Mt. Herman ESE Center

2022-23 Ungraded Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Mt. Herman ESE Center

1741 FRANCIS ST, Jacksonville, FL 32209

http://www.duvalschools.org/mhesc

Demographics

Principal: Moses Williams

Start Date for this Principal: 4/25/2024

2021-22 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Function (per accountability file)	ESE
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	72%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: Unsatisfactory 2020-21: No Rating 2018-19: Unsatisfactory 2017-18: I 2016-17: No Rating
DJJ Accountability Rating	2023-24: No Rating

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

A Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) is a requirement for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) ungraded schools pursuant to 1001.42 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and for DJJ schools

receiving a rating of Unsatisfactory pursuant to Sections 1003.51 and 1003.52, F.S. and Rule 6A-1.099813, F.A.C.

CSI schools can be designated as such in 2 ways:

1. Have a graduation of 67% or lower; or
2. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

DJJ Unsatisfactory Ratings are based on percentages by program type:

• Prevention and Intervention: 0%-50%

• Nonsecure Programs: 0%-59%

• Secure Programs: 0%-53%

SIP Plans for Ungraded CSI schools and DJJ schools receiving an Unsatisfactory rating must be approved by the district and reviewed by the state.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) provides schools and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) the opportunity to identify the academic and priority goals along with strategies for each school. School leadership teams may refine their SIP annually to define their school's academic and priority goals to increase student achievement.

Schools and LEAs are strongly encouraged to collaborate in the development and implementation of this plan.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission is to provide an environment that will maximize the potential of our students by providing challenging, realistic and functional goals in the areas of:

Academic Growth
Communication
Independent Functioning
Social Skills

We strive to cultivate awareness and acceptance and to provide a smooth transition into society that will improve the quality of life for students and their families.

Provide the school's vision statement.

"Learning to Live Life and Live it Abundantly"

Briefly discuss the population unique to your school and the specific supports provided to meet the mission and vision.

Mt. Herman ESC is a ESE Center school. Our school is made up of medically fragile students with moderate to severe disabilities. We provide unique academic services with a full time medical staff. Our students growth is measured regularly through integrated formal assessments as well as a formal datafolio assessment.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Williams, Moses	Principal	Instructional Leadership • Vision/Mission Ambassador • Instructional Planning, Implementation and Monitoring o UOPD • Data Analysis and Continuous Improvement • CAST Evaluations/Walk Throughs • Teacher Development Safety and Security of Students
Johnson, Delores	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leadership • Vision/Mission Ambassador • Instructional Planning, Implementation and Monitoring o UOPD • Data Analysis and Continuous Improvement • CAST Evaluations/Walk Throughs • Teacher Development Safety and Security of Students

Is education provided through contract for educational services?

No

If yes, name of the contracted education provider.

NA

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Pending, Moses Williams

Total number of students enrolled at the school.
111

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school.
17

Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?
15

Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?
5

Number of teachers with ESE certification?
15

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
5

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
3

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2022-23

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/2/2022

2021-22 - 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	2	2	6	5	8	5	6	4	9	7	11	5	27	97
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	4	2	6	3	2	1	4	2	5	1	18	49
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2
Level 1 on 2022 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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2

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	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	6	7

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		47%	55%					54%	61%
ELA Learning Gains								56%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile								53%	54%
Math Achievement		40%	42%					57%	62%
Math Learning Gains								57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile								52%	52%
Science Achievement		45%	54%					50%	56%
Social Studies Achievement		50%	59%					76%	78%

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					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

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					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2022					
	2019					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

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										90	
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	8			17							
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		27			19						
BLK		24			21						
WHT		38									
FRL		29			25						

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	90
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	90
Total Components for the Federal Index	1
Percent Tested	

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	90
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students

Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students

Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students

Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students

Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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.

Reflect on the Areas of Focus from the previous school year. What progress monitoring was in place related to the Areas of Focus?

Pre and Post assessments
Classroom Observations
Student work samples
Datafolio

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

School climate and culture. We increased opportunities for collaboration and created committees to generate "buy in".

What area is in the greatest need of improvement? What specific component of this area is most problematic? What is your basis (data, progress monitoring) for this conclusion?

Enhancing instructional practices to reflect authentic experiences for students is the greatest need. Student assessment is the most problematic. Teachers were not familiar with the way students were to be assess therefore they could not create similar experiences in the classroom.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Teacher struggle to find resources and create assessments that create learning experiences aligned to datafolio.

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

Students are making choices daily and working to engage in literacy in their way.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided to support teachers and leaders.

Teachers went to data folio training. We have begun on going literacy and assessment training to support teacher development.

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	20 % of of grade level planning groups at Mt. Herman has shown marginal evidence of collaborative lesson planning. A review of surveys, exit slips and lesson plan products have shown limited understanding of lesson development in accordance with CAST domain 1. This has impacted student learning by limiting student exposure to standards.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	75% of Mt. Herman grade level groups will show evidence of collaborative lesson planning. Evidence of this increase will be shown by an increase in teacher ratings in CAST domain 1 and will also yield lesson plans that uniformly address the standards, contain systematic instruction, and differentiated to individual students.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Classroom walkthroughs and Administratively lead PLC
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Implementation of facilitated common planning meetings will be held at minimum once a week. During this time we will review CAST domain 1 rubric, Quality Program Indicators, the lesson plan template, and walk-through rubric.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Teachers and classroom staff need to collaborate on classroom instruction to ensure all standards are being addressed. This will lead to improved learning gains for all students.

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. Provide time for faculty and staff to plan for areas of responsibility.
2. Monitor effective use of this time.
3. Purchase printer to support MHSEC unique student needs through the creation of "Adapt-a-books" and textured activities that support the unique disabilities of our students. The books and activities require volume printing that will be specifically located to aid the workflow of production and promote utilization of support staff and teachers.
4. Hire part-time staff to support teachers and support in the implementation of curriculum, instruction, and planning.
5. Hire a parent liaison to support parents in reinforcing learning and engaging in the learning community.
6. Purchase assistive technology needed to help students access and engage in learning experiences, making choices, participate in assessments and do home learning activities to reinforce learning.

Person Responsible	Moses Williams (williamsm4@duvalschools.org)

Monitoring ESSA Impact: If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.	Datafolio monitoring tools provided greater indicators for incremental gains.

RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

  ◦ The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

  ◦ The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

  ◦ Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Mt. Herman is an ESE school that uses measures other than FSA. All of our students have moderate to severe cognitive disabilities. Our students have individualized growth measures that may not equate to a level 3 on the FAST however a greater emphasis has been place on training to increase student levels of engagement with literacy.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Mt. Herman is an ESE school that uses measures other than FSA. All of our students have moderate to severe cognitive disabilities. Our students have individualized growth measures that may not equate to a level 3 on the FAST however a greater emphasis has been place on training to increase student levels of engagement with literacy.

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

  ◦ Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

  ◦ Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

  ◦ Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

Students will demonstrate incremental growth as outlined in their IEP. Students will demonstrate growth with the appropriate level of assistance by the third collection period of the datafolio assessment.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Students will demonstrate incremental growth as outlined in their IEP. Students will demonstrate growth with the appropriate level of assistance by the third collection period of the datafolio assessment.

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Student growth will be monitored through first and second data collection periods as well as quarterly grade monitoring. Teacher observation, administrative walk throughs, and student products will be reviewed as well.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Williams, Moses, williamsm4@duvalschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

PLCs focused on aligned assessments to promote student growth and engagement with literacy

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Teachers need continuous support and training creating literary activities that will provide students access to the curriculum

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Collaboration in PLC to lessons that infuse literacy and create datafolio align assessments.	Williams, Moses, williamsm4@duvalschools.org

Positive Culture & Environment
A positive school culture and environment is critical in supporting sustainable schoolwide improvement initiatives. When schools implement a shared focus on improving school culture and environment, students are more likely to engage academically. A positive school culture and environment can also increase staff satisfaction and retention.

Select a targeted element from the menu to develop a system or process to be implemented for schoolwide improvement related to positive culture and environment.
Parent Engagement

Describe how data will be collected and analyzed to guide decision making related to the selected target.

Mt. Herman hosts several governing bodies to encourage a collaborative positive work environment. Below is a list of a few of these groups. All of these groups are designed to encourage collaboration relating to school improvement and overall success.

Shared Decision Making Team
SAC
Design Team
Leadership Team
Social Hospitality
Parent Work groups

Data sources will be sign in sheets and feedback

Describe how the target area, related data and resulting action steps will be communicated to stakeholders.

The feedback regarding parent engagement will be articulated through SAC and PTSA

Describe how implementation will be progress monitored.

Parent surveys will be conduct through activities as well as 5E towards the end of the school year.

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.

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Continue to reach out to parents and provide resources to support strategies and instructional growth for students	Johnson, Delores, johnsond4@duvalschools.org