

Duval County Public Schools

Tiger Academy



2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	11
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	16

Tiger Academy

6079 BAGLEY RD, Jacksonville, FL 32209

firstcoastymca.org

Demographics

Principal: Charles Mcwhite

Start Date for this Principal: 7/25/2019

2018-19 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)	91%
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
School Grade	2018-19: D
School Grades History	2017-18: C
	2016-17: B
	2015-16: C
	2014-15: C
	2013-14: C
2018-19 Differentiated Accountability (DA) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N
Year	A
ESSA Status	CS&I

* 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

To provide the children of the Northside a structured and nurturing learning environment that is focused on rigorous academic standards, character development, self-discipline, personal and social responsibility and family involvement.

Provide the school's vision statement

Tigers Today...Leaders Tomorrow!

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title
Mc White, Charles	Principal
Principal	
Mondy, Tumika	Assistant Principal
Assistant Principal	
Didier, Jessie	Other
Other	
Aikens, Jean	Instructional Coach
Instructional Coach	
Golden, Susan	Other
Other	
Tardif, Jennifer	Guidance Counselor
Guidance Counselor	
Fuller, Tonia	Instructional Coach
Instructional Coach	

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	38	36	36	38	42	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	232	
Attendance below 90 percent	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	
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	1	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	

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	2	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/25/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
Attendance below 90 percent															
One or more suspensions															
Course failure in ELA or Math															
Level 1 on statewide assessment															

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
Students with two or more indicators															

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	1	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	16	29	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70

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

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

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	48%	50%	57%	45%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	56%	58%	49%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	30%	50%	53%	45%	46%	48%
Math Achievement	49%	62%	63%	53%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	28%	63%	62%	58%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	19%	52%	51%	56%	48%	47%
Science Achievement	29%	48%	53%	14%	55%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	38 (0)	36 (0)	36 (0)	38 (0)	42 (0)	42 (0)	232 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	1 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	2 ()	2 ()	5 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	2 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)	3 (0)	10 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	2 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (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.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	48%	51%	-3%	58%	-10%
	2018	52%	50%	2%	57%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	45%	52%	-7%	58%	-13%
	2018	46%	49%	-3%	56%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
05	2019	51%	50%	1%	56%	-5%
	2018	36%	51%	-15%	55%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	58%	61%	-3%	62%	-4%
	2018	60%	59%	1%	62%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	48%	64%	-16%	64%	-16%
	2018	51%	60%	-9%	62%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				
05	2019	41%	57%	-16%	60%	-19%
	2018	47%	61%	-14%	61%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	29%	49%	-20%	53%	-24%
	2018	14%	56%	-42%	55%	-41%
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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	6	40		13	20						
BLK	48	54	30	49	28	19	29				

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
FRL	44	52	23	43	17	15	26				

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	18			27							
BLK	46	49	45	54	58	56	14				
FRL	45	50	54	45	55	42	13				

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	37
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	257
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data**Students With Disabilities**

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	20
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

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	37
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	31
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	1

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

Science performance. It was the 5th grade teacher's first year teaching science. There was an increase of 15% however the trend is still below the district's performance.

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

Lowest 25% Math learning gains. The school's lone 4th grade math teacher was on maternity leave for the first two months of school and resigned one month after returning. The school's only 5th grade math teacher was new to the grade level.

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

Math learning gains. The school's lone 4th grade math teacher was on maternity leave for the first two months of school and resigned one month after returning. The school's only 5th grade math teacher was new to the grade level.

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

Science achievement. Used MAP assessments for baseline assessing and progress monitoring.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

The number of students scoring a Level 1 and the low % of students showing learning gains.

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

1. Lowest 25% in Math
2. Math learning gains
3. Lowest 25% in Reading
4. Science Performance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title	Learning gains in math
Rationale	Our school wide math learning gains declined a great deal. We will focus our school improvement efforts on ensuring that our students are enriched in math and we will target overall math learning gains as our focus.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The school plans to increase the learning gains from 28% to 56%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tonia Fuller (tfuller@firstcoastymca.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will place a heavy emphasis on small group instruction based upon data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	By adding an additional classroom teacher to focus on small group instruction in math, we have an opportunity to better group students together according to the data and to target those areas of deficiency. FSA data, iReady data and other classroom data will be used.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Diagnostic assessment based upon iReady data 2. Small groups identified according to the data 3. Rtl block in the schedule twice per day for targeted small group instruction 4. After-school tutoring twice per week 5.
Person Responsible	Charles Mc White (cmcwhite@firstcoastymca.org)

#2

Title	Teacher recruitment and development
Rationale	All intermediate math teachers at Tiger Academy were in their first year of teaching the particular grade level. By recruiting and developing established teachers, we will be able to provide our students with well-trained, consistent teachers.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The new teachers at Tiger Academy will receive effective or highly effective evaluations at the end of the school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Charles Mc White (cmcwhite@firstcoastymca.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Recruiting and developing effective teachers. Providing professional development to grow teachers professionally.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will attend workshops designed to grow them professionally. Staff development will take place throughout the year on instructional strategies and behavior management.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Staff development activities2. Professional development plans3.4.5.
Person Responsible	Charles Mc White (cmcwhite@firstcoastymca.org)

#3

Title	Classroom Management Strategies
Rationale	By developing better school-wide classroom management strategies, teachers will have a more positive impact on the school's academic performance.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Less than 50 discipline referrals for the 2019-2020 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tumika Mondy (tmondy@firstcoastymca.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Classroom management training, such as CHAMPs, to increase student engagement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Students who are engaged perform better academically. We will use staff development training to better understand how to manage classroom behaviors.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional Development Trainers 2. 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Charles Mc White (cmcwhite@firstcoastymca.org)

#4

Title	Increased performance in Reading and Science
Rationale	The school's science performance and reading performance are below the district's average.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	The school will increase its reading performance from 48% to 55% and its science performance from 29% to 40%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tonia Fuller (tfuller@firstcoastymca.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will incorporate additional small group instruction in reading and math to improve performance with an emphasis on small group instruction. We will use boot camp materials in science and phonics reader sets in reading to provide small group instruction. We will also incorporate after school tutoring.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We will have a reading interventionist for the primary grades (K-2) to focus on reading improvement in the early grades.
Action Step	
Description	1. Diagnostic assessment 2. Small group instruction 3. Reading interventionist targets deficiencies 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Jean Aikens (jaikens@firstcoastymca.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students

Tiger Academy has a full-time staff member who is assigned to support parent, family and other stakeholders in their fulfillment of the school's mission and support student needs. Additionally, we will offer monthly parent events designed to promote parent involvement.

PFEP Link

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services

The school will ensure the social-emotional needs of our students are met by providing a full-time school counselor and by implementing our school-wide mental health plan.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another

The school has a full-time student support specialist who works with the families of 5th grade students to guide and assist in their transition to middle school.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact

The principal and executive director identify and establish school goals. The school's leadership team meets twice per month to review data, set a strategic focus and to monitor student progress. This process includes a budget review to determine that funds are allocated in a manner to best meet the school's needs. The principal will be responsible for overseeing this process, with input from the leadership team, teachers and staff.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations

To advance college and career awareness, the school will conduct college tours for all 3rd, 4th and 5th grade students. In partnership with UNF and other organizations, we will continue to support the professional development of our teachers and academic success of our students.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A	Areas of Focus: Learning gains in math				\$88,070.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	1211 - Tiger Academy	School Improvement Funds	2.0	\$81,070.00
			<i>Notes: Classroom Teacher for small group instruction</i>			
	5100	510-Supplies	1211 - Tiger Academy	School Improvement Funds		\$7,000.00
			<i>Notes: Math supplemental materials</i>			

