

Duval County Public Schools

Alimacani Elementary School



2020-21 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	15
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Alimacani Elementary School

2051 SAN PABLO RD S, Jacksonville, FL 32224

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

Demographics

Principal: Robyn White

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2006

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	51%
2019-20 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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (75%) 2017-18: A (67%) 2016-17: A (74%) 2015-16: A (64%)
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	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Alimacani Elementary School

2051 SAN PABLO RD S, Jacksonville, FL 32224

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	30%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	35%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
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.

Alimacani Elementary School is committed to providing a rigorous curriculum that inspires each learner to acquire knowledge in a safe environment. Alimacani implements standards-based best teaching educational practices that are imparted in an equitable manner in an effort to help each student realize their greatest level of academic, social, and physical achievement. Alimacani values the opportunity to foster relationships through communication among students, parents, educators, business partners and stakeholders.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Where education is a treasure and every child is inspired to reach for their dreams.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Stalls, Kathy	Principal	Responsible for all leadership activities and vision for the school. Responsible for maintaining a school that has a safe environment as well as quality instruction. Administers balanced budget, promotes a positive work environment, and involves community stakeholders and parents.
Kasper, Angela	Assistant Principal	
Green, Katecia	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2006, Robyn White

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.*

3

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

45

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	51%
2019-20 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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (75%) 2017-18: A (67%) 2016-17: A (74%) 2015-16: A (64%)
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 .	

Early Warning Systems**Current Year**

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	138	131	116	126	119	126	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	756
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	1	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	2	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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

Thursday 10/8/2020

Prior Year - 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	138	141	139	150	140	130	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	838
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 or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	

Prior Year - 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	138	141	139	150	140	130	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	838
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 or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	76%	50%	57%	75%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	62%	56%	58%	67%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	50%	53%	57%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	88%	62%	63%	80%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	79%	63%	62%	83%	63%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	78%	52%	51%	78%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	85%	48%	53%	76%	50%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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	2019	81%	51%	30%	58%	23%
	2018	87%	50%	37%	57%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	69%	52%	17%	58%	11%
	2018	77%	49%	28%	56%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-18%				
05	2019	71%	50%	21%	56%	15%
	2018	67%	51%	16%	55%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	87%	61%	26%	62%	25%
	2018	81%	59%	22%	62%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	82%	64%	18%	64%	18%
	2018	80%	60%	20%	62%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	85%	57%	28%	60%	25%
	2018	74%	61%	13%	61%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

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

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	66%	56%	10%	55%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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	51	55	55	65	73	74	65				
ELL	47	70		67	73						
ASN	88			82							
BLK	67	48		88	81	82	70				
HSP	74	64	71	79	79	79	81				
MUL	68	79		74	75						
WHT	78	61	43	92	78	80	90				
FRL	69	64	59	81	76	71	82				
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	46	54	36	50	65	52	38				
ELL	50	70		58	70						
ASN	75			75							
BLK	54	48		67	59		23				
HSP	72	69	69	74	86	67	86				
MUL	82	47		86	71						
WHT	82	68	56	81	76	50	73				
FRL	71	60	51	71	68	48	57				
2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	46	41	39	51	77	72	32				
ASN	64	60		79							
BLK	67	58		74	76		57				
HSP	64	67	58	67	78	80	71				
MUL	58	58		69	74		71				
WHT	81	70	59	85	86	81	82				
FRL	64	59	53	70	79	74	65				

ESSA Data

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	76
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	81
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	605
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	63
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	68
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	85
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	73
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	75

Hispanic Students	
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	74
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	75
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	72
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The lowest performance area overall was our BQ (lowest performing 25%) students in ELA at 56% which is up from 52% in 2019. . One of the contributing factors is that our small group instruction does not happen daily for all students. Work to make sure small groups happen daily is a priority.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

The greatest decline from the prior year was in ELA proficiency. We went down only 2 points from 78 to 76 percent proficient. Even though we only went down 2 percentage points, we need to make sure our small group instruction is specifically targeted to increasing students' proficiency this year.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Alimacani is higher than the district and the state in all areas when looking at the data.

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

Our fifth grade Science showed the most improvement +18 points from the previous year 85% proficiency this year. We had a former ELA 5th grade teacher dedicated to teaching Science for three classes which left the other teachers only having to prep for one subject area, Math. Another team continued with the same teacher teaching Math and Science to two classes.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Our students with disabilities need specific attention and monitoring this year to make sure they are making the gains they need throughout the school year.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. ELA lowest performing student gains
2. ELA learning gains
3. ELA proficiency
4. Math lowest performing student gains
5. Math gains

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

This area of focus was the lowest performing area so if we increase the monitoring of students with disabilities or lowest 25% of the school, then student outcome will improve.

Measurable Outcome:

Monitor the following quarterly for this group of students:
i-Ready Math and Reading, Reading benchmarks, Math benchmarks, Achieve3000, Science PMA's, and Penda

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kathy Stalls (stallsk@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Support ESE/Grade Level Teachers through common planning with lesson studies to make sure lessons are aligned with the standards.
2. Target the instruction to the student levels using LLI, Phonics for Reading, and other ESE supplement materials. Meet students at their level during small groups to push them forward to grade level standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Support of planning with ESE/Grade Level Teachers will be important to help strengthen instructional practices through common planning with administration.
2. Teachers and teacher teams will use and analyze a variety of data to assess the effectiveness of instructional strategies then modify instruction if needed to continuously meet the needs of all students. Small group instruction must happen with all teachers to ensure focused teaching and learning is happening. Students must take ownership in their learning.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	At least 90% of all teachers will meet in content teams twice monthly to plan rigorous instructional delivery of standards-based tasks and assessments. Aligned instruction will include comparable experiences to the standards across the grade level. Data analysis shows that our lowest performing students need extra attention to the standards, therefore, teacher teams will collaborate twice monthly to plan instructional delivery models that have worked for student advancement. Teachers will monitor student progress monthly and make changes as needed.
Measurable Outcome:	At least 90% of all teachers will meet in content teams twice monthly to plan rigorous instructional delivery of standards-based tasks and assessments. Aligned instruction will include comparable experiences to the standards across the grade level.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kathy Stalls (stallsk@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Administrators will have focused support in the areas of reading, math, and science. They will work one-on-one with teacher teams and content areas, complete coaching cycles and collaboratively plan with teachers to provide effective standards based instruction. K and 1 will implement the BEST standards beginning this school year, therefore, collaborative planning will involve analyzing data, unpacking standards, and student evidence of grade level learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	High quality professional development with teachers is among the most important and long standing challenges facing schools. Investing in on the job training offering time for high performing teachers to mentor newer teachers, and planning with high quality instructional leaders will develop high performing teachers.

Action Steps to Implement

Administrators will develop collaborative planning sessions for each grade level/content area in order to help teachers plan and monitor implementation of the BEST standards, including reading and writing programs that are focused on Florida Standards, math curriculum, science curriculum. Administrators will observe proper implementation of instructional delivery processes to ensure advancement of learning. They will ensure that proper interventions and blended learning platforms are utilized effectively and monitored.

Person Responsible Kathy Stalls (stallsk@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Identifying students who are the Lowest Performing Quartile that are on our Duval HomeRoom learning platform. Make sure they are receiving interventions appropriately and are making significant progress.

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 ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

N/A

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00