

Duval County Public Schools

# Whitehouse Elementary School



## 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Whitehouse Elementary School

11160 GENERAL AVE, Jacksonville, FL 32220

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Angela Jordan**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	87%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: C (50%) 2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (61%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</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 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](http://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

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## Whitehouse Elementary School

11160 GENERAL AVE, Jacksonville, FL 32220

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

### 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	Yes	87%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	36%

### School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		B	B

### 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 in every classroom for every student every day.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Every student is inspired and prepared for success in college, career and life.

### 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
Jordan, Angela	Principal	The primary leader of the school building. Developing, implementing, and evaluating the programs within the school and looking for ways to improve the student experience by making changes to improve the quality of the instructional and social/emotional programs. Responsible for setting and meeting the school's budget: General and Title I.
Parker, Kanzla	Assistant Principal	Support the principal in the development, implementation and evaluation of instructional and social/emotional programs. Help create school-wide goals including those related to student learning and student behavior. Responsible for helping maintain the school's budget: General and Title I
Spottswood, Catherine	Reading Coach	Support the principal in the development, implementation and evaluation of instructional and social/emotional programs. Helps create school-wide reading goals related to student learning through prevention and intervention academic programs. Designs small group intervention lessons based on student's individual data.
Jones, Rhonda	School Counselor	Support the principal in the development, implementation and evaluation of instructional and social/emotional programs. Implement a comprehensive school counseling program that promotes and enhances student achievement and motivation.

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Angela Jordan

**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.*

1

**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.*

2

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

25

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

361

**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.**

1

### 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	70	78	57	74	74	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	409
Attendance below 90 percent	0	40	17	32	25	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	130
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	1	2	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	1	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	14	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	19	23	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76

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	1	17	17	27	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	84

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	1	1	0	5	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 7/29/2022

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	65	47	69	72	50	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	412
Attendance below 90 percent	1	17	24	26	14	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	1	5	40	33	12	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	172
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	1	9	32	28	16	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	143
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	40	35	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119
	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	1	8	34	30	9	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150

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	1	2	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	65	47	69	72	50	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	412
Attendance below 90 percent	1	17	24	26	14	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	128
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	1	1	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	1	5	40	33	12	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	172
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	1	9	32	28	16	57	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	143
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	40	35	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119
	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	1	8	34	30	9	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150

#### 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	1	2	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	52%	50%	56%				45%	50%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	53%						51%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%						43%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	57%	48%	50%				59%	62%	63%
Math Learning Gains	45%						52%	63%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	27%						53%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	70%	59%	59%				76%	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	46%	51%	-5%	58%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	39%	52%	-13%	58%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
05	2022					
	2019	49%	50%	-1%	56%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

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	67%	61%	6%	62%	5%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	49%	64%	-15%	64%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				
05	2022					
	2019	48%	57%	-9%	60%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	72%	49%	23%	53%	19%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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	26	37	45	33	39		36				
BLK	45	46		52	50		71				
HSP	50	55		50	45						
WHT	54	58	52	58	46	18	71				
FRL	41	51	48	44	41	18	56				
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	24	55		32	45						
BLK	47	50		41	33		82				
HSP	50			67							
WHT	52	61	45	55	49		84				
FRL	42	54	50	42	39	17	77				
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	18	33	31	27	42	36	20				
BLK	32	45		38	65	67	67				
HSP	38			38							
WHT	48	49	50	65	49	45	78				
FRL	42	54	44	51	51	46	69				

### 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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	352

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	53
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	50
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

Multiracial Students	
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	51
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	43
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?

WES ELA scores, showed small group reading interventions/tutoring allowed proficiency to increase from 2021 to 53 (+1). Math proficiency increase from 54 to 57 (+3). Science decreased of 11 points from 81 to 70.

Cohort comparisons to 2019, 3rd ELA was 6% less than the district/12% less than the state, 4th ELA was 13% less than the district/19% less than the state, 5th ELA was 1% less than the district/7% less than the state. In math, 3rd was 6% higher than the district/5% higher than the state, 4th was 15% less than the district/15% less than the state, 5th was 9% less than the district/12% less than the state. In Science, WES was 23% higher than the district/19% higher than the state.

ELA subgroup data shows a trending positive increase in SWD achievement over 2019-2022, a slight decrease from 2021 to 2022 for BLK students but still is an overall increase from 2019, HSP students are holding at 50%, WHT students show a slight increase while FRL students a slight decrease. ELA gains show an increase in all areas from 2019 but when compared to 2021 SWD.

Math subgroup data shows a trending positive increase in SWD and BLK. However, HSP, WHT, and FRL show a decrease in achievement. Math gains show a negative decline except for our BLK (+17%) and FRL (+2%). Our math lowest 25% has showed a significant decline from 2019 with only a 1% increase over 2021.

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

Based on the 2022 school data, ELA proficiency increased by 1 point to 53% from 52% in 2021, ELA gains declined from 58% (2021) to 53% and ELA lowest performing quartile declined from 53% (2021) to 48%..

The 2022 Math data showed a proficiency increased by 3 points to 57% from 54% in 2021, math gains declined from 48% (2021) to 45% and math lowest performing quartile did not increase from 27%. Math proficiency, growth and lowest quartile gains are Whitehouse Elementary's critical area.

The 2022 Science scores decreased by 11 points from 81% to 70%..

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

In 2022, Whitehouse Elementary's Reading Coach continued to provide coaching on best practices, modeled lessons, lead data discussions and professional learning communities. We continued Reading Mastery in K-2 students and Corrective for select students in grades 3-5. Title I funds helped Whitehouse to pay for additional staff (paraprofessionals). Paraprofessionals and targeted staff were trained to deliver explicit reading instruction. In grades 3-5, students will participate in walk to read tutoring based on their individual data.

Title I funds also supported a Parent Liaison to provide families with additional support and access. This position continues to be essential as we repair the parent engagement from COVID in 20220. Our Title I dollars will continue to fund a Reading Interventionist, Paraprofessionals and a Parent Liaison for the 2022 - 2023.

Based on the lack of gains and growth in Math, we will continue Acaletics to develop a continual review and pre-exposure benchmarks.. The Whitehouse implemented of Acaletics saw monthly progress in students mastering standards. However, our 2022 data suggests that additional explicit math instruction is required to develop growth and LPQ gains. Whitehouse Elementary will have walk to math tutoring in grades 3-5 based on individual student data.

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

In ELA proficiency showed 1% growth and Math proficiency showed the most improvement with an increase of 3%.

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

Based on the 2022 FSA ELA data, Whitehouse Elementary is making a slight positive trend and will continue to implement Corrective for select students in grade 3-5. Trained staff and paraprofessionals will continue to deliver explicit reading instruction to close reading gaps for all subgroups. There will be a special focus on 3rd grade with targeted in school tutoring on key benchmarks and test taking procedures. As we implement B.E.S.T. standards, we will provide additional progress monitoring throughout the year.

Based on the 2022 data, there are several factors that contributed to the decline of Whitehouse Elementary's FSA Math Gain and LPQ Gains. Uneven learning opportunities over the last two years due to COVID have increased the math content loss. The past two years, Whitehouse teachers have struggled to get students to grade level through tutoring before school, after school, through district

programs such as GEAR UP and daily small group instruction. Students lack of foundational skills prove to be a barrier in reaching growth or gains in grades 3-5.

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

Whitehouse Elementary will continue in school tutoring opportunities in math focused on the major work of the grade in third through fifth.

Whitehouse Elementary will continue to Corrective for select students in grade 3-5. Trained staff and paraprofessionals will continue to deliver explicit reading instruction to close reading gaps for all subgroups. There will be a special focus on 3rd grade with targeted in school tutoring on key benchmarks.

**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.**

August - Data trends (FSA), goal setting and teacher IPDPs, 4-step plan

September - Data review, goal adjustments, I-ready, Achieve 3000, PMPs, Corrective progress tracking, Acaletics, small group learning targets, Benchmark development and implementation task and assessment alignment, Test taking observations, Freckle data reports

October - RtI implementation and tracking, 3rd grade portfolio and standards proficiency tracking, Benchmark alignment, development and implementation, define target learning groups, test taking strategies

November - Review of all systems, Benchmark alignment, development and implementation, 4-step plan review and update, Acaletics updates

December/January - Midyear data review, Benchmark alignment, development and implementation, pacing calendars

February - targeted learning groups update, goal monitoring, 4-step plan review and update

March - Final data review towards school based goals

April - Testing expectations, PMP close out, Rti close out,

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

Weekly walkthroughs will be conducted to maintain a tight alignment to benchmarks. Trend data will be shared in PLC and a plan developed to target areas of need. Leadership will develop a 4 step plan to target and tier support for students. Teachers will be trained to provide explicit reading and math instruction through PLC. Common planning time will support targeted benchmarks. Leadership data chats with students and teachers quarterly to monitor progress towards overall school goals. Teacher data chats with students after each major assessment to help students track their progress towards their personal learning goals.

**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 B.E.S.T. Standards**

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

Based on our 2021-2022 standards based classroom walk-through and our 5E's survey data, teachers at Whitehouse Elementary need to collaborate to ensure that instruction, student tasks and assessments are aligned to the grade level benchmarks. This alignment would lead to an increase in student performance and overall achievement in all subject areas. Teachers in K-5 will be fully implementing the BEST standards, collaboration is critical to ensure that grade level benchmark alignment for increase student mastery.

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

If Whitehouse Elementary Teachers engage in focused observations of their peers, teachers will gain confidence in their instructional practices which would lead to an increase in collaborative practices while implementing the BEST standards.

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

Develop a needs survey that helps WS Leadership Team to understand what each teacher considers their area of strength and area of growth. Leadership Team will participate in the focused walkthrough with select grade levels.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Angela Jordan (planka@duvalschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**  
 Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Each month, the Leadership team with teachers will use the focused walkthrough form to collaborate to identify best practices in instruction, aligned tasks and assessment for BEST benchmark alignment.  
 Bi-weekly leadership team meetings to discuss BWT results and plan for PLC/ Common Planning. Biweekly PLC will focus on key instructional needs as notated by the Admin walkthroughs. Teachers will use biweekly common planning time to continue to develop aligned tasks and assessments that support the major work of the grade level/subject area. As lessons are taught, teachers will have the opportunity to observe their peers to provide feedback and gain strategies to implement in their classroom.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**  
 Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria

Based on the 5E's survey Whitehouse teachers value collaboration. However, the last year teachers continued to struggle with collaboration after COVID 19 protocols were relaxed. We are implementing new benchmarks K-5 teachers will need additional feedback and support to ensure alignment of instruction, tasks and assessments.



**used for selecting  
this strategy.**

**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.

Weekly Common Planning to: Understand the Best Standards, align instruction, student tasks, and assessments to the standards. Analyze data to drive lesson development

**Person Responsible** Angela Jordan (planka@duvalschools.org)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Based on the new F.A.S.T progress monitoring assessment, Whitehouse Elementary's focus will be on increasing proficiency by 10 points in each subject area. In order to increase proficiency, we will focus on bubble students and maintaining our current proficient students.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

If Whitehouse Elementary school teachers increase differentiated instruction student's individual proficiency will increase in all subject areas.

**Monitoring:**

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

Whitehouse leadership team will develop a 4-step plan to identify student needs and tier the support for each child through planned differentiated small group instruction.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Angela Jordan (planka@duvalschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Using F.A.S.T progress monitoring assessment data, prior FSA scores, Achieve 3000, and STAR diagnostic data teachers will create lesson plans that reflect differentiation strategies for targeted students in whole group lessons as well as small group instruction.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

Utilizing the 4 step plan, the WES Leadership team can identify additional supports needs for student to be successful in meeting grade level requirements. The Leadership team can then support teachers in selecting materials that meet each support level needed.

**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.

All K-5 teachers will meet weekly in Common Planning to focus on understanding the BEST Standards, aligning the curriculum resources and assessments to the best standards.

Plan standard based small group instruction using district approved resources

Frequently progress monitor student's response to instruction using the various assessment platforms (FAST Progress Monitoring Assessments, iReady Reading and Math (1-2), Waterford (KG), Achieve 3000 (3-5), and STAR (3-5) and plan interventions

**Person Responsible**

Angela Jordan (planka@duvalschools.org)

The Title I grant project and funds will be leveraged for supplemental programming and will be used to implement salaried and non-salaried activities. The position the grant covers will be a para, a teacher, a reading interventionist, a parent liaison. Also, Acaletics and supplies/materials and activities.

Reading Interventionist and paras will support Corrective and Acaletics differentiated groups.

**Person Responsible**

Catherine Spottswood (hagoodc1@duvalschools.org)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement**

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

Many cultures are represented at Whitehouse, from Haitian, African, Hispanic, Black and White, country, and city. We know that we all must collaborate to succeed. The faculty and staff at Whitehouse Elementary honor the diversity of the school by building relationships with the students. The process involves allowing students to participate in a learning style surveys, "getting to know you" exercises, and providing a safe supportive learning environment that appreciates differences where students feel safe to take risks.

Based on the 5Es survey - Academic Press: Ambitious Instruction, less than 50% of students reported that their teachers made them think, challenged them, or asked them difficult questions, Based on survey results, classroom instruction is mostly teacher centered. In order to increase proficiency students need to be actively engaged in lessons.

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

If Whitehouse Elementary teachers can actively engage students in the learning process student proficiency will increase.

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

During classroom observations, PLCs and common planning, the teachers and admin will be looking for students response to instruction by reviewing informal and formal assessment data.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Kanzla Parker (parkerk4@duvalschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Teachers will utilize cooperative groups work, high order questioning and classroom accountable talk.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.**  
**Describe the**

Based on the 5Es survey, students desire that teachers engage them in the learning process by developing critical thinking questions that challenge or require them to explain their thinking.

**resources/criteria  
used for selecting  
this strategy.**

**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.

Weekly planning using the Depth of Knowledge to create questions

Progress Monitor using STAR, iReady, Waterford and Achieve 3000 during Common Planning to plan interventions for small groups.

**Person**

**Responsible**

Kanzla Parker (parkerk4@duvalschools.org)

**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**

Implementing the usage of reading interventionist by grouping students according to blended learning and running record scores. Interventionists will use Leveled Literacy Intervention by Fountas & Pinnell in grades 1st and 2nd grades. Finally, implementation of UFLI Foundations Program will be done in grades K-2 starting in the 2nd nine weeks. Training has begun on this program.

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

Implementing the usage of reading interventionist by grouping students according to blended learning and FSA (previous year) scores. Grades 3-5 interventionist will use Corrective Reading (SRA/Reading Mastery).

Quarterly data monitoring is reviewed by administration to see if program is working for that student and if continued placement is needed. Also, weekly Tier 1 planners are done with teachers in grades 3-5 with the Benchmark Advance reading program.

**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)**

Improve end of year blended learning diagnostic scores to reflect 60% or higher in the "green" or on grade level category.

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

Improve ELA proficiency score to 53% or higher on the FAST ELA Assessment in grades 3-5. Improve our ELA proficiency scores for our Students with Disabilities by increasing their proficiency from 26% to 31% on the FAST ELA 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.

Using the FAST Progress Monitoring throughout the year, we will review individual student, class and grade level data to project our end of year outcomes. In addition, we will make adjustments to intervention groups as needed based on the PM data.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Jordan, Angela, plank@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. Â§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?

Benchmark Advance: Moderate to Strong Evidence  
Corrective Reading/SRA: Promising

Heggerty (Kindergarten Phonemic Awareness): Strong Evidence  
 Waterford Blended Learning (For Kindergarten): Moderate  
 I-Ready Blended Learning (For 1st/2nd Grade): Promising  
 Achieve 3000 Blended Learning (For 3rd-5th Grade): Promising  
 Benchmark Advance is directly aligned to the B.E.S.T. standards.

### **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?

All of these programs have been supported by the DCPS Academic Services department. All of the programs are in alignment with the grade levels they are intended to serve. In addition, our school is an early adopter for the University of Florida LI - Foundations program, which includes all of the foundational skill requirements (phonemic awareness, explicit/systematic phonics, teaching of high frequency words, etc.)

### **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
<p>*UFLI-Foundations program by grade level model classrooms, facilitators. Training will be done by facilitators and administration. Monitoring will take place by administration. Assessment is built in weekly through high frequency word assessments and phonics assessments.</p> <p>*Benchmark Advance training done weekly through PLCs and district offered training in the summer. Ongoing support through TDEs for writing for teachers in grades 4-5. Monitoring of weekly assessment and unit assessments in PLCs. (Looking for 60% of students hitting 70% or higher per teacher)</p> <p>*Waterford is monitored weekly through PLCs as well as encouraging students to get 80% or higher on items.</p> <p>*Monitoring of I-Ready as this program has been in place for several years. Percentage of students hitting 30 minutes or more will be monitored in PLCs.</p>	<p>Jordan, Angela,  <a href="mailto:planka@duvalschools.org">planka@duvalschools.org</a></p>

## 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.

Whitehouse Elementary continues to work on building a positive school culture and environment through Positive Behavior Support implementation and building classroom communities through creating positive student and student-adult relationships. Teachers communicate high expectations for all students. Teachers meet in collaborative planning bi-weekly to routinely examine disaggregated data to look for growth/needs among student groups. Monthly PBIS meetings to review discipline referrals and incident reports, in and out-of-school suspension and attendance also forms the basis for discussions of what's working (or not) for particular groups within a school and What needs to be done. Administration ensures that teachers have resources, training, and ongoing support to meet them and provides frequent, constructive feedback, and actively makes themselves available to teachers and staff.

Additionally, Whitehouse Elementary leadership team examines the 5 Essentials Survey data to improve the learning environment and culture. As a result of the survey, teachers feel like they need increased collaborate with one another.

Based on the students responses from the 5E's survey, Whitehouse Elementary will be adding a student engagement goal to ensure that students will be given the opportunity to participate in cooperative groups work, respond to high order questioning to increase critical thinking skills and engage in classroom accountable talk to enhance student understanding of new benchmarks.

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

Kanzla Parker - PBIS Lead/Assistant Principal  
 Patricia Reed - Clam Classroom Trainer - Teacher  
 Rhonda Jones - Careacter Education/Getting to know you surveys - School Counselor  
 Carolyn Pender - Equity Advocate  
 Meaghan Wilkes Calm Classroom Trainer - Teacher  
 David Garren - DTU representative - Teacher  
 Jillliaine Ragsdale - ESE Lead