Venetia Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Venetia Elementary School

4300 TIMUQUANA RD, Jacksonville, FL 32210

http://www.duvalschools.org/venetia

Demographics

Principal: Monique Chatman

Start Date for this Principal: 6/30/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	74%
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 (62%) 2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: C (51%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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.](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

Venetia Elementary School

4300 TIMUQUANA RD, Jacksonville, FL 32210

http://www.duvalschools.org/venetia

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 KG-5	No	74%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	72%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A		A	A

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a 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.

Venetia Elementary School of the Medical Arts provides a well-balanced, rigorous curriculum designed to meet the academic and social needs of individual students as well as create an environment that supports an interest in the medical fields.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Venetia Elementary School of the Medical Arts is to provide students with opportunities to explore practices, subjects, and experiences in academic and medical fields as well as inspire and provide rigorous preparation for students to continue their exploration in the Medical Arts Middle School program and beyond as healthy, productive citizens of our society.

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
Worthen, Monique	Principal	
McDaniel, Jason	Assistant Principal	
Cooley, Amber	Reading Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 6/30/2022, Monique Chatman

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Total number of students enrolled at the school

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

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

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	50	70	58	62	61	66	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	367
Attendance below 90 percent	1	23	17	20	14	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	2	0	3	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	2	0	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	7	23	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

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	10	15	17	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56

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	0	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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

Thursday 6/30/2022

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	61	59	60	64	74	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	395
Attendance below 90 percent	0	14	12	12	16	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	1	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	12	26	17	15	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	14	28	25	28	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	14	23	18	19	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	61	59	60	64	74	77	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	395
Attendance below 90 percent	0	14	12	12	16	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	1	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	12	26	17	15	51	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	14	28	25	28	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	14	23	18	19	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	62%	50%	56%				52%	50%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	68%						60%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%						69%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	71%	48%	50%				66%	62%	63%
Math Learning Gains	65%						77%	63%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%						61%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	56%	59%	59%				57%	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	59%	51%	8%	58%	1%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	53%	52%	1%	58%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	49%	50%	-1%	56%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

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	69%	61%	8%	62%	7%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	83%	64%	19%	64%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
05	2022					
	2019	50%	57%	-7%	60%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	59%	49%	10%	53%	6%
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	27	50	45	40	41	40	20				
ELL	24	53		45	60						
BLK	61	63	45	65	56	45	57				
HSP	55	76		67	72		43				
MUL	75	69		83	77						
WHT	63	72	70	76	66		53				
FRL	55	63	52	64	61	53	33				

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	17	15		32	38		23				
ELL	22			50							
BLK	41	50		43	37		26				
HSP	34	50		60	45		33				
MUL	58			64							
WHT	60	45		65	45		73				
FRL	40	48	20	46	48		32				
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	17	50	64	21	39	36	27				
BLK	48	62	71	59	75	58	41				
HSP	48	33		59	79		60				
MUL	56	80		67	73						
WHT	59	64		80	81		86				
FRL	41	54	67	56	70	47	51				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	17
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	453
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	40

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	56
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	63
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	76
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	67
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	54
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?

Trends that emerge across grade levels are our students with disabilities and lowest performing quartile are struggling to obtain proficiency and a substantial growth. Science Achievement continues to be a concern with being less that 60%.

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

ELA & Math Lowest 25% Gains and Science Achievement is posing the greatest need for improvement with all areas being less than 60%. We did receive double digit increases from the previous year.

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

Contributing factors include learning loss from some students participating in online learning the year prior. Frequency of small group instruction was also a factor. Standard task alignment played a factor in science. In order to improve, we will need to meet with small groups frequently and ensure we are using the correct resources to meet student needs. We will also implement small group and centers more frequently in science to provide remediation for students in need. We will ensure targeted practice toward standards alignment.

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

Based on the 2022 state assessment data, the greatest area of improvement was math lowest 25% gains with a 38 point increase. ELA Lowest 25% increased 36 points and math learning gains increase 24 points. Based on progress monitoring data, ELA Achievement showed the most improvement with PMA 1 being an average of 51% and state assessment data being 62% overall proficiency.

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

Contributing factors for improvement include drilling down data and providing targeted supports to students based on their individual need and data. Also, consistent releasing of students to work more independently with tasks. We continued to monitor data each quarter and throughout the year to provide additional feedback.

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

We will train on the new BEST standards for proper in-depth implementation. We will continue with having a sense of urgency since our focus will be aiming for proficiency. We will focus on teaching the standards and allowing time for remediation.

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 provide professional development on standards analysis, planning and implementing small group instruction as well as frequent progress monitoring. We will also provide additional training on the new reading (3-5) and math curriculum (K-5).

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

Consistent monitoring through weekly common planning will ensure sustainability of improvement. we will analyze PMA data, lesson checks, weekly assessments and daily classwork to ensure effective instruction is implemented. Small group plans will be monitored for implementation through walkthroughs and consistent feedback.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. 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.	Based on our subgroup, students with disabilities are falling below in several academic areas. Accommodations must be followed with fidelity for classroom teachers. Teachers could use more strategies for working with students with disabilities.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	100% of all teachers will engage in strategies to support and increase student achievement for students with disabilities.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	This are will be monitored by dat tracking of SWD through tasks and assessments. We will specifically analyze data for SWD for assessments and tasks. We will compare data between all students and SWD subgroup.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Monique Worthen (worthenm1@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Tach in small interactive groups (use of interactive monitor) Assess learning in multiple ways Work collaboratively with VE teachers
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	If we focus on these evidence based strategies for our SWDs, then we will provide more support for our students and increase achievement. Working with the VE Teachers collaboratively, will ensure needed support for students and ensure that we are meeting the needs of the student specifically.

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.

Professional Development of evidence-based strategies to use with SWDs.

Person Responsible	Monique Worthen (worthenm1@duvalschools.org)

Analyze data and plan specifically for students with disabilities.

Person Responsible	Monique Worthen (worthenm1@duvalschools.org)

Administration and VE Team will monitor implementation of strategies for SWDs.

Person Responsible	Jason McDaniel (mcdanielj3@duvalschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Based on the introduction of new standards for the state of Florida, we will focus on aligning our instruction to master the B.E.S.T standards. Our instructional practices will be geared toward getting the students acclimated, progressing and eventually mastery of the new standards.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	100% of our teachers will adjust their instructional practices through standards aligned instruction to have our students achieve mastery of the new B.E.S.T standards.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Administration will monitor this area using the Standards Walkthrough Tool provided by DCPS and provide feedback to the teachers of our observations.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Monique Worthen (worthenm1@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Standards Walkthrough Observations Planning sessions Professional Learning Communities (PLC) Common Planning Work task and standards alignment
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Through standards walkthroughs, common planning, and participating in professional learning communities, we will be able to ensure that all of our teachers are aligning their instruction and instructional practices to the B.E.S.T standards.

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.

Standards Walkthroughs

Person Responsible	Monique Worthen (worthenm1@duvalschools.org)

Standards Walkthroughs

Person Responsible	Jason McDaniel (mcdanielj3@duvalschools.org)

Professional Learning Communities

Person Responsible	Monique Worthen (worthenm1@duvalschools.org)

Common Planning

Person Responsible	Amber Cooley (cooleya@duvalschools.org)

Planning Sessions

Person Responsible	Monique Worthen (worthenm1@duvalschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Based on the 5 Essentials Data, there is a need for collaboration among the staff across grade levels. Collaborating across grade levels will help with cohesive planning for all core subjects.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	100% of teachers will collaborate to plan instructionally and make sound decisions on instruction.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Administration will monitor and provide feedback during common planning and plan sessions to ensure the desired outcome.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Monique Worthen (worthenm1@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Common Planning Professional Learning Communities Plan Sessions Instructional Rounds
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	If we common plan, participate in PLCs, and instructional rounds, we will work collaboratively on planning lessons as well as assessments and remediation. This will also allow us the opportunity provide feedback to colleagues and plan accordingly.

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.

Instructional Rounds within grade level and across grade levels.

Person Responsible	Monique Worthen (worthenm1@duvalschools.org)

Weekly Common Planning

Person Responsible	Amber Cooley (cooleya@duvalschools.org)

Professional Learning Communities and Plan Sessions once a quarter

Person Responsible	Monique Worthen (worthenm1@duvalschools.org)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	ELL students scored below 41% with a score of 40% based on the current state assessment data.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	100% of teachers will implement research based ELL strategies to help improve students achievement.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	ELL strategies will be monitored through the use of analyzing ELL plans and documentation for implementation.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Monique Worthen (worthenm1@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Use ELL plans as a guidance for accommodations for each student. Incorporate ESOL strategies in class for each ELL student.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	The strategy aligns to state guidance for implementation of using ELL plans for accommodations.

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.

Train on use of ELL plans, accommodation implementation and how to document implementations.

Person Responsible	Jason McDaniel (mcdanielj3@duvalschools.org)

Train on the ESOL strategies to implement during core and small group lessons.

Person Responsible	Monique Worthen (worthenm1@duvalschools.org)

RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A for area of focus

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

5th Grade students fell below 50% on the state assessment.

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A for area of focus

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

70% or more will score a level 3 and above on the current standardized ELA assessment.

50% or more 5th Graders will score a level 3 and above on the current standardized ELA assessment.

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

We will monitor the the Area of Focus through the FAST assessment given three times a year. We will also monitor weekly classroom assessments as well as blended learning assessments. Weekly walkthroughs data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Worthen, Monique, worthenm1@duvalschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

*Use of Leveled Literacy Intervention in small groups for specific student targets.
*Use of Benchmark Intervention Kit aligned to the BEST ELA Standards.
◦ Ensure all instruction in reading is systematic and explicit, based on data, and uses an evidence-based sequence of reading instruction and strategies to meet the needs of students at the school
level and determining appropriate instructional adjustments
◦ Ensure that data from formative assessments are used to guide differentiation of reading
instruction (Waterford, iReady, Achieve 3000, Freckle)
◦ Ensure incorporation of reading and literacy instruction by all content area teachers into subject
areas to extend and build discussions of text in order to deepen understanding

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Each program used is geared toward increasing the student achievement in reading. Resources used are based on student needs from data collected. Each program identified has proven effectiveness for the target population when monitored and feedback is provided for next steps.

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Implement and monitor small group instruction using research-based programs. Students will be assessed through informal and formal assessments to track proficiency in reading. Professional Learning will continue on how to identify student need based on data.	Worthen, Monique, worthenm1@duvalschools.org
Tracking of Lexile Levels through Achieve 3000 and Freckle to help support and guide differentiated reading instruction. Students assess monthly to provide current data for reading levels.	Worthen, Monique, worthenm1@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.

We address building a positive school culture and environment through a continuous process of celebrating our teachers and students for building and sustaining a solid foundation for success. Our students are celebrated for their academic successes as well as their exemplary behavior that is on display every day. Our teachers are celebrated for leading our students in reaching those heights that were thought to be unattainable. We foster a culture of positive reinforcement and collaboration. We are inviting to our community and all stakeholders through consistent communication, collaboration and partnership.

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

Administration: welcome, listen to, and collaborate with all stakeholders
Teachers/Staff: welcome, listen to, and collaborate with parents, students, and community
Military Family Life Counselor (MFLC): welcome, listen to, and collaborate with all military families
Full Service Counselor: welcome, listen to, and collaborate with parents and students