

Duval County Public Schools

Cedar Hills Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	18
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	19
VI. Title I Requirements	21
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	22

Cedar Hills Elementary School

6534 ISH BRANT RD, Jacksonville, FL 32210

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our Mission is to provide educational excellence in every school for every student everyday. Cedar Hills Elementary is committed to providing highly quality educational opportunities that will inspire all students to acquire and use the knowledge and skills needed to succeed in a global economy and culturally diverse world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to ensure every student is inspired and prepared for success in college or career and life.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
McKinney, Marva	Principal	Principal (Marva McKinney) provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing interventions and support relating to all programs. The principal ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation, UFLI, Corrective Reading and Acaletics. Mrs. McKinney collaborates with the Leadership Team for planning and achieving academic goals for improving the school as a whole. Mrs. McKinney collaborates with the team daily, formal meetings take place once weekly. The Qualtrics Survey is one tool that is used to gather information from the faculty and staff, this information assists with the shared decision making process to determine the scope and sequence of professional development for the school year.
Bylerley-Ray, Megan	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal, Megan Ray is responsible for articulating a clear instructional vision alongside the principal with a school-wide focus on teaching and learning that is data driven and rooted in the belief that all students can achieve at high levels. Megan Ray, with the principal, and the Leadership Team is responsible for implementing consistent school-wide instructional practices that are clear, results oriented and research based. Megan Ray is instrumental in creating opportunities for ongoing learning and staff development that is informed by data. Megan Ray and the Leadership Team weekly and complete weekly calibration walks utilizing the Standard Walkthrough Tool.
Taylor, Vincent	Instructional Coach	
Woods, Courtney	Instructional Coach	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The School Advisory Council meets at least 8 times a year, at this time all stakeholders are invited. All members are given the opportunity to give input towards areas of the SIP and other topics as it relates to the improvement of the school

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

NA

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	84%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: D
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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		
Absent 10% or more days	2	34	35	39	34	32	0	0	0	176	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	1	3	0	0	0	6	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	40	39	0	0	0	83	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	24	33	0	0	0	61	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	27	39	42	0	0	0	0	0	110	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	18	22	35	35	36	0	0	0	147

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	5	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	43	40	34	43	35	40	0	0	0	235	
One or more suspensions	4	3	4	10	4	4	0	0	0	29	
Course failure in ELA	2	1	1	6	2	0	0	0	0	12	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	5	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	27	45	0	0	0	84	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	12	25	34	0	0	0	71	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	17	6	31	56	53	60	0	0	0	223	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	1	1	14	32	53	0	0	0	102

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	1	21	0	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	43	40	34	43	35	40	0	0	0	235	
One or more suspensions	4	3	4	10	4	4	0	0	0	29	
Course failure in ELA	2	1	1	6	2	0	0	0	0	12	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	5	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	27	45	0	0	0	84	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	12	25	34	0	0	0	71	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	17	6	31	56	53	60	0	0	0	223	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	1	1	14	32	53	0	0	0	102

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	1	21	0	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	33	48	53	28	50	56	25		
ELA Learning Gains				59			36		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				59			39		
Math Achievement*	41	58	59	38	48	50	31		
Math Learning Gains				63			27		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58			12		
Science Achievement*	60	52	54	40	59	59	21		
Social Studies Achievement*					63	64			
Middle School Acceleration					53	52			
Graduation Rate					46	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	55	54	59	25			58		

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	214
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	370
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	21	Yes	4	4
ELL	30	Yes	3	1
AMI				
ASN	45			
BLK	34	Yes	1	
HSP	37	Yes	1	
MUL	50			
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	43			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	23	Yes	3	3
ELL	34	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN	57			
BLK	45			
HSP	44			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	63			
PAC				
WHT	44			
FRL	44			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	33			41			60					55
SWD	17			29			25				4	
ELL	10			25							3	55
AMI												
ASN	31			50							3	55
BLK	30			33			49				4	
HSP	28			36							4	67
MUL	40			60							2	
PAC												
WHT	45			63			90				4	
FRL	35			39			64				5	52

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	28	59	59	38	63	58	40					25
SWD	10	35	36	7	25	27	18					
ELL	15	55		27	58		25					25
AMI												
ASN	44	64		56	64							

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
BLK	24	56	54	32	58	58	36					
HSP	30	72		33	72		40					18
MUL	43	64		64	82							
PAC												
WHT	28	55		45	61		33					
FRL	27	56	57	36	61	56	38					24

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	25	36	39	31	27	12	21					58
SWD	4	20		13	0							
ELL	32			56								58
AMI												
ASN	60			73								55
BLK	16	32	36	22	13	14	9					
HSP	27			27								67
MUL	17			33								
PAC												
WHT	35	40		40	33		38					
FRL	21	32	42	26	24	17	22					60

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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
05	2023 - Spring	43%	47%	-4%	54%	-11%
04	2023 - Spring	33%	50%	-17%	58%	-25%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	25%	46%	-21%	50%	-25%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	40%	59%	-19%	59%	-19%
04	2023 - Spring	38%	58%	-20%	61%	-23%
05	2023 - Spring	58%	52%	6%	55%	3%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	57%	48%	9%	51%	6%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

ELA Proficiency is the lowest component of the school grade, however it has been steadily increasing over the years from 2020-2021 at 25% and 2022-2023 at 35%.

The lowest performing subgroup is Students with Disabilities which is currently at 32% and has been consistently below 32% for the past 3 years. The exceptional student education teachers have all been moved to other schools or back into the classroom; we have 3 positions this year and they are filled with veteran teachers.

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

Cedar Hills' students did not decline in any subgroups or school grade components last 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.

Data is from the 2021-2022 school year. The greatest gap was with the number of Level 1 Students in ELA . The school is at 44.9% whereas the State is 24.6%, the difference is 20.3%. In Math the Level 1 students is 45.5% and the State is 28.7%, the difference is 16.8%.

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

In 2022-2023, our Science score increased from 40% to 60%, the difference is 20%. Small group instruction was heavily implemented along with assistance from the district science specialist.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

The first area of concern is Students with Disabilities. The second group would be the English Language Learners.

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

1. Students with Disabilities
2. English Language Learners
3. Reading Proficiency
4. Reading LPQ
5. Math Proficiency

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Student attendance during the 2022-2023 showed that 39% of the students were absent 20+ days.

Measurable Outcome:

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

During the 2023-2024 school year the goal is to reduce the percentage to 25% of students missing 20+ days.

Monitoring:

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

CHE has created an Attendance Intervention Team with both school and district-based personnel. Every month CHE will have an incentive for the students who have attended all month.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marva McKinney (mckinneym3@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Students will be directly rewarded for their attendance on a monthly basis. Ms. James, Ms. Cox, Ms. McKinney and Ms. Ray will be directly monitoring the attendance of all of the children. Ms. McKinney and Ms. Ray will be monitoring the Students with Disabilities and English Language Learning specifically.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The data indicates that Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners displayed little to no growth last year.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Progress monitoring of the weekly student data will determine the effectiveness of the strategies.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: Ms. Benton (Interventionist) Monday and Wednesday Grade 3: Para Monday and Tuesday Grade 4: 10:30 -11:00 (Centers) Para Tuesday and Wednesday Grade 5: 2:05-2:45 (Resource)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

ELA LPQ and Learning Gains will be the focus for improvement. These groups will be addressed through small group interventions provided by the classroom teacher and ESE teachers

Measurable Outcome:

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

The goal for LPQ is to increase from 59% to 69%. The goal for Learning Gains is to move from 59% to 63%.

Monitoring:

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

Freckle will be the monitoring tool used. The small groups will have pre and post-test data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marva McKinney (mckinneym3@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Freckle will be used to monitor growth, along with pre and post-test data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Freckle is a research-based intervention.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs will take place during voluntary faculty meetings. These meetings will take place during the first 45 days of school.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

According to the most recent FAST PM data, the Standards Walkthrough Tool, classroom instruction, aligned tasks, and assessments; additional support is required.

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

According to the most recent FAST PM data, the Standards Walkthrough Tool, classroom instruction, aligned tasks, and assessments; additional support is required. The overall percentage of students proficient in reading/ELA for the 2022-2023 school year was 35%.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

100% of teachers will participate in weekly collaborative planning and data chats with school-based leadership, resulting in an increase in student proficiency to 50%.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

100% of teachers will participate in weekly collaborative planning and data chats with school-based leadership, resulting in an increase in student proficiency to 50%. This will be measured by the 2023-2024 FAST PM; additional data will be derived from the DMA.

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

Weekly classroom walkthroughs will be completed using the Standards Walkthrough Tool.

*Leadership will meet weekly to discuss successes/areas of focus noticed throughout each grade level.

*Leadership will work to develop PLCs/Common Planning that address areas of concern and use model teachers to present as experts when appropriate.

*Leadership will revisit classrooms to monitor adjustments in instruction

*Leadership will conduct monthly data chats with teachers.

*Teachers and leadership team will use data collected to make informed decisions surrounding differentiated and small group instruction.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

McKinney, Marva, mckinneym3@duvalschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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?

*Implementation of Benchmark Advance curriculum.

*Implementation of differentiated small groups.

*Implementation of UFLI.

*Afterschool Tutoring Program

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

*Implementing Benchmark Advance will introduce students to grade-level material that provides standards instruction as directed by the BEST standards.

*Differentiated small group instruction will provide students with instruction based on their needs/ deficiencies.

*UFLI will provide students with engaging instruction focused on phonics

*Afterschool Tutoring Program

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

*Common planning that is based on teacher/student needs

*Use of the student work protocol when to make adjustments to instruction

McKinney, Marva,

*Providing additional paraprofessional support to ELA classrooms for small group instruction.

mckinney3@duvalschools.org

*Use of Student Work Protocol

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The SIP methods of dissemination via the website, one copy in multiple languages is located in the parent involvement room, and there are copies in the multiple languages located in the office.

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

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

The Family Engagement Plan's methods of dissemination are the website, one copy in multiple languages is located in the parent involvement room, and there are copies in the multiple languages located in the office.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(ii))

We have hired an ESOL Paraprofessional and an additional ESE teacher to provide additional support and monitoring.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

NA

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

NA

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

NA

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

NA

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

NA

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

NA

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No