ELA 9 and 10; and the use of Study Island in BIO. To assist with subgroups we will also be conducting PD on supporting students with disabilities with the support of our ESE team. In PLCS we will continue to review products that teachers are making and using for instructional, task based, and assessment purposes.

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

For sustainability- we are working to include Algebra 1A teachers with our Algebra 1 PLCS- to grow our less experienced teachers in the work of standard based instruction and to then build the bench for future math test takers. We will continue to double block our level 1 ELA students and provide sheltered ESOL students with appropriate acclimation to the English language. The collaboration of those teachers in PLC will also be a focus for our reading/ELA PLCs. In USH PLCS, we will be having our more experienced teachers present their materials and strategies to grow capacity of others. In Biology, we will continue to do lesson studies that build off teachers strengths based on specific standard data.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: To improve the culture and environment, specifically relating to parent involvement, we plan to increase academic awareness through data driven family events. These will provide the opportunities for parents and families to engage in a variety of focus meetings. The focus meetings will include but not be limited to graduation requirement course information, tests requirements, test preparation options, and post secondary transition options for ESE students. To increase attendance of events, we will utilize face to face and video conferencing forums (a through online platforms to increase flexibility with parent's schedules), continued communication of events/opportunities via auto-calls, and continue embedding multiple languages into calls and flyers.

Measurable Outcome: Our outcome is to raise parent/guardian participation at school events/meetings from 15-20% to 40% or higher.

- *Leadership meetings with a data focus on each agenda such as AIT meeting results for attendance improvement
- *Student Services touchbase and data analysis meetings to analyze PBIS efforts and referral data

Monitoring: *Instructional Meetings to find common threads for professional development on standards based instruction
 *Grad cohort meetings to analyze data on current at risk seniors and make actionable plans
 *Teacher input during early release faculty meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Marleny Chirino (mesam@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Hosting school meetings and events through various platforms (i.e. Microsoft TEAMS, Business Skype, and face to face), will off parents further access to their child's school without limiting their availability to one date and time. These meetings will include targeted and relevant data sets that can build further on their child's success.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Based on new updated graduation requirements, state assessment changes, and implementation of new standards, parents need more assistance with guiding their student's success. A more targeted approach will increase the relevance and allow parents to be equipped to assist their child for academic success. Further, based on the demographics of our stakeholder population, having events that are flexible and at multiple times of the day, offered in different languages, and virtually, will increase the participation and parent support.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Leadership team will meet to create a calendar with monthly meeting options for parents outside of SAC, Counselor Nights, etc. Include PFEP events. - Spanish, Arabic, and Burmese sessions will be included.
2. Publish calendar on School Website. (Chief Braund)
3. Continued communication of events/opportunities via auto-calls. (Marleny Chirino/ Jennifer Bridwell)
4. Continue embedding multiple languages into calls and flyers. (Jennifer Bridwell/ Ashley Radford/ Jennifer Martinez)
5. Post Microsoft Livestream onto the website so that parents who missed out can have an archive to reference with the information. (Braund, Bridwell, and Martinez)
6. At the conclusion of each meeting, have parents complete a Survey to gather data pertinent to follow up meetings, recommendations, and monitor adjustments needed to make events further successful.
7. Every quarter, track student grades, attendance, discipline, etc. to ensure that we are targeting all

appropriate audiences and see how the impact of the meetings are having a direct effect on our student performance (All Leadership Members)

Person Responsible Marleny Chirino (mesam@duvalschools.org)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: To improve instruction within our school, our focus will be on standards aligned instruction. We will engage in Professional Learning Communities that utilize Learning Arcs in order to adequately prepare teachers to plan appropriate standard aligned tasks and assessments. Walkthrough data indicates an improvement of student tasks/work products being aligned to grade appropriate standards. We will utilize the instructional coach position to support new teachers and to all teachers provide assistance with creating equivalent experiences that align to standards through material that is vetted and then provided to all students, regardless of current level (in efforts to go against Opportunity Myth).

Measurable Outcome: A vast majority of student tasks and assessments will be aligned to grade appropriate standards based on EQUIP protocol.

Monitoring: Continued PLCs, instructional walkthroughs by admin and coaching team, instructional meetings that review data, district walkthroughs to align look fors and feedback.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Marleny Chirino (mesam@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Quality Professional Learning Communities centered around Standards Based Instruction provides teachers the opportunity to continuously utilize the Learning Arc Tool to analyze and synthesize standards to produce an experience and tasks that lead toward the mastery of appropriate grade level standards for all students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research from The Opportunity Myth shows that all students deserve the opportunity to receive standards aligned instruction and grade level appropriate assignments.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide Professional Development for Admin, Instructional Coaches, and Teachers, focused on further understanding the Learning Arcs for standards and differentiating a Professional Learning Community v. a Common Planning. The Opportunity Myth will be reviewed during Pre-Planning to further connect where we started last year and where we currently stand. (Marleny Chirino)
2. Have calibration walk-throughs with Admin to ensure that our lenses are aligned. (All Admin Team)
3. Engage in weekly Instructional Meetings to discuss the result of calibration visits and determine school wide areas of opportunity and individual PLC areas of opportunity. (All Admin and Instructional Coaches for PLC portion)
4. Admin and Coaches will engage in their appropriate weekly PLC meetings with their content areas using Steps 1-4 of the Learning Arc form. The standard(s) and resources available for standards will be reviewed and broken down into different components of the arc and review achievement level mastery requirements. Admin will be responsible for placing their documentation into one binder upon completion. (All Admin and Instructional Coaches)
5. Coaches and/or teachers will engage/facilitate Common Planning meetings to create tasks that align to standards and the appropriate learning arc, providing the same opportunity for mastery to all students. (Teachers/Coach)
6. Complete weekly classroom walk-throughs using the Standard-Based Walk-Through tool. (All Admin and Coaches). This will offer an opportunity to observe lead teachers that can lead a PLC for a particular standard.
7. On a bi-weekly basis, student work will be assessed in Instructional Meetings to check alignment to standards, to delivery of instruction, and to student mastery of task (All Admin and Instructional Coaches.)
8. Individual coaching support, PLC support, etc. will be offered and differentiated based on results.

(Admin and Instructional Coaches)

9. Ongoing data analysis via administrative meetings, Instructional meetings, and PLC's will be a standard agenda item and used to desegregate the data and check for student mastery, opportunities for differentiation, and adjust calendar and plan for ensuring students meet individualized goals toward proficiency and appropriate grade level experience/learning.

Person Responsible Marleny Chirino (mesam@duvalschools.org)

Title I funds will be used to purchase additional classroom supplies and materials for teacher/student use in improving student achievement.

USA Test Prep software subscription: \$425.00

MathXL software subscription: \$14,250.00

Storeroom Order: \$247.00

Reach Technologies calculators: \$9,775.00

Reach Technologies toner supplies: \$1,500.00

\$26,197.00

Person Responsible Marleny Chirino (mesam@duvalschools.org)

Title I funds will be utilized to fund the following teaching, instructional coaching, deans, and interventionist positions in order to support pockets of at risk students to increase the graduation rate of the school.

Science Teacher- Ismael Emmanuelli (bilingual to support Spanish speaking students)

Math Teacher- Josue Artavia (bilingual to support Spanish speaking students)

Language Arts- Holly Gauthier

Reading Interventionist- Sue Wrye

Dean of Students- Bryan Turner

Graduation Coach- Jennifer Martinez

Person Responsible Marleny Chirino (mesam@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.

With use of Title 1 PFEP budget the following items will be part of our budget:

1. Providing workshops for our parents, at multiple times during the day (as well as virtual), tailored around specific strategies that can be completed at home to support literacy in multiple aspects as well as emphasize the importance of attendance and its effect on success. When the strategies allow parents to connect with the children and their education, all will benefit from it. For example, ACT/SAT strategies, post graduate opportunities through parent nights with local companies and agencies, and attendance focused events.

2. We will continue to conduct neighborhood visits through our social worker and truancy officer, focusing on 5 specific apartment complexes in the school zone to encourage a bridge between community and school. Working with apartment managers, different family support agencies, Full Service Schools in order to best support the whole child and family.

3. In order to reach our ESOL population that can easily be truant or struggle with absenteeism, we will focus reaching this population through events in the early part of the school year, when parent involvement is at the highest level. And again during the beginning of the third quarter to ensure student success for the closing of the school year. These events will focus on the barriers listed previously. We will continue to offer ELL parents opportunities to learn the basics of their students' schedule, expectations and goals to graduate with our ESOL designated counselor and paraprofessional support.

4. To bridge the educational gap for our ESOL population as well as provide pre-requisite support for our non-proficient population, we will provide parents with resources such as phonetic flash cards, SAT/ACT preparation materials, vocabulary support and resources, math fluency flashcards, manipulatives, etc. These resources will allow students to build their academic background and strategies through engagement with their family.

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.

In order to best support our working families, EHS will offer events in the mornings, lunch times, AND evenings in order to

reach more families. Topics and strategies that will assist parents in assisting their students with being successful in their academics such as steady attendance, strategies for testing, and grade level progression requirements. Events that combat truancy (such as Attend and Achieve), that encourage strong school culture (such as Remarkable Rams), and that equip parents the knowledge to best support their students with progression and post-secondary options (such as Counselor Nights and Post-Secondary Transition Night). This information will also be sent through flyers to families' homes, through weekly auto-calls, and school website links.

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

5000 role models, Gentleman of Englewood, Gear Up, DCPS World Languages team, Johnson & Johnson, TRIO, BTE, YLDP, Full Service

Part V: Budget

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

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