

Duval County Public Schools

Oceanway Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Oceanway Elementary School

12555 GILLESPIE AVE, Jacksonville, FL 32218

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

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Gray

Start Date for this Principal: 6/15/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	82%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (66%) 2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Oceanway Elementary School

12555 GILLESPIE AVE, Jacksonville, FL 32218

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

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	82%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	54%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A		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 school, in every classroom, for every student, every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every student is inspired and prepared for success in college or a 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
Gray, Jennifer	Principal	Instructional Leader and Building Management
Pipkin, Barbara	Other	Instructional Coaching and ELA Support
Johnson, Keith	Other	Instructional Coaching and Math Support
Troy, Ronrica	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/15/2020, Jennifer Gray

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.*

3

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

27

Total number of students enrolled at the school

635

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.

1

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	90	78	95	117	104	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	582
Attendance below 90 percent	1	23	28	38	30	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	2	5	3	4	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in Math	2	3	2	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	21	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	6	16	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	5	33	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98

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	2	9	27	49	14	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114

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	2	1	3	8	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/22/2022

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	67	78	99	101	88	108	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	541
Attendance below 90 percent	1	23	32	28	27	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	154
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	1	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	6	44	46	15	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	177
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	1	10	28	41	23	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	145
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	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	9	37	39	19	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	165

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	0	0	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	67	78	99	101	88	108	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	541
Attendance below 90 percent	1	23	32	28	27	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	154
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	1	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	6	44	46	15	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	177
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	1	10	28	41	23	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	145
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	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	9	37	39	19	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	165

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	0	0	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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%				56%	50%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	64%						61%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	64%						56%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	70%	48%	50%				70%	62%	63%
Math Learning Gains	79%						65%	63%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	74%						38%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	57%	59%	59%				51%	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	56%	51%	5%	58%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	61%	52%	9%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	48%	50%	-2%	56%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

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	66%	61%	5%	62%	4%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	75%	64%	11%	64%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
05	2022					
	2019	61%	57%	4%	60%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	51%	49%	2%	53%	-2%
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	14	44	44	34	73	75	40				
ELL											
BLK	54	73	82	72	88	92	65				
HSP	66	65		74	74		70				
MUL	43			64							
WHT	45	59	64	66	73	67	53				
FRL	45	65	66	61	78	72	53				

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	22	24		33	33		29				
ELL											
BLK	46	53		58	40		48				
HSP	56			65			45				
WHT	44	41	33	57	50	14	56				
FRL	42	35	36	51	33		37				

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	24	42	30	45	46	23	14				
BLK	54	59	54	68	55	31	38				
HSP	65	62		78	77						
WHT	54	61	57	71	68	42	55				
FRL	50	62	59	69	64	47	55				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
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	90
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	550
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
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	90
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	75
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	70
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	54
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	61
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	63
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?

Our Students with Disabilities (SWD) subgroup data points continue to show the lowest performance rates. This subgroup has significant academic deficiencies and many are working 2 or more grade levels below their current placement.

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

Reading proficiency, gains, and lowest performing quartile in the previous learning cycle demonstrate the greatest need for improvement. While scoring above the state in all areas, looking at historical data, reading performance continues to be a focus point. In addition, while gains were noted in Science (5th grade), this is also a shared focus due to the natural alignment to reading performance.

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

Navigating a return to brick and mortar instruction following the national pandemic, our data indicates that our students are still scoring significantly below grade level expectations as they progress through our programming. Our continued focus on small group instruction and interventions designed specifically to remediate the foundational skills in reading and then building on fluency and comprehension, will continue to be critical elements to our support systems utilized throughout the year to support student learning and development. The ability to utilize additional Title I funds to purchase the other half of our media specialist, creates a full-time position at the school level. This individual will assist in pulling small groups for reading interventions during Media rotations. In addition, the ability to add additional instructional paraprofessionals to our staff with Title I monies will provide 1 (one) full-time individual and 2 (two) part-time individuals to pull small groups and complete Tier II interventions to address reading gaps and foundational reading needs for students.

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

Our learning gains and lowest performing quartile gains in Math were phenomenal in the most recent learning cycle. Historically, students within the LPQ have not demonstrated gains. However, we saw tremendous gains in both our overall learning gains (+31), but specifically with our LPQ subgroup (+58)

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

Our focus on small group instruction and remediation of foundational skills in math were instrumental in this success. Utilizing ESSER tutors and laser focused interventions with standards mastery and tools for instruction provided students with skill specific instruction to address gaps in learning and ensure success.

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

We must continue to utilize these resources and small group instruction in Math, as well as in ELA for the 22-23 school year. Utilizing additional Title funding will allow for additional small group instruction and interventions consistently through the purchase of additional personnel to implement these supports. Our Media Specialist will pull groups during media rotations, with the additional of her .5 funding. Our 3 added instructional paras will provide support in classrooms and through the support of small group instruction in ELA. In addition, by utilizing additional resources such as Pikmykid and bloomz, we can ensure all instructional time is used throughout the day and communication between families is increased.

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.

We will continue to provide professional development supported by the science of reading and guided reading groups. In addition, we will utilize coaching sessions in small group/center rotations, and the use of our new Benchmark curriculum materials in both reading and math.

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

We will, again, utilize the support of the ESSER tutor/coach, per state funding. She will work directly with students and staff to support instruction and student learning. Additional personnel will be used to provide foundational skills support in reading, daily, to bridge learning gaps and ensure continued success in the future.

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.

Previous walk-through data indicates students struggling to articulate their understanding of the standards as it relates specifically to what they are learning, that tasks are not consistently aligned to the rigor or depth of identified standard, and do not consistently require students to display mastery of the identified standard. This is negatively impacting our student's learning and mastery of grade level standards.

As the new BEST standards are implemented in 3rd-5th grades this year along with new state testing measures, with state accountability results being awarded in a 'held harmless' year, we must review our current level of progress and focus on proficiency by targeted bubble students.

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

Across all grade levels in the ELA & Math content areas, 85% of completed Benchmark-Based Instruction and Assessment Walk-Through Tool will result in a final rating of 1.5 or higher when rating if students are demonstrating mastery of the standard through appropriate activities/tasks that are equivalent to state assessments.

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

The administrative team will conduct weekly Benchmark-Based Instruction and Assessment Walk-Throughs to monitor progress and provide specific weekly review to classroom teachers via weekly PLC meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Gray (grayj1@duvalschools.org)

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

Professional Learning Communities will be utilized to provide professional development and ultimately empower our teachers to unpack standards to develop lessons and tasks that utilize a variety of cognitive learning strategies to reach all students where they are and provide them with an instructional path to display mastery of the identified standard or an appropriate grade level component in daily lessons.

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

When a school functions as a true professional learning community, educators within that school embrace high levels of learning for ALL students as both the REASON the organization exists, as well as the fundamental responsibility of all who work within it. (DuFour, DuFour, Easker, Many & Mattos, Learning by Doing, 2016) In addition, data pulled from the 21-22 school year Standards Walk dashboard demonstrated a school-wide strength of using aligned materials and implementing aligned instruction. This data indicates a need to focus on student application at the level of mastery aligned to state assessments.

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.

Utilize a Reading and Math interventionists to provide job-embedded professional development related to standards and monitoring of levels of understanding through available data points at consistent intervals (i.e. benchmark testing and progress monitoring)

Person Responsible Jennifer Gray (grayj1@duvalschools.org)

Utilize a Reading and Math Interventionists to help monitor the instructional practices and implementation of identified strategies and best practices that are aligned to standards based instruction to support learning and understanding, providing coaching, as needed.

Person Responsible Jennifer Gray (grayj1@duvalschools.org)

Continue the scheduled blocks of weekly administratively directed common planning's to facilitate discussions, analyze student data points, and review student work in support of standards work and daily lesson alignment.

Person Responsible Ronrica Troy (pinkneyr@duvalschools.org)

Conduct at least 4 benchmark-based instruction and assessment walks weekly as a leadership team, reviewing results and discussing next steps specifically related to aligned tasks and assessments.

Person Responsible Ronrica Troy (pinkneyr@duvalschools.org)

Utilize additional resources such as Pikmykid and bloomz to ensure every instructional minute of the day is used for direct instruction and communication between families remains a top priority.

Person Responsible Jennifer Gray (grayj1@duvalschools.org)

Utilize media specialist to pull intervention groups weekly during media rotations to provide small group instruction to bridge learning gaps related to foundational skills.

Person Responsible Barbara Pipkin (pipkinb@duvalschools.org)

Utilize additional instructional paraprofessionals (3) to provide intervention support to students performing below grade level, using research-based interventions daily to bridge learning gaps related to foundational skills.

Person Responsible Barbara Pipkin (pipkinb@duvalschools.org)

Implement on-going, on-level mathematical activities through the use of acaletics materials, coupled with general classroom supplies, to ensure daily exposure to key concepts and foundational skills.

Person Responsible Keith Johnson (johnsonk4@duvalschools.org)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus

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

Statewide accountability data as measured by the Florida State Assessment (FSA) indicates that our subgroup Students with Disabilities (SWD) fall just about the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index with a score of 46%. This is the only subgroup that has previously fallen below the identified threshold, and therefore remains a targeted area of focus for the 22-23.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our subgroup Students with Disabilities (SWD) will score above the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index on the 2022-2023 state accountability report as indicated by Florida State Assessment (FSA) data. As a state monitored target, we must develop an action plan to address this target.

Monitoring:

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

The leadership team will review current data and conduct data chats with teachers to monitor students' growth.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Gray (grayj1@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

All classrooms in all content areas will implement targeted, aligned interventions with students at their current instructional level and consistently monitored for effectiveness and adjusted according to the individual needs of each student.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Interventions that are aligned with grade level standards and scaffolded to support individual student instructional needs will connect and build upon learning to move a student down a prescribed instructional path that will lead to mastery of the identified standard. Federal Index data indicates the need for this intended focus to support our students with disabilities, but also supports the learning of all students across our campus.

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.

Pilot and implement the University of Florida Literacy Intervention (UFLI) with primary grades.

Person Responsible Barbara Pipkin (pipkinb@duvalschools.org)

Implement Acaletics groupings aligned with on-going assessments to provide support specific to the student's current instructional level.

Person Responsible Keith Johnson (johnsonk4@duvalschools.org)

Provide job-embedded professional development, as needed, for specific research-based intervention programs such as Acaletics, UFLI and LLI to support individual student needs.

Person Responsible Jennifer Gray (grayj1@duvalschools.org)

Utilize weekly PLCs to analyze student work and data related to interventions and instructions to determine instructional next steps.

Person Responsible Jennifer Gray (grayj1@duvalschools.org)

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.

It is the goal of the school to promote helpfulness, inclusiveness, and responsibility. We will do this by providing opportunities for families to become involved in their child's education through monthly events such as our Parent-Student Conference Nights, Math and Literacy Nights, and Night of the Arts.

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

These events will also involve other stakeholders such as business partners, as well as our faith-based partners.