

Duval County Public Schools

Alden Road Excep. Student Center



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Positive Culture & Environment	15
Budget to Support Goals	16

Alden Road Excep. Student Center

11780 ALDEN RD, Jacksonville, FL 32246

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

Demographics

Principal: Joseph Blitch G

Start Date for this Principal: 7/28/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	[Data Not Available]
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
ESSA Status	CS&I

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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

It is the mission and commitment of Alden Road School, its families and the community to provide individualized instruction within a safe, respectful and positive learning environment that promotes self-determination, self-advocacy, self-esteem and skills for communication and life-long learning.

Provide the school's vision statement

The vision of Alden Road is to instruct, mentor and support students to reach their full potential as responsible and productive citizens within the community.

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
Blitch, Joseph	Principal	Monitor progress toward SIP goals Provide frequent feedback to staff regarding strategies outlined in SIP Receive feedback from faculty, staff and stakeholders regarding the SIP Present Mid-Year Stakeholder Review to stakeholders
Baine, Donna	Assistant Principal	Monitor progress toward SIP goals Provide frequent feedback to staff regarding strategies outlined in SIP Receive feedback from faculty, staff and stakeholders regarding the SIP Manage Title I component of SIP
Comberg, Lorrie	Guidance Counselor	Monitor systems for student placement in the most appropriate academic setting Monitor IEP compliance to ensure all students receive appropriate services

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/28/2020, Joseph Blitch G

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	[Data Not Available]
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
ESSA Status	CS&I

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide 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	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

Tuesday 7/28/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	9	14	19	119	174
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	3	5	6	36	56
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
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	0	0	0	1	6	6	8	13	18	38	90

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	2	4	3	11	0	13	6	39

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	6	9	14	19	119	174
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	3	5	6	36	56
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
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	0	0	0	1	6	6	8	13	18	38	90

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	2	4	3	11	0	13	6	39

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	0%	47%	56%	0%	47%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	48%	51%	0%	49%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	42%	42%	0%	42%	44%
Math Achievement	0%	51%	51%	0%	51%	51%
Math Learning Gains	0%	52%	48%	0%	55%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	47%	45%	0%	50%	45%
Science Achievement	0%	65%	68%	0%	61%	67%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Social Studies Achievement	0%	70%	73%	0%	67%	71%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(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
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17

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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	22
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	152
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	22
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
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
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	6
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
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
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
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	14
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	16
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

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

Based on 18-19 GEometry E.O.C. data, 8% of Alden Road students scored in the proficiency range. This is a slight downward trend from the previous year. Contributing factors include the following: Many students face challenges with communication, behavior, lack of prescriptive data needed to design relevant learning opportunities that address specific needs of individual students and many students lack necessary background knowledge in content areas.

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

Based on FSAA data (18/19), Alden Road students made the greatest decline in ELA, posting proficiency scores of 19% in 17-18 and proficiency scores of 18% in 18-19. Contributing factors related to the decline include the following: Many students face challenges with communication, behavior, lack of prescriptive data needed to design relevant learning opportunities that address specific needs of individual students and many students lack necessary background knowledge in content areas.

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

The greatest gap compared to the state average was 0% proficiency in Math for African American Males. Potential factors that contributed to this include: Lower levels of engagement during instruction due to cognitive disability, exposure to learning activities that are aligned to grade level standards and attainment of prerequisite skills necessary to reach proficiency.

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

Based on 2018-2019 data, the greatest are of growth was on the Geometry EOC. Alden Road students increased from 0% proficient to 8% proficient. TMA's were created during common planning with Admin., Instructional Lead support to ensure alignment with standards and populated into Unify. TMA questions were linked to the appropriate standard(s) and the data was used to diagnose individual needs of students. Exit tickets were utilized in daily learning to ensure frequent checks for understanding was occurring. Guided questioning strategies were used daily in instruction to gauge individual student mastery of learning concepts.

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

1. Decrease the number of students not meeting the 90% attendance threshold
2. Decrease the number of students meeting 2 or more criteria for Early Warning Indicators

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

1. Increase proficiency of on the Geometry EOC from 8% to 18%
2. Increase proficiency on the FSAA ELA assessment from 8% to 18%
3. Decrease the number of restraint/seclusions by 20%
4. Increase the percentage of Post Grad. Transition Students meeting satisfactory on the CBVE Skills Assessment Rating Scale by 15%.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: A critical area of focus for the majority of students at Alden Road is engagement. Due to communication barriers, some students face challenges with expressing wants and needs, articulating their thinking and understanding of learning concepts and actively participating in collaborative learning groups and independent (with supports) learning activities.

Measureable Outcome: With the strategic implementation of communication practices, students will increase the frequency of attempts to articulate wants and needs and actively participate in all learning activities, increasing the level of engagement throughout all learning experiences.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Joseph Blitch (blitchj@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Utilization of Core Boards/Core Vocabulary to support a whole language approach to communication.
Boardmaker Program - Title I funds will be used to fund the Boardmaker program to improve communication among our students and address individualized student needs per their IEP's.
Supplemental Curriculum Kits - Title I funds will be used to purchased supplemental curriculum kits to meet the needs of our students.
Supplies - Title I funds will be used to purchase additional classroom supplies to support student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Strategies selected are research based and have proven effective in promoting skill acquisition for students with disabilities.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Culture and Environment was identified as an area of focus based on the results of the 5E survey that indicated there was a lack of Teacher/Teacher and Principal/Teacher trust.
Measureable Outcome:	Alden Road will implement strategies to address the current climate as it relates to staff cohesiveness in order to see a 10% decrease in the number of staff indicating trust among colleagues/Principal is a burden to the work environment. The 10% decrease will place Alden Road in the effective range for that domain.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Joseph Blitch (blitchj@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The Leadership Team will utilize PLC time to increase teacher/teacher collaboration in an effort to build trust among colleagues. Efforts will be made to expand Paraprofessional training/collaboration opportunities to ensure all staff have a voice in the daily operations of the school.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Prior to the 5 Essentials survey, Alden Road brought a school culture facilitator trained in the John Maxwell model to assess the professional climate in the building. The feedback was opposite the findings of the 5 Essential Survey and indicated the climate/culture at Alden Road was strong. The Paraprofessionals were not included in the Maxwell training, but did participate in the 5 Essential Survey.

Action Steps to Implement

Create PLC time for Paraprofessionals
 Design Team Building exercises
 Develop strategies to gauge school climate throughout the year utilizing anonymous surveys, collaboration, etc.

Person Responsible Joseph Blitch (blitchj@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

N/A

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.

Alden Road will build positive relationships with parents and other community stakeholders through the use of parent involvement activities, social media post and monthly newsletters. Parent involvement activities will provide parents and caregivers the opportunity to connect with available agencies and resources outside of Alden Road. These activities will also create opportunities for parents/caregivers to engage with teachers to discuss priority needs for their child(ren)

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			2521 - Alden Road Excep. Student Center			\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment:				\$0.00
Total:						\$0.00