

Duval County Public Schools

J. Allen Axson Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

J. Allen Axson Elementary School

4763 SUTTON PARK CT, Jacksonville, FL 32224

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

Demographics

Principal: Cecilia Robinson Vanhoy

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2011

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	28%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (80%) 2018-19: A (75%) 2017-18: A (70%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

J. Allen Axson Elementary School

4763 SUTTON PARK CT, Jacksonville, FL 32224

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	28%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	55%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	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.

To provide educational excellence to every student every day using the Montessori Method of instruction.

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Robinson Vanhoy, Cecilia	Principal	Educational Leader: Support Teachers, students and families in educating students at Axson.
Roberts, Amy	Assistant Principal	Managing all aspects of running a school in addition PD, Testing, Curriculum and Instruction
Fitzharris, Adrienne	Instructional Coach	Working with teachers, Curriculum and Instruction(PD with teachers in PLC), works with AP to manage data and work with teachers and small groups.
Bryson, Irene	School Counselor	Works with teacher and students on SEL Curriculum and lessons. Also pulls small groups and has been assigned other job duties related to school counselor
Avera, Stacy	Other	Manages Upper Elementary Team and works directly with AP, Instructional Coach and Principal.
Dubberly, Robyne	Other	She is responsible for managing her ESE team and works directly with AP, Instructional Coach and Principal
Queniat, Isabelle	Other	Teacher, Team Leader and works directly with AP, Instructional Coach and Principal
Budd, Tara	Other	Works with teachers, parents and Gifted students
Davis, Shannon	Other	Teacher, Team Leader and works directly with AP, Instructional Coach and Principal
Lee, Jill	Other	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2011, Cecilia Robinson Vanhoy

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

29

Total number of students enrolled at the school

581

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

4

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

4

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	110	83	73	79	60	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	473
Attendance below 90 percent	1	18	8	9	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	0	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	0	2	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Thursday 8/18/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data Review**

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

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	86%	50%	56%				85%	50%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	70%						77%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	72%						63%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	84%	48%	50%				84%	62%	63%
Math Learning Gains	84%						80%	63%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	85%						55%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	77%	59%	59%				81%	48%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	90%	51%	39%	58%	32%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	78%	52%	26%	58%	20%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-90%				
05	2022					
	2019	87%	50%	37%	56%	31%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	86%	61%	25%	62%	24%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	90%	64%	26%	64%	26%
Cohort Comparison		-86%				
05	2022					
	2019	79%	57%	22%	60%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-90%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	81%	49%	32%	53%	28%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	70	60	83	68	76		73				
ASN	83	86		92	86						
BLK	71	55		76	82						
HSP	77	79		77	86						
MUL	89	50		79	93						
WHT	90	70	71	86	82	83	83				
FRL	73	64	64	73	82	83					

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	72	58		64	63	62	50				
ASN	92			88							
BLK	68			68							
HSP	77			73							
MUL	80			75							
WHT	89	65		81	67		86				
FRL	68	50		63	42		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	58	62	57	61	75	61	53				
ASN	100			90							
BLK	64	47		83	78						
HSP	81	76		85	82		73				
MUL	84	79		79	71						
WHT	89	87	73	85	79	50	91				
FRL	66	62	64	76	85		53				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	80
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	558
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	72
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0
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%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	87
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	71
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	80
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	78
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	81
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	73
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

We continue to show an increase in growth for both reading and math for our LPQ and overall student population.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Our data indicates that we need to focus on our LPQ students moving from 3rd-4th grade. They scored lower than our normal 3rd grade proficiency level.

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

The majority of the low performing students were online learning for 1st - 2nd grade.
The Upper Elementary team will continue to fill gaps to support growth.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

LPQ for reading and math.

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

Collaborative planning among the Upper Elementary Team.

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

Continued use of entire grade level planning and tutoring for LP students.

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.

PLC's during resource time lead by our Instructional Coach, Holly Fitzharris

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

Continued interventions based on-going data

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

We have an on-going need to increase growth in our LPQ students. This is evident in K-5 and will need adjusting based on K-5 BEST Standards.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

on-going review of our new data set related to FAST

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Admin and teachers will review data monthly to determine next steps.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amy Roberts (buncha@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

The new testing results.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

This strategy will give us data aligned with the new standards.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Instructional Coach will pull data after each assessment period
2. Administration and Instructional Coach will meet with grade level teams to analyze trends and plan for individual student support in ELA

Person Responsible

Adrienne Fitzharris (fitzharris@duvalschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

We have an on-going need to increase growth in our LPQ students. This is evident in K-5 and will need adjusting based on K-5 BEST Standards.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

on-going review of our new data set related to FAST

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Admin and teachers will review data monthly to determine next steps.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amy Roberts (buncha@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

The new testing results.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

This strategy will give us data aligned with the new standards.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Instructional Coach will pull data after each assessment period
2. Administration and Instructional Coach will meet with grade level teams to analyze trends and plan for individual student support in math.

Person Responsible

Adrienne Fitzharris (fitzharris@duvalschools.org)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Axson continues to monitor the elements of the 5Essentials by surveying: student, parents and staff for feedback each school year.

In order to continue to maintain a well-organized school it takes the involvement of all stakeholders. Each member brings their unique perspective that continues to make our Montessori environment thrive. It is

essential school leaders make opportunities for stakeholders to be heard and help create and drive a positive school culture.

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

The stakeholders are all district and school administrators working with Axson's, staff, parents and students. Each year we work with the stakeholders listed above to continue to maintain and work towards a stronger culture each school year. To do this the leaders of Axson are open and receptive to feedback and strive to do our best to listen and improve based on that feedback.