Duval County Public Schools

Lone Star Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Lone Star Elementary School

10400 LONE STAR RD, Jacksonville, FL 32225

http://www.duvalschools.org/lonestar

Demographics

Principal: Cheryl Quarles Gaston R

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	95%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	

* 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

It is the mission of Lone Star Elementary School to challenge our students to achieve their goals and dreams.

Provide the school's vision statement

Lighting the fire of learning in every child’s mind.

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
	Guidance Counselor	
Farrington, Leigh	Assistant Principal	
Quarles Gaston, Cheryl	Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Cheryl Quarles Gaston R

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.*

1

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

14

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education

2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	95%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	
* 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	56	65	75	86	77	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	451
Attendance below 90 percent	15	8	13	19	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	22	39	23	16	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	28	41	38	48	12	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	187

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	23	33	22	30	12	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137

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	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/7/2020

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	56	73	75	89	73	94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	460
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	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	

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	56	73	75	89	73	94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	460
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
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	61%	50%	57%	54%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	69%	56%	58%	50%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	50%	53%	31%	46%	48%
Math Achievement	67%	62%	63%	69%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	63%	63%	62%	53%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	52%	51%	35%	48%	47%
Science Achievement	63%	48%	53%	62%	55%	55%

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	51%	51%	0%	58%	-7%
	2018	48%	50%	-2%	57%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	66%	52%	14%	58%	8%
	2018	50%	49%	1%	56%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		18%				
05	2019	60%	50%	10%	56%	4%
	2018	58%	51%	7%	55%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	64%	61%	3%	62%	2%
	2018	62%	59%	3%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	69%	64%	5%	64%	5%
	2018	75%	60%	15%	62%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	57%	57%	0%	60%	-3%
	2018	63%	61%	2%	61%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-18%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	61%	49%	12%	53%	8%
	2018	59%	56%	3%	55%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
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 2016-17**	**C & C Accel 2016-17**
SWD	34	58	60	31	44	33	31				
ELL	53	57		53	64						
ASN	58	60		83	80						
BLK	55	69	60	67	64	33	64				
HSP	67	81		57	63						
MUL	74	79		79	79						
WHT	62	66	63	64	55	36	64				
FRL	55	69	63	58	63	43	53				

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**
SWD	22	37	21	36	44	39	33				
ELL	20	44	55	45	60						
ASN	63	69		74	69						
BLK	44	45	35	59	38	23	48				
HSP	43	38		60	57		61				
MUL	50	38		72	43						
WHT	65	55	28	79	61	50	71				
FRL	47	48	29	63	44	30	57				

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	61
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	65
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	486

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
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	58
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	70
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	59
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	66
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	78
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

Native American Students	
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	59
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	59
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

Our data component with the lowest performance was LPQ math. We used our financial resources to provide push-in reading support and did not have any to provide push in math support.

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

We did not have any data that declined from the previous 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

The data component that had the greatest gap compared to the state average was LPQ math. We did not have the human capital or financial resources to provide the necessary push-in support.

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

The data that showed the most improvement was LPQ ELA. We utilized the available human capital and any resources available to provide necessary push-in support.

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

Level 1 on State Assessments in 3rd grade ELA.

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

1. MTSS - improving the effectiveness of meeting the needs of all students.
2. 3-Phase Instruction for ELA - a) extended level instruction; b) instructional-level instruction; c) on grade-level instruction
3. 2-Phase Insruction for Math - a) on grade-level instruction; b) instructional groups and basic facts automaticity
4. Infuse science into all academic courses.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Description of Area of Focus: Instructional practice specifically relating to standards-aligned instruction will focus on supporting teachers with research-based practices that follow state adopted standards within the specific content area. Rationale for Area of Focus: Standards-based data (FSA, Common Assessments, Walk-Through etc.) collected from the 2019-2020 school year showed students performing at grade level in ELA, Math, and Science with inconsistencies in tasks aligned to grade appropriate standards. Students are not provided with consistent opportunities to be successful with standards-aligned tasks while adhering to the district curriculum guide, and teachers have limited effective teaching methods to support learning. Walk-Through data collected from the 2019-2020 school year showed that 50% of teachers were providing grade appropriate standards-aligned tasks.
	* By October 2020 - at least 80% of teachers will provide opportunities for students to engage in standards-aligned tasks according to Walk-Through data (both virtual and brick & mortar). By December 2020, 100% of teachers will provide opportunities for students to engage in standards-aligned tasks.
Measureable Outcome:	We need to increase our school grade by gaining 13 points. *ELA proficiency: increase by 2; *ELA Gains: increase by 2; *ELA Bottom Quartile: increase by 2; *Math proficiency: increase by 2; *Math Gains: increase by 2; *Math Bottom Quartile: increase by 2; *Science: increase by 2.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cheryl Quarles Gaston (quarlesc@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Professional Learning Communities (PLC): Professional Learning Communities will be focused on standards-based planning, student work, project-based learning, analysis protocol, development of common assessments, and analyzing data. The work of the PLC will be centered around the research of Richard Dufour's PLC questions and will be utilized throughout the following Instructional format: 1. MTSS - improving the effectiveness of meeting the needs of all students. 2. 3 Phase Instruction for ELA - a) extended level instruction; b) instructional level instruction; c) on grade-level instruction 3. 2 Phase Instruction for Math - a) on grade-level instruction; b) instructional groups and basic facts automaticity 4. Infuse science into all academic courses.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We are embracing the District's priorities and utilizing information attained from the Opportunity Gap to address them at the school level for our students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Reorganization of Problem Solving Team with new members, procedures and accountability.
2. ELA-School-wide explicit vocabulary instruction, RMSE intervention for K-2; LLI intervention for 3-5; I-Ready K-5; Freckles 4-5; Achieve 3-5; Making Meaning K-5; Duval Reads for Science and Social Studies; Deliver grade-level standards-based instruction daily; Project-based learning (K-5); Push-in classroom support with paras and tutors.
3. Eureka Math, Acaletics (2-5), I-Ready K-5; Freckles 4-5; Zearn (3-5); Push-in support
4. Adoption of Genius Hour for interdisciplinary-constructivist teaching approach; emphasis on science, inquiry, & project-based learning (student-selected projects).
5. Reading coach-analyze reading achievement progress; provide professional development; facilitate coaching cycles; and provide coaching for teachers.
6. Science Lab teacher-design and monitor science achievement progress and provide instruction for students and coaching for teachers
7. Reading interventionist-provide tier-2 and tier-3 intervention to struggling readers.
8. District Math Coach-analyze data, provide professional development & coaching for teachers.

Person Responsible Cheryl Quarles Gaston (quarlesc@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.

We will use the data from our 5 Essentials Survey. We were in the green (very positive) in every category except one (we were “neutral”). That area was Teacher Collaboration. According to UofChicago (survey designers), 3 or more areas rated as “strong” (green) means your school is more likely to grow and succeed. She shared the results and we watched a video from DCPS about ways to address/improve the Teacher Collaboration portion. After the

video, Mrs. Gaston asked grade level teams to complete a planning sheet with their ideas about ways to address this portion so that we can build it into our SIP. She asked all grade levels to submit this information to her by the end of the day. She also asked all faculty and staff to share any thoughts, ideas or discussions about our SIP and what we need to do in order to improve our school. All ideas have been integrated into our PLC's for the subsequent school year. Most Noteworthy: Teachers would like opportunities to observe their colleagues to gain feedback and offer feedback. Therefore, Collaborative Coaching Cycles will be utilized for the upcoming school year.

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: Standards-aligned Instruction**	**$0.00**
		Total:	**$0.00**