

Duval County Public Schools

Chet's Creek 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 | 13 |
| Planning for Improvement | 20 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 24 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 24 |

Chet's Creek Elementary School

13200 CHETS CREEK BLVD, Jacksonville, FL 32224

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

Demographics

Principal: Susan Phillips T

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2021

| | |
|--|--|
| 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 | No |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 58% |
| 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: A (72%) 2017-18: A (73%) 2016-17: A (76%) |
| 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 | 13 |
| Planning for Improvement | 20 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 24 |

Chet's Creek Elementary School

13200 CHETS CREEK BLVD, Jacksonville, FL 32224

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

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School KG-5</p> | <p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p> | <p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">36%</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="text-align: center;">No</p> | <p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">53%</p> |

School Grades History

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

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.

Chets Creek Elementary School is a standards-based learning community committed to preparing students for success in a competitive, interdependent and global workplace.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We envision Chets Creek Elementary as a standards-based learning community where internationally benchmarked performance standards help all learners experience the real life application of basic skills and concepts. Learning leaders use diagnostic tools to assess every student's academic strengths and weaknesses and then develop a course of instruction to meet the learner's academic needs. This diagnostic and prescriptive teaching philosophy has become the cornerstone of our success.

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 |
|---------------------|---------------------|--|
| Phillips, Susan | Principal | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making; ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS; conducts assessment of instructional skills of school staff; ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation requirements; ensures adequate professional development to support implementation of aligned standards, instruction and curriculum and assessment; and communicates with parents regarding school-based plans and activities • Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/ programs; analyzes scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches; identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered “at risk”; assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring. |
| Heybruch, Peggy Sue | Assistant Principal | <p>Supports school wide work in aligning standards with instruction, curriculum tools, and assessment. Provides leadership as the Chair for Science Leadership Council. Implements testing program and manages all data collection systems. Analyzes school data to identify areas of support for teachers and students. Assists with monitoring classroom instruction and providing feedback for improvement to teachers. Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/ programs; analyzes scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches; identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered</p> |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-------------------------|-------------------------|--|
| | | <p>“at risk”; assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.</p> |
| <p>Conte, Elizabeth</p> | <p>Teacher, ESE</p> | <p>Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students; links community agencies and district staffing personnel to school and families to support the child’s academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success; provides consultation services to general and special education teachers, parents, and administrators; administers program support for ESOL and directs 504 plan management, conducts social skills groups. Provides leadership as the Co-Chairs for MTSS Leadership Council. Acts as liaison for implementation of MTSS at the school level; receives ongoing MTSS training and delivers information to schools; provides direct intervention services to an identifies groups of students for action research, tracks students progress and collaborates with leadership in using data to make decisions and interventions and strategies that support MTSS.</p> |
| <p>Nelson, Kathryn</p> | <p>School Counselor</p> | <p>Provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students; links community agencies and district staffing personnel to school and families to support the child’s academic, emotional, behavioral, and social success; provides consultation services to general and special education teachers, parents, and administrators; administers program support for ESOL and directs 504 plan management, conducts social skills groups. Provides leadership as the Co-Chairs for MTSS Leadership Council. Acts as liaison for implementation of MTSS at the school level; receives ongoing MTSS training and delivers information to schools; provides direct intervention services to an identifies groups</p> |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-----------------|---------------------|---|
| | | <p>of students for action research, tracks students progress and collaborates with leadership in using data to make decisions and interventions and strategies that support MTSS.</p> |
| McMillan, Chris | Instructional Coach | <p>Designs and implements professional development opportunities for lead content teachers in ELA. Provides individual and team coaching to teachers in the classroom and by providing demonstration lessons. Leads professional book studies for teachers. Develops, leads, and evaluates school core content standards/ programs; analyzes scientifically based curriculum/behavior assessment and intervention approaches; identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered “at risk”; assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.</p> |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/29/2021, Susan Phillips T

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.*

8

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.*

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

57

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,135

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

6

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

5

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|--|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | | |
| Number of students enrolled | 201 | 188 | 194 | 203 | 204 | 190 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1180 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 32 | 29 | 33 | 25 | 36 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 187 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 8 | 4 | 11 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| Course failure in Math | 6 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 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 | 0 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 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 | 20 | 43 | 54 | 31 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 193 |

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 | 8 | 4 | 11 | 2 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/29/2021

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 | 193 | 181 | 203 | 218 | 219 | 187 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1201 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 42 | 39 | 40 | 35 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 185 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in Math | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 1 | 21 | 40 | 39 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 120 |

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 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

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 | 193 | 181 | 203 | 218 | 219 | 187 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1201 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 42 | 39 | 40 | 35 | 29 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 185 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in Math | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 1 | 21 | 40 | 39 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 120 |

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 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

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 | | | | 82% | 50% | 57% | 81% | 50% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 68% | 56% | 58% | 63% | 51% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 65% | 50% | 53% | 62% | 46% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 86% | 62% | 63% | 88% | 61% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 76% | 63% | 62% | 73% | 59% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 58% | 52% | 51% | 71% | 48% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 72% | 48% | 53% | 76% | 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 | 82% | 51% | 31% | 58% | 24% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 82% | 52% | 30% | 58% | 24% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -82% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 72% | 50% | 22% | 56% | 16% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -82% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 85% | 61% | 24% | 62% | 23% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2019 | 86% | 64% | 22% | 64% | 22% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -85% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 80% | 57% | 23% | 60% | 20% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -86% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 70% | 49% | 21% | 53% | 17% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

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

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

| Grade 3 | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |

| Grade 4 | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |

| Grade 5 | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |

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 | 58 | 59 | 47 | 68 | 73 | 83 | 41 | | | | |
| ELL | 62 | 72 | 67 | 73 | 81 | | 67 | | | | |
| ASN | 86 | 79 | | 93 | 77 | | 85 | | | | |
| BLK | 59 | 65 | | 73 | 65 | 70 | 45 | | | | |
| HSP | 67 | 63 | 56 | 74 | 68 | 50 | 72 | | | | |
| MUL | 79 | 50 | | 79 | 67 | | 58 | | | | |
| WHT | 85 | 74 | 75 | 90 | 76 | 82 | 76 | | | | |
| FRL | 66 | 62 | 52 | 74 | 68 | 72 | 64 | | | | |
| 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 | 55 | 58 | 58 | 62 | 57 | 46 | 35 | | | | |
| ELL | 58 | 65 | 68 | 74 | 71 | 63 | 40 | | | | |
| ASN | 81 | 72 | | 94 | 92 | | 100 | | | | |
| BLK | 82 | 66 | 67 | 82 | 79 | 75 | 60 | | | | |
| HSP | 68 | 59 | 58 | 77 | 71 | 58 | 53 | | | | |
| MUL | 83 | 59 | | 91 | 77 | | 83 | | | | |
| WHT | 89 | 74 | 76 | 89 | 76 | 53 | 80 | | | | |
| FRL | 71 | 63 | 66 | 76 | 69 | 56 | 56 | | | | |
| 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 | 59 | 50 | 50 | 65 | 55 | 52 | 39 | | | | |
| ELL | 64 | 73 | 83 | 84 | 75 | 88 | 42 | | | | |
| ASN | 97 | 79 | | 100 | 71 | | 90 | | | | |
| BLK | 62 | 42 | | 76 | 58 | 58 | 50 | | | | |
| HSP | 72 | 70 | 69 | 84 | 72 | 82 | 58 | | | | |
| MUL | 80 | 40 | | 89 | 80 | | 60 | | | | |
| WHT | 85 | 62 | 61 | 90 | 75 | 66 | 86 | | | | |
| FRL | 71 | 56 | 56 | 79 | 65 | 64 | 60 | | | | |

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 | 69 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|-----|
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 47 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 550 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 58 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 67 |
| 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 | 84 |
| 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 | 63 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 61 |
| 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 | 67 |
| 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 | 80 |
| 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 | 63 |
| 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?

.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate 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?

.

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

.

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

.

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

.

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.

.

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

.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Based on previous data, teachers must identify and continuously assess student performance and strategically plan for all students to make a year's worth of growth. If teachers utilize data to effectively plan for and implement rigorous, differentiated learning opportunities through whole group, small group and individualized instruction for all students, then student achievement will improve and they will make a year's worth of learning growth.

Measurable Outcome: 69% of all students will make learning gains in reading.
77% of all students will make learning gains in math.
68% of students identified in the lowest performing quartile will make learning gains in reading.
61% of students identified in the lowest performing quartile will make learning gains in math.

Monitoring:

1. Implement teacher meetings during common planning.
2. Upload grade level FSA aligned common assessments into Unify so that item analysis is available for teacher use.
3. Provide training on the use of Unify to monitor student performance.
4. Implement quarterly data reviews with teachers to determine shifts needed in core and/or tiered instruction for students.
5. Administer district quarterly PMAs and analyze data to inform instruction.
6. Schedule common planning meetings devoted to reviewing student work samples from common assignments.
7. Develop/Use established rubrics for evaluating student samples compared to grade level standard expectations.
8. Showcase student work samples on classroom display boards and content focus board walks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Susan Phillips (phillipss4@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Improve teacher knowledge of how to target appropriate instruction / next steps for all students, using data available to them, during common planning sessions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers must be able to identify and use data to inform student conferences, tiered intervention and to provide differentiated small group and center experiences.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our second area of focus is in the area of Culture and Environment and includes a unified, consistent school wide behavior plan that is equitable and strategic in meeting the needs of all students and supporting all students in meeting behavioral expectations in all parts of their school day.
 If faculty and staff use the school wide behavior plan with fidelity throughout the day, students will have a unified set of expectations and behavior incidents will decrease, maximizing opportunities for academic learning.

Measurable Outcome: Decrease the number of student discipline referrals that lead to missing class instruction by 10%.

- Monitoring:**
1. Train the teachers on the expectations rubric with language aligned with the Guidelines for Success that outlines expectations in all areas of the school and the school day.
 2. Communicate the Expectations in a clear and consistent manner to faculty, staff, students and families so that all stakeholders are aware of the expectations.
 3. Guidelines for Success posted in classrooms, hallways and common areas.
 4. Utilize Calm Classroom as a way to encourage students to deescalate their own behavior.
 5. PBIS and FOCUS Team meet regularly to monitor student behavior data.
 6. Behavior Threat Assessment Team meets regularly to identify concerns and identify strategies to address the concerns.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Susan Phillips (phillipss4@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Align the language in the behavior management plan so that the guidelines, language used in instruction and on the behavior rubric are aligned throughout the school.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Improved teacher consistency in implementing the behavior plan, provides equity for all students and all students remain in the classroom and on task to receive instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Based on 2021 5 Essentials Data Collaborative Practices was identified as a weak area. |
| Measurable Outcome: | The 2022 5 Essentials data will improve from a score of 34 to 50. |
| Monitoring: | This area will be monitored through agendas and feedback from Teacher Meetings and PLCs. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Susan Phillips (phillipss4@duvalschools.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | Teachers will observe one another and debrief the lessons. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | The two weakest areas in the 5 Essentials Collaborative Practices data related to the opportunity to observe in other teacher's classrooms. |

Action Steps to Implement

WOW Days provide for extended professional learning opportunities for teachers and will include a demonstration lesson and debrief.

Person Responsible Susan Phillips (phillipss4@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.

Per the SafeSchoolsfor Alex.org website, Chets Creek reported 0.2 incidents per 100 students (incident rate). When compared to all elementary schools statewide, it falls within the "very low" category. Chets Creek ranked #248 out of 1,395 elementary schools statewide and #12/97 elementary schools in the county. When the three categories of incidents of behavior / discipline were analyzed, Violent behaviors was "Low", whereas Property Incidents and Drug/Public Order Incidents were "very low". The low incidents of violent behaviors consisted of two physical attacks out of 1,211 students. Our school will continue to monitor the school culture and environment through the lens of behavior and discipline data and provide additional or varied support depending on identified needs.

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.

Our school builds a positive school culture by:

1. Training the teachers on the expectations rubric with language aligned with the Guidelines for Success that outlines expectations in all areas of the school and the school day.
2. Communicating the Expectations in a clear and consistent manner to faculty, staff, students and families so that all stakeholders are aware of the expectations.
3. Guidelines for Success posted in classrooms, hallways and common areas.
4. Utilize Calm Classroom as a way to encourage students to deescalate their own behavior.
5. PBIS and FOCUS Team meeting regularly to monitor student behavior data.
6. Behavior Threat Assessment Team meeting regularly to identify concerns and identify strategies to address the concerns.

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

All of our school stakeholders play a role in promoting a positive culture and environment at our school.

Part V: Budget

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

| | | | |
|---------------|--------|--|---------------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |