# Martin Luther King, Jr Elementary School

leadership

analysis

Florida

college and career

students

mission

family and community involvement

ambitious

school improvement

striving achievement

teaching

relationships

success

areas of focus

instruction

needs assessment

resources

supportive environment

growth

strategic planning

collaboration

vision

learning

**2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan**

## Table of Contents

# Martin Luther King, Jr Elementary School

## 8801 LAKE PLACID DR E, Jacksonville, FL 32208

## http://www.duvalschools.org/mlking

## Demographics

## Principal: Andrea Willis

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Closed: 2023-06-30 |
|---|---|
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>PK-5 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2020-21 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| **2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: C (41%)<br><br>2017-18: D (32%)<br><br>2016-17: C (44%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Northeast |
| **Regional Executive Director** | Cassandra Brusca |
| **Turnaround Option/Cycle** | N/A |
| **Year** | N/A |
| **Support Tier** | N/A |
| **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

<div style="background:#2d2d66; color:white; text-align:center;">

# Martin Luther King, Jr Elementary School

</div>

**8801 LAKE PLACID DR E, Jacksonville, FL 32208**

http://www.duvalschools.org/mlking

## School Demographics

| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | **2020-21 Title I School** | **2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5 | Yes | 100% |

| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate**<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 98% |

## School Grades History

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

## 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.**

Martin Luther King Jr. F.A.M.E. Academy will provide educational excellence in every classroom, for every student, every day.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

At Martin Luther King Jr. Elementary, every student is inspired and prepared for success in middle school and beyond.

## 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 |
|---|---|---|
| Johnson, Laquitrice | Principal | Instructional Leader- Lead work with school instructional and behavioral goals. |
| Willis, Andrea | Assistant Principal | Assist with school instructional and behavioral goals; to assist the School Principal in all job duties and responsibilities through implementation and support.<br>- Provides opportunities for shared decision making among faculty and staff<br>- Oversee master schedule, operations and facilities<br>- Hire and support qualified teachers and staff to ensure student needs are met<br>- Maintains and monitors outreach programs for parents and community to build relationships<br>- Provides instructional delivery support through frequent classroom walkthroughs and PLCs<br>- Oversee and support ESE, ESOL, MTSS process and compliance<br>- Ensure safety measures are implemented to maintain a secure campus from internal and external factors. |
| Telfair, Henrietta | Curriculum Resource Teacher | Provide interventions/supports for students; assist teachers with guidance for interventions |
| Payne, Marva | School Counselor | Provide social/emotional support to students; follow up on behavior and attendance data; assist students with developing/achieving academic/ behavioral goals. |
| Harb, Zayna | Math Coach | Provide coaching support to faulty members in planning and implementing standards based math instruction effectively. Math Coach supports the mission and vision of the school. Implements the principal's vision for mathematics in all grade levels Pre-Kg-5th.<br>- leads Math common planning for all grade levels<br>- leads integration of Science content through related Math skills/strategies<br>- provides tiered coaching to support teachers<br>- models the instructional delivery of effective Math lessons<br>- Reviews school Math data in order to implement a strategic plan to reach student proficiency and gains. |
| Mbowe, Caralyn | Reading Coach | Provide coaching support to faulty members in planning and implementing standards based ELA instruction effectively. Provide coaching support to faulty members in planning and implementing standards based Reading instruction effectively. Reading Coach supports the mission and vision of the school. Implements the principal's vision for English Language Arts in all grade levels Pre-Kg-5th.<br>- leads ELA common planning for all grade levels<br>- leads integration of Science content through related Reading skills/strategies<br>- provides tiered coaching to support teachers<br>- models the instructional delivery of effective Reading/Writing lessons<br>- Reviews school ELA data in order to implement a strategic plan to reach student proficiency and gains. |

## Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Andrea Willis

**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.*
3

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**
20

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**
290

**Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.**
5

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.**
6

**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 | 22 | 51 | 45 | 67 | 42 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 269 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 8 | 18 | 21 | 26 | 12 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 104 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 7 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 12 | 20 | 38 | 20 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 106 |

**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 | 6 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |

**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 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Monday 7/26/2021

## 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 | 53 | 66 | 60 | 43 | 64 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 348 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 25 | 15 | 18 | 27 | 22 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 116 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |

**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 | 1 | 6 | 19 | 35 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90 |

**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 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |

## 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 | 53 | 66 | 60 | 43 | 64 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 348 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 25 | 15 | 18 | 27 | 22 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 116 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |

**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 | 1 | 6 | 19 | 35 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 90 |

**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 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

| School Grade Component | 2021 | | | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | | | | 23% | 50% | 57% | 23% | 50% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 34% | 56% | 58% | 31% | 51% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 41% | 50% | 53% | 27% | 46% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 48% | 62% | 63% | 33% | 61% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 55% | 63% | 62% | 46% | 59% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 65% | 52% | 51% | 38% | 48% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 22% | 48% | 53% | 27% | 55% | 55% |

**Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments**
**NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.**

| ELA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 31% | 51% | -20% | 58% | -27% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 19% | 52% | -33% | 58% | -39% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -31% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 19% | 50% | -31% | 56% | -37% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -19% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 68% | 61% | 7% | 62% | 6% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 32% | 64% | -32% | 64% | -32% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -68% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 47% | 57% | -10% | 60% | -13% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -32% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 21% | 49% | -28% | 53% | -32% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

## Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady was the progress monitoring tool used for grades 1st and 2nd.
Progress Monitoring Assessment (PMA) was the progress monitoring tool used for grades 3rd-5th.

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 15 | 38 | 38 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 11 | 31 | 31 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 16 | 33 | 47 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 11 | 27 | 31 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Grade 2 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 14 | 10 | 19 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 12 | 5 | 17 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 14 | 10 | 16 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 10 | 7 | 16 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Grade 3 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 0 | 4 | 25 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 4 | 0 | 4 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 9 | 9 | 41 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 20 | 35 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Grade 4 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 2.5 | 0 | 23 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 7 | 2.4 | 30 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 14 | 0 | 16 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Grade 5 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 1.6 | 4.8 | 26 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 8.4 | 9.6 | 31 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Science | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 13 | 9 | 20 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 10 | 3 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |

## Subgroup Data Review

| 2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD | | 50 | | 9 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 22 | 30 | 57 | 35 | 29 | 43 | 5 | | | | |
| FRL | 20 | 33 | 67 | 33 | 29 | 50 | 4 | | | | |
| 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 | 6 | 28 | 28 | 17 | 56 | 71 | | | | | |
| BLK | 22 | 32 | 39 | 47 | 55 | 62 | 19 | | | | |
| FRL | 22 | 32 | 38 | 46 | 55 | 62 | 17 | | | | |

| 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 | 3 | 20 | 21 | 8 | 26 | 29 | | | | | |
| BLK | 23 | 31 | 29 | 33 | 46 | 39 | 29 | | | | |
| FRL | 19 | 30 | 27 | 30 | 45 | 38 | 23 | | | | |

## 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 | 31 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | YES |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 3 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 220 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|---|
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 20 |
| 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 | |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Native American Students | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |

| Asian Students | |
|---|---|
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

| Black/African American Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 32 |
| 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 | |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| 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 | |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 34 |
| 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?**

Trends show major deficiencies in Reading and comprehending on grade level and lack of content-related vocabulary.
Trends for Math, according to data across grade levels, show proficiency percentages as follows.
Greatest gaps seen in 2nd grade, and a huge dip in 5th grade.
K:14% on level based on END OF YEAR view
1st: 34% on level based on END OF YEAR view
2nd: 30% on level based on END OF YEAR view
3rd: *33% proficient (94th out of 123 schools)
4th: *42% proficient (79th out of 123 schools)
5th: *31% proficient (106th out of 123 schools)

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

2021 state assessment demonstrates a need for improvement in Science, across the board. Though initial 5th grade PMA data showed some signs of academic progress, 5th grade Science FSA data showed the greatest need for improvement.

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

State assessment shows a dire need for improvement in 5th grade Science. Action for improvement includes non-negotiable for teaching Science in all grades, and a need to determine and understand pre-requisites for the 5th grade Science state assessment. A seasoned teacher is now teaching ELA and is supporting Science standards by embedding Science instruction and vocabulary acquisition during Center time, using such resources as Achieve 3000 articles and Study Island, with the support of coaching from school-based and district specialists.

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

3rd grade Reading and 4th grade Math showed the most improvement.

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

The 4-step plan was implemented, which included students working in small groups with core teacher, a member of leadership, a coach or a district specialist. Groups focused on grade level, standards-based instruction, as well as immediate remediation.

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

* Immediate response to intervention as soon as the first set of data is generated.
* Data chats: Admin/leadership/teachers, teacher/teacher, teacher/student
* A deep dive into PMA data to ensure we plug holes, and push high performers.

**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.**

Common planning time to work on learning arcs, plan grade level, standards-based lessons, with aligned activities, resources and assessments.

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

Support from content area specialists with unpacking and understanding standards, as well as the expectations placed upon students.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

| #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Grade-level, standards-based instruction, with evidence of differentiation. Approximately 23% of our students were proficient on the 2018/2019 FSA. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | 100% of our core content teachers will engage in effective standards-based procedures. These instructional practice shifts will positively impact student proficiency and learning gains, as teachers, coaches and administration are working collaboratively during PLC, to ensure that planning and curriculum implementation revolve around standards-based, grade level instruction. |
| **Monitoring:** | The AOF will be monitored during classroom walkthroughs using the SWT and Dashboard. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Caralyn Mbowe (mbowec@duvalschools.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. Content teams consistently plan standards-based instruction with aligned tasks and assessments, FCIM becoming a way of work, implementing learned best practices through Collaborative Coaching Cycle (CCC). |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | As expressed in the Opportunity Myth, our students need more opportunities with on grade level work, aligned to standards. Teachers need more support with FCIM; thus, the Collaborative Coaching Cycle (CCC), will provide this intentional support. Coaching is a deliberate, intentional conversation between colleagues with the ultimate goal of strengthening instructional planning and practice. The Reading Coach is instrumental in accomplishing this goal. |

### Action Steps to Implement

SBLT will train teachers on how to use FSA data and scale to determine how many points are needed for each of their students to make a gain.

**Person Responsible** Andrea Willis (willisa@duvalschools.org)

Reading Coach will guide teachers in drilling down within the FSA clusters, to determine where students have the greatest deficiency.

**Person Responsible** Andrea Willis (willisa@duvalschools.org)

Reading Coach will facilitate PD on how to plan lessons whereby goals/objectives/ activities/assessments all align to the grade level standard.

**Person Responsible** Andrea Willis (willisa@duvalschools.org)

Our paraprofessional will be trained and used as an additional support person during "Walk to Read" intervention.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

Teachers will utilize technology as a resource to support Reading Goals. These resources will include the strategic use of Achieve 3000 and Freckle, as well some iReady, depending on STAR diagnostic assessment results.

**Person Responsible** Laquitrice Johnson (moselyl@duvalschools.org)

| #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Grade level, standards-based instruction, with evidence of differentiation. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.<br>100% of our core content teachers will engage in effective standards-based procedures. These instructional practice shifts will positively impact student proficiency and learning gains, as teachers, coaches and administration are working collaboratively during PLC, to ensure that planning and curriculum implementation revolve around standards-based, grade level instruction. |
| **Monitoring:** | The AOF will be monitored during classroom walkthroughs using the SWT and Dashboard. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Andrea Willis (willisa@duvalschools.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Content teams consistently plan standards-based instruction with aligned tasks and assessments, FCIM becoming a way of work, implementing learned best practices through Collaborative Coaching Cycle (CCC). |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | As expressed in the Opportunity Myth, our students need more opportunities with on grade level work, aligned to standards. Teachers need more support with FCIM; thus, the Collaborative Coaching Cycle (CCC), will provide this intentional support. Coaching is a deliberate, intentional conversation between colleagues with the ultimate goal of strengthening instructional planning and practice. The Reading Coach is instrumental in accomplishing this goal. |

### Action Steps to Implement

SBLT will train teachers on how to use FSA data and scale to determine now many points are needed for each of their students to make a gain.

| **Person Responsible** | Laquitrice Johnson (moselyl@duvalschools.org) |
|---|---|

Math Coach will guide teachers in drilling down within the FSA clusters, to determine where students have the greatest deficiency.

| **Person Responsible** | Laquitrice Johnson (moselyl@duvalschools.org) |
|---|---|

Math Coach will facilitate PD on how to plan lessons whereby goals/objectives/ activities/assessments all align to the grade level standard.

| **Person Responsible** | Laquitrice Johnson (moselyl@duvalschools.org) |
|---|---|

Teachers will utilize technology as a resource to support Math Goals. These resources will include the strategic use of Study Island and Freckle, as well some iReady, depending on STAR diagnostic assessment results.

| **Person Responsible** | [no one identified] |
|---|---|

| **#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities** |
|---|

| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | On the 2018/19 FSA, only 6% of our SWD students were proficient. |
|---|---|
| **Measurable Outcome:** | 60% of our SWD students will increase their Reading comprehension level; thus, move from one grade level to the next, closer to being on grade level. |
| **Monitoring:** | Instructional Walkthroughs, using SWT form will capture effectiveness of centers. iReady and Achieve data will be a measurement of progress monitoring. Biweekly reports analyzed. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Henrietta Telfair (telfairh@duvalschools.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Supplementary Materials- Listening Stations: This line item will be used to support fluency for students who struggle with reading and comprehending on-grade level text. The school intends to utilize this resource to support quality center activities, across multiple grade levels. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Research supports that Reading fluency and comprehension are strictly inter-related, and also correlated with important aspects of academic life, such as school outcomes. |

| **Action Steps to Implement** |
|---|

Teachers will group students according to Reading level; assign weekly text for students to engage in, listening to text, as they follow along.

| **Person Responsible** | Henrietta Telfair (telfairh@duvalschools.org) |
|---|---|

Teachers will assign weekly, standards-based activities for students to engage in, using leveled text, (i.e. written summary, group discussion of text- accountable talk)

| **Person Responsible** | Henrietta Telfair (telfairh@duvalschools.org) |
|---|---|

## #4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Community Involvement

| | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Over the past 1.5-2 years, largely in part to COVID, students have had an extended period void of structure and adequate education, as well as social/emotional support. As our students have experienced trauma, so have parents/guardians, and educators. We need additional support with helping to reteach students the school "way of work", as well as teaching them, along with their caregivers, strategies for how to positively communicate and reacclimate to the structured learning environment, so that they an be ready to learn. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Forty-six students had two or more early warning indicators . Our goal is to decrease this number by 50%. Our focus will be on attendance and discipline referrals. |
| **Monitoring:** | School Counselor will help to track and follow up on discipline referrals submitted, as well as ensure that students who need to be referred to full service, actually are referred. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Marva Payne (paynem@duvalschools.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Our school counselor, as well as full-service therapist, will help to bridge school and parents/community, by working closely with school leadership to help support parents through communication of available resources (academic, clothing, social/emotional supports, etc.); support with PBIS goals and assist our most valuable stakeholders with social-emotional needs. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | As we are embarking on becoming a dedicated "trauma-informed school", we understand the importance of alternative methods of approaching misbehavior, and detrimental affects of out of school suspension. Our full service therapist is able to serve as in-house resource when students have committed certain offenses, yet need to remain in school to continue education, while supporting with PBIS. |

### Action Steps to Implement

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

### 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.

**1. Students will be welcome on to campus as they arrive each morning, as they are checked in via CDC/district guidelines.**
**2. Principal will make every attempt to speak positive words to students at the beginning of each day.**
**3. Students will engage in daily sessions of Calm Classroom, Social Circles, as well as some integration of Sanford Harmony Lessons.**
**4. Faculty/staff will be trained and expected to us Restorative Practices and Positive Behavior & Intervention Supports.**
**5. PBIS team will be nurtured, so that they can support teachers and students.**
**6. All classroom teachers will be expected to make contact with parents/guardians for first, positive interaction, and communicate at least quarterly about academic and behavior progress.**
**7. Principal will attempt to meet with some students with 2 or more Early Warning Indicators, before the start of school, to build relationships, and help students/parents set positive goals. Discipline and Attendance data will be monitored monthly.**

## 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.

1. Students will be welcome on to campus as they arrive each morning, as they are checked in via CDC/district guidelines.
2. Principal will make every attempt to speak positive words to students at the beginning of each day.
3. Students will engage in daily sessions of Calm Classroom, Social Circles, as well as some integration of Sanford Harmony Lessons.
4. Faculty/staff will be trained and expected to us Restorative Practices and Positive Behavior & Intervention Supports.
5. PBIS team will be nurtured, so that they can support teachers and students.
6. All classroom teachers will be expected to make contact with parents/guardians for first, positive interaction, and communicate at least quarterly about academic and behavior progress.
7. Principal will attempt to meet with some students with 2 or more Early Warning Indicators, before the start of school, to build relationships, and help students/parents set positive goals.

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

Administration: train staff on Restorative Practices
PBIS Committee: train and support faculty with effective, research-based strategies/interventions for positive outcomes
Teachers: Follow through of learned strategies for positive behavior and relationship building
Parents: Follow through with goals set; support students by being involved with their academics; attend scheduled meetings, etc.
Students: Work towards goals set; adhere to school expectations
Parent Liaison: help bridge school and parents/community, helping to support parents with various needs; support with PBIS goals

## Part V: Budget

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

| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | $0.00 |
|---|--------|---------------------------------------------|-------|
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | $0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | $0.00 |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Community Involvement | $0.00 |
| | | Total: | $0.00 |