

Duval County Public Schools

Lone Star Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	24

Lone Star Elementary School

10400 LONE STAR RD, Jacksonville, FL 32225

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

Demographics

Principal: Cheryl Quarles Gaston R

Start Date for this Principal: 7/20/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	93%
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (61%)
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	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	24

Lone Star Elementary School

10400 LONE STAR RD, Jacksonville, FL 32225

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	99%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	62%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

It is the mission of Lone Star Elementary School to challenge our students to achieve their goals and dreams.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Lighting the fire of learning in every child's mind.

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
Quarles Gaston, Cheryl	Principal	Oversees all operations at the school level
Farrington, Leigh	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/20/2021, Cheryl Quarles Gaston R

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.*

2

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

19

Total number of students enrolled at the school

399

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

3

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

2

Demographic Data

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	67	68	61	76	73	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	440
Attendance below 90 percent	10	23	19	16	20	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	2	2	1	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	2	1	3	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	9	28	25	18	50	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	16	25	26	25	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	2	1	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	2	14	26	20	21	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	1	2	4	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/8/2021

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	56	65	75	86	77	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	451
Attendance below 90 percent	15	8	13	19	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	22	39	23	16	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	28	41	38	48	12	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	187

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	23	33	22	30	12	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	56	65	75	86	77	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	451
Attendance below 90 percent	15	8	13	19	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	22	39	23	16	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	28	41	38	48	12	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	187

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	23	33	22	30	12	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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				61%	50%	57%	54%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				69%	56%	58%	50%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				60%	50%	53%	31%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				67%	62%	63%	69%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				63%	63%	62%	53%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				38%	52%	51%	35%	48%	47%
Science Achievement				63%	48%	53%	62%	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	51%	51%	0%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	66%	52%	14%	58%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2021					
	2019	60%	50%	10%	56%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	64%	61%	3%	62%	2%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	69%	64%	5%	64%	5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
05	2021					
	2019	57%	57%	0%	60%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	61%	49%	12%	53%	8%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

We used I-Ready for reading and math; We used baseline & PMAs for 5th grade science

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	28%	43%	43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	0%	2%	2%
	English Language Learners	2%	2%	2%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	16%	36%	54%
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	0%	2%	2%
	English Language Learners	2%	2%	2%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16%	36%	54%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	17%	47%	59%
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	0%	1%	5%
	English Language Learners	0%	1%	2%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	8%	43%	61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	0%	6%	7%
	English Language Learners	0%	3%	2%
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	48%	61%	71%
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	4%	5%	9%
	English Language Learners	0%	3%	4%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	48%	61%	71%
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	4%	5%	9%
	English Language Learners	0%	3%	4%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	44%	45%	54%
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	1%	1%	4%
	English Language Learners	5%	4%	4%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	25%	41%	52%
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	0%	2%	2%
	English Language Learners	2%	1%	4%
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	29%	35%	42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	2%	3%	5%
	English Language Learners	0%	1%	2%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	28%	43%	53%
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	2%	3%	4%
	English Language Learners	1%	1%	4%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	40%	76%	89%
	Economically Disadvantaged	n/a	n/a	n/a
	Students With Disabilities	6%	8%	12%
	English Language Learners	1%	4%	5%

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	7			37							
ELL	44			40							
ASN	50										
BLK	34	39		42			44				
HSP	61			57							
MUL	55										
WHT	65	52		76			70				
FRL	38	38		48			58				
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	34	58	60	31	44	33	31				
ELL	53	57		53	64						
ASN	58	60		83	80						
BLK	55	69	60	67	64	33	64				
HSP	67	81		57	63						
MUL	74	79		79	79						
WHT	62	66	63	64	55	36	64				
FRL	55	69	63	58	63	43	53				
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	22	37	21	36	44	39	33				
ELL	20	44	55	45	60						
ASN	63	69		74	69						
BLK	44	45	35	59	38	23	48				
HSP	43	38		60	57		61				
MUL	50	38		72	43						
WHT	65	55	28	79	61	50	71				
FRL	47	48	29	63	44	30	57				

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	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	84
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	345
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	82%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	22
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	56
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	50
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	40
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	59
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	55
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	66
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	51
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

Proficiency in all grade levels is not where it should be.

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

Our data component with the lowest performance was LPQ math. We used our financial resources to provide push-in reading support and did not have any funds to provide push-in math support.

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 a reading coach but not a math coach. Our reading coach meets with teachers weekly but we do not have a person dedicated to math as support for our teachers. We do not have a district math coach that visits regularly. We need funds to provide push-in support for math and funds for teachers to provide after school tutoring.

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

The data that showed the most improvement was LPQ ELA. We utilized the available human capital and all resources available to provide necessary push-in support.

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

We had push-in support for reading.

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

Continued push-in support for reading and math, as well as after school tutoring to target students who have significant deficits.

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.

continued work with Learning ARCs with district and school-based coach; PLCS with K-2 surrounding the new BEST standards and the new Benchmark curriculum.

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

Still evaluating, based upon FSA scores

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>Description of Area of Focus: Instructional practice specifically relating to standards-aligned instruction will focus on supporting teachers with researchbased practices that follow state adopted standards within the specific content area.</p> <p>Rationale for Area of Focus: Standards-based data (FSA, Common Assessments, Walk-Through etc.) collected from the 2019-2020 school year showed students performing at grade level in ELA, Math, and Science with inconsistencies in tasks aligned to grade appropriate standards. Students are not provided with consistent opportunities to be successful with standardsaligned tasks while adhering to the district curriculum guide, and teachers have limited effective teaching methods to support learning. Walk-Through data collected from the 2019-2020 school year showed that 50% of teachers were providing grade appropriate standards-aligned tasks.</p> <p>* By October 2021 - at least 80% of teachers will provide opportunities for students to engage in standards-aligned tasks according to Walk-Through data (both virtual and brick & mortar). By December 2020, 100% of teachers will provide opportunities for students to engage in standards-aligned tasks.</p>
Measurable Outcome:	<p>We need to increase our school grade by gaining 13 points.</p> <p>*ELA proficiency: increase by 2;</p> <p>*ELA Gains: increase by 2;</p> <p>*ELA Bottom Quartile: increase by 2;</p> <p>*Math proficiency: increase by 2;</p> <p>*Math Gains: increase by 2;</p> <p>*Math Bottom Quartile: increase by 2;</p> <p>*Science: increase by 2.</p>
Monitoring: Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	<p>Cheryl Quarles Gaston (quarlesc@duvalschools.org)</p>
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Professional Learning Communities (PLC): Professional Learning Communities will be focused on standards-based planning, student work, project-based learning, analysis protocol, development of common assessments, and analyzing data. The work of the PLC will be centered around the research of Richard Dufour's</p>

PLC questions

and will be utilized throughout the following Instructional format:

1. MTSS - improving the effectiveness of meeting the needs of all students.
2. 3 Phase Instruction for ELA - a) extended level instruction; b) instructional level instruction; c) on grade-level instruction
3. 2 Phase Instruction for Math - a) on grade-level instruction; b) instructional groups and basic facts automaticity
4. Infuse science into all academic courses.

We are embracing the District's priorities and utilizing information attained from the Opportunity Gap to address them at the school level for our students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

1. Reorganization of Problem Solving Team with new members, procedures and accountability.
2. ELA-School-wide explicit vocabulary instruction, RMSE intervention for K-2; LLI intervention for 3-5; I-Ready K-5; Freckles 4-5; Achieve 3-5; Making Meaning K-5; Duval Reads for Science and Social Studies; Deliver grade-level standards-based instruction daily; Project-based learning (K-5); Push-in classroom support with paras and tutors.
3. Eureka Math, Acaletics (2-5), I-Ready K-5; Freckles 4-5; Zearn (3-5); Push-in support
4. Adoption of Genius Hour for interdisciplinary-constructivist teaching approach; emphasis on science, inquiry, & project-based learning (student-selected projects).
5. Reading coach-analyze reading achievement progress; provide professional development; facilitate coaching cycles; and provide coaching for teachers.
6. Science Lab teacher-design and monitor science achievement progress and provide instruction for students and coaching for teachers
7. Reading interventionist-provide tier-2 and tier-3 intervention to struggling readers.
8. District Math Coach-analyze data, provide professional development & coaching for teachers.

Person Responsible

Cheryl Quarles Gaston (quarlesc@duvalschools.org)

1. Reorganization of Problem Solving Team with new members, procedures and accountability.
2. ELA-School-wide explicit vocabulary instruction, RMSE intervention for K-2; LLI intervention for 3-5; I-Ready K-5; Freckles 4-5; Achieve 3-5; Making Meaning K-5; Duval Reads for Science and Social Studies; Deliver grade-level standards-based instruction daily; Project-based learning (K-5); Push-in classroom support with paras and tutors.
3. Eureka Math, Acaletics (2-5), I-Ready K-5; Freckles 4-5; Zearn (3-5); Push-in support
4. Adoption of Genius Hour for interdisciplinary-constructivist teaching approach; emphasis on science, inquiry, & project-based learning (student-selected projects).
5. Reading coach-analyze reading achievement progress; provide professional development; facilitate coaching cycles; and provide coaching for teachers.
6. Science Lab teacher-design and monitor science achievement progress and provide instruction for students and coaching for teachers
7. Reading interventionist-provide tier-2 and tier-3 intervention to struggling readers.

8. District Math Coach-analyze data, provide professional development & coaching for teachers.

Person Responsible

Cheryl Quarles Gaston (quarlesc@duvalschools.org)

1. Reorganization of Problem Solving Team with new members, procedures and accountability.
2. ELA-School-wide explicit vocabulary instruction, RMSE intervention for K-2; LLI intervention for 3-5; I-Ready K-5; Freckles 4-5; Achieve 3-5; Making Meaning K-5; Duval Reads for Science and Social Studies; Deliver grade-level standards-based instruction daily; Project-based learning (K-5); Push-in classroom support with paras and tutors.
3. Eureka Math, Acaletics (2-5), I-Ready K-5; Freckles 4-5; Zearn (3-5); Push-in support
4. Adoption of Genius Hour for interdisciplinary-constructivist teaching approach; emphasis on science, inquiry, & project-based learning (student-selected projects).
5. Reading coach-analyze reading achievement progress; provide professional development; facilitate coaching cycles; and provide coaching for teachers.
6. Science Lab teacher-design and monitor science achievement progress and provide instruction for students and coaching for teachers
7. Reading interventionist-provide tier-2 and tier-3 intervention to struggling readers.
8. District Math Coach-analyze data, provide professional development & coaching for teachers.

Person Responsible

Cheryl Quarles Gaston (quarlesc@duvalschools.org)

1. Reorganization of Problem Solving Team with new members, procedures and accountability.
2. ELA-School-wide explicit vocabulary instruction, RMSE intervention for K-2; LLI intervention for 3-5; I-Ready K-5; Freckles 4-5; Achieve 3-5; Making Meaning K-5; Duval Reads for Science and Social Studies; Deliver grade-level standards-based instruction daily; Project-based learning (K-5); Push-in classroom support with paras and tutors.
3. Eureka Math, Acaletics (2-5), I-Ready K-5; Freckles 4-5; Zearn (3-5); Push-in support
4. Adoption of Genius Hour for interdisciplinary-constructivist teaching approach; emphasis on science, inquiry, & project-based learning (student-selected projects).
5. Reading coach-analyze reading achievement progress; provide professional development; facilitate coaching cycles; and provide coaching for teachers.
6. Science Lab teacher-design and monitor science achievement progress and provide instruction for students and coaching for teachers
7. Reading interventionist-provide tier-2 and tier-3 intervention to struggling readers.
8. District Math Coach-analyze data, provide professional development & coaching for teachers.

Person Responsible

Cheryl Quarles Gaston (quarlesc@duvalschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>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.</p> <p>o The percentage of students in grades 3-5, below Level 3 on the 2021 statewide, standardized English Language Arts assessment are as follows: 3rd grade is 52%, 4th grade is 36%, and 5th grade is 62%.</p> <p>o The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2020-2021 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized grade 3 English Language Arts assessment is as follows: 1st - 80% and 2nd - 73%</p>
Measurable Outcome:	<p>K-5 data: *Increase percentage of K-2 students scoring "At Grade Level" or above by 3-4 percentage points. Decrease number of "Below Grade Level" students by 3-4 percentage points.</p> <p>*Increase percentage of 3 -5 grade students scoring Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized English Language Arts assessment by 3-4 percentage points. Decrease number of "Below Grade Level" students by 3-4 percentage points.</p>
Monitoring:	<p>Our school leadership team, district content specialist support, and Supplemental Instructional APs will review ELA data from district assessments.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	<p>Cheryl Quarles Gaston (quarlesc@duvalschools.org)</p>
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Data Driven Lesson Planning: Understanding where students are with mastery of standards, using data from informal and formal assessments, planning clear objectives, implementation, and checking for understanding when lesson planning.</p> <p>Small Group/Differentiated Instruction: Based on data, breaking groups of students into smaller groups to ensure Tier II support is given. Not all students are on the same level, but all standards must be mastered.</p> <p>Small group instruction will allow teachers to meet students at their level to support their needs.</p> <p>Progress Monitoring: Ensuring whole group lessons, interventions, and assessments are done with fidelity.</p> <p>Checking effectiveness from student data.</p>

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

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

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

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

Action Steps to Implement

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

Person Responsible Cheryl Quarles Gaston (quarlesc@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 Cheryl Quarles Gaston (quarlesc@duvalschools.org)

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

Person Responsible Cheryl Quarles Gaston (quarlesc@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.

- 1.) **Primary/Secondary Concern - Monitor the Social Needs of the Students**
- 2.) **Primary/Secondary Concern - Monitor the Emotional Needs of the Students**

Utilizing "Wrap-Around" services provided by the District, School, & Community; the BTAT Team will continue to meet monthly with the School Resource Officer to assess and discuss potential threats to the student, school, and/or community. The following services will be made available to the student and/or family:

- * **School Counseling Services or Support Groups**
- * **District SOS Program for Student Discipline**
- * **Referral for Full-Service Schools Therapists**
- * **Referral for Full-Service Schools Counseling and/or Support (student - family)**
- * **Faith-Based Partnerships (services)**
- * **Mentoring Program for students in crisis**
- * **CRISIS Interventions**
- * **Micah's Backpack Program (i.e. weekend food giveaway)**
- * **Calm Classroom Program**
- * **Positive Discipline in the Classroom**
- * **Administration using Equity Audits in the Classroom to assess Behavior & Discipline Data**

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.

We will use the data from our 5 Essentials Survey. We were in the green (very positive) in every category except one (we were "neutral"). That area was Teacher Collaboration. According to UofChicago (survey designers), 3 or more areas rated as "strong" (green) means your school is more likely to grow and succeed. She shared the results and we watched a video from DCPS about ways to address/improve the Teacher Collaboration portion. After the video, Mrs. Gaston asked grade level teams to complete a planning sheet with their ideas about ways to address this portion so that we can build it into our SIP. She asked all grade levels to submit this information to her by the end of the day. She also asked all faculty and staff to share any thoughts, ideas or discussions about our SIP and what we need to do in order to improve our school. All ideas have been integrated into our PLC's for the subsequent

school year. Most Noteworthy: Teachers would like opportunities to observe their colleagues to gain feedback and offer feedback. Therefore, Collaborative Coaching Cycles will be utilized for the upcoming school year.

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

Teachers - using positive discipline, rewarding good behavior

Students - using strategies used in Calm Classroom and those learned at home and at school

Parents - support students and teachers' efforts

Staff - support school efforts to promote positive discipline

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00