

Duval County Public Schools

San Jose 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 | 9 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 20 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 20 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 24 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 0 |

San Jose Elementary School

5805 SAINT AUGUSTINE RD, Jacksonville, FL 32207

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

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.

At San Jose Elementary, we will empower students to become lifelong learners and responsible citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At San Jose Elementary, we believe that all children can learn. No children will be left behind. No exceptions. No excuses.

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 |
|------------------|---------------------|--|
| Gomez, Jasmin | Principal | Oversee SIP implementation for ELA & Math; provide monitoring and support of behavior and science goal |
| Cousins, Brianna | Assistant Principal | Oversee SIP implementation for behavior goal and science |

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.

During our School Advisory Council meetings we invite all stakeholders which include: school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students, families, and business/community partners. Through this we are able to gain their input on areas for school improvement.

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))

The SIP will be regularly monitored to have an impact on increasing student achievement, specifically for those with the greatest achievement gap. This will be done through our monthly SAC meetings where we will review data with families and implement strategies and interventions to support those with the greatest achievement gap. We will implement targeted small group instruction, student engagement strategies, additional PD to share best practice through reflection, lesson studies, instructional rounds,

etc. We will also ensure that we are empowering students to take ownership of their learning through accountability.

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 PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | Yes |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 81% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 100% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | Yes |
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | N/A |
| 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) 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: C |
| 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 | 3 | 65 | 46 | 55 | 40 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 247 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 68 | 58 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 128 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 36 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 69 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 3 | 87 | 102 | 86 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 278 |

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 | 3 | 51 | 37 | 40 | 47 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 220 |

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 | 11 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

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 | 6 | 58 | 60 | 42 | 32 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 238 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Course failure in ELA | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Course failure in Math | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 52 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 111 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 38 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 7 | 40 | 81 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 209 |

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 | 7 | 39 | 72 | 73 | 41 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 275 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 4 | 4 | 3 | 10 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |

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 | 6 | 58 | 60 | 42 | 32 | 40 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 238 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Course failure in ELA | 4 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Course failure in Math | 3 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 52 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 111 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 38 | 49 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 7 | 40 | 81 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 209 |

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 | 7 | 39 | 72 | 73 | 41 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 275 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 4 | 4 | 3 | 10 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |

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* | 30 | 48 | 53 | 36 | 50 | 56 | 33 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 66 | | | 39 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 53 | | | 38 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 57 | 58 | 59 | 52 | 48 | 50 | 38 | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 62 | | | 45 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 57 | | | 41 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 36 | 52 | 54 | 26 | 59 | 59 | 19 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 63 | 64 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 53 | 52 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 46 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | 80 | | | |
| ELP Progress | 55 | 54 | 59 | 61 | | | 45 | | |

* 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) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 41 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 3 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 205 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 5 |
| Percent Tested | 99 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--------------------------------------|-----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 52 |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|-----|
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 413 |
| 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 | 25 | Yes | 1 | 1 |
| ELL | 33 | Yes | 1 | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 44 | | | |
| BLK | 41 | | | |
| HSP | 39 | Yes | 1 | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 51 | | | |
| 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 | 46 | | | |
| ELL | 49 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 55 | | | |
| BLK | 51 | | | |
| HSP | 48 | | | |

| 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 | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 55 | | | |
| FRL | 57 | | | |

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 | 30 | | | 57 | | | 36 | | | | | 55 |
| SWD | 17 | | | 33 | | | | | | | 4 | 28 |
| ELL | 21 | | | 51 | | | 27 | | | | 5 | 55 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 40 | | | 71 | | | 42 | | | | 5 | 53 |
| BLK | 29 | | | 56 | | | 35 | | | | 5 | 64 |
| HSP | 26 | | | 54 | | | 33 | | | | 5 | 53 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 37 | | | 57 | | | 43 | | | | 4 | 65 |
| FRL | 32 | | | 60 | | | 42 | | | | 5 | 54 |

| 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 | 36 | 66 | 53 | 52 | 62 | 57 | 26 | | | | | 61 |
| SWD | 7 | 61 | 50 | 18 | 61 | 73 | | | | | | 52 |
| ELL | 27 | 63 | 51 | 50 | 62 | 61 | 18 | | | | | 61 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 52 | 63 | | 69 | 67 | | 23 | | | | | 58 |

| 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 | 38 | 84 | | 47 | 49 | 54 | 23 | | | | | 62 |
| HSP | 28 | 59 | 47 | 47 | 64 | 50 | 25 | | | | | 61 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 41 | 57 | | 55 | 67 | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 44 | 73 | 57 | 58 | 67 | 65 | 31 | | | | | 62 |

| 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 | 33 | 39 | 38 | 38 | 45 | 41 | 19 | | | | | 45 |
| SWD | 4 | 47 | | 12 | 13 | | 0 | | | | | 20 |
| ELL | 23 | 34 | 38 | 39 | 63 | 56 | 22 | | | | | 45 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 49 | 53 | | 63 | 76 | | 53 | | | | | 52 |
| BLK | 29 | 40 | 36 | 24 | 22 | 30 | 9 | | | | | 36 |
| HSP | 28 | 34 | 45 | 38 | 54 | 55 | 15 | | | | | 41 |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 38 | | | 40 | | | | | | | | 70 |
| FRL | 34 | 37 | 39 | 39 | 39 | 40 | 14 | | | | | 46 |

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 | 27% | 47% | -20% | 54% | -27% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 33% | 50% | -17% | 58% | -25% |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 24% | 46% | -22% | 50% | -26% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 55% | 59% | -4% | 59% | -4% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 54% | 58% | -4% | 61% | -7% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 46% | 52% | -6% | 55% | -9% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 29% | 48% | -19% | 51% | -22% |

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 decreased by 4% in the 2022-2023 school year. The transition to new standards and state assessment is suspected to have impacted this decrease due to the large learning curve that served as a challenge. Schoolwide K-5th grade ELA data shows a trend for low reading proficiency. Given our large ELL newcomer, and transient population, this could also be serving as a contributing factor to this trends despite school efforts to increase reading proficiency.

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

Same as above. ELA proficiency decreased by 4% in the 2022-2023 school year. The transition to new standards and state assessment is suspected to have also impacted this decrease due to the large learning curve that served as a challenge. Schoolwide K-5th grade ELA data shows a trend for low reading proficiency. Given our large ELL newcomer, and transient population, this could also be serving as a contributing factor to this trends despite school efforts to increase reading proficiency.

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.

Reading proficiency and science proficiency display the greatest gap. Given our large ELL population, it is imperative that we focus delivering intervention supports to targeted groups of ELLs to ensure we are providing the necessary supports to bridge existing academic gaps.

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

Math proficiency showed an increase of 6% and science proficiency had an increase of 9%. Consistent monitoring of math unit assessments and targeted math centers focusing on push students contributed to this increase. Walk to math based on student data also helped students practice deliberately and engage in productive struggle.

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

Increase performance of ELLs and Hispanic students as they are displaying the lowest performance in ELA.

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

Increase reading proficiency in K-5th grade
Target and increase reading gains in 4-5th grade
Increase science proficiency in 5th grade

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.

Positive culture and environment to increase attendance and academic performance.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If teachers implement TBRI, Calm-Down Corner, and Positive Referrals, then we will see an increase in student attendance and student academic performance.

Monitoring:

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

Discipline data, positive referrals, student of the month, attendance, surveys.
Unit assessments, STAR, for academic achievement tracking.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Brianna Cousins (harmonb2@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.)

Implement TBRI Strategies such as Engine Check to be proactive/attentive to student needs emotionally.
Implement student engagement strategies in every classroom through collaborative learning and group work
Implement Positive Behavior Systems using daily Morning Meeting/Afternoon Peace Circle while using Calm Classroom strategies
Implement Positive Behavior Systems by having a Calm Down Area in every classroom to be proactive with addressing negative student behavior
Implement Positive Behavior Systems using Panda Paws
Implement Positive Behavior Systems using Positive Referrals aligned to SJE Guidelines for Success.
Reduce class size to allow for teachers to provide more intensive support to struggling learners.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Positive behavior systems and implementing TBRI strategies will cause an increase in student attendance and student engagement. When teachers and staff can be in tune with how students are feeling, they can differentiate instruction to meet their needs. This allows for students to feel welcomed, heard, and safe.

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.

Admin will provide professional development to all teachers and staff on the use of Panda Paws to reward desired behaviors in common areas; Admin and School Counselor will provide professional development to all teachers and staff on the use of Positive Referrals to reward desired behaviors in and out of the classroom. Admin and Counselor will provide PD on the use of calm down bins and a calm down space in the classrooms. After the PD, teachers will implement a calm down area in all classrooms. Teachers will provide calm down bins that include a variety of resources to assist students with regulating their emotions.

Person Responsible: Brianna Cousins (harmonb2@duvalschools.org)

By When: Fall 2023

TBRI training provided to teachers and refresher at beginning of the year. Teachers and staff will learn TBRI strategies to implement in the classroom to meet students emotional/social needs and to assist them in regulating their emotions.

Person Responsible: Brianna Cousins (harmonb2@duvalschools.org)

By When: Fall 2023

PBIS team monthly meetings will allow for teachers and staff to discuss and modify schoolwide needs regarding PBIS/Incentives/implementation.

Person Responsible: Brianna Cousins (harmonb2@duvalschools.org)

By When: Ongoing-all year

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

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.

Increase reading proficiency, reading gains, and science proficiency through targeted BEST and FCAT standards based instruction.

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

If teachers increase the use of standards aligned tasks and increase student engagement, then student proficiency will increase in reading and science (and math).

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

assessment data from multiple platforms (DMA, Unit Assessments, iReady, STAR Freckle, DIBELs), walkthrough data, CAST data, 5 Essentials, surveys

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

San Jose Elementary will commit to generating standards aligned tasks by engaging in unpacking standards, item specifications, achievement level descriptors (ALDs) and modifications of the Benchmark Advance/Math Reveal curriculum. Evidence will include the Standards Based Walkthrough Tool data, student work, student journal usage, etc. The Title I grant project and funds will be leveraged for supplemental programming and will be used to implement salaried and non-salaried activities. The activities and strategies include meeting with each grade level team for collaborative planning, conducting classroom walkthroughs to ensure standards aligned instruction is in motion, invite teachers/ interventionists to observe their colleagues, have interventionists model lessons for novice teachers, etc.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
 Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Standards-based aligned student tasks will lead to an increase of academic proficiency in all content areas- specifically reading and science.

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.

Action Step #1- Admin and instructional coaches will meet with each grade level team weekly during collaborative planning time to plan standards based aligned student tasks including modifying Benchmark Advance and Math Reveal lessons/tasks/assessments.

1. Admin and coaches will plan and facilitate weekly common planning sessions among grade level

teams.

2. Admin and coaches will provide a plethora of research-based resources for teachers to generate aligned student tasks.
3. Admin, instructional coaches, Math Interventionist and Reading Interventionists will collaborate with teachers to develop aligned student tasks.
4. Admin, instructional coaches, Math Interventionist and Reading Interventionists will provide intensive support to students far below grade level through targeted intervention support coupled with standards based small group instruction. This is an opportunity for admin, instructional coaches, Math Interventionist and Reading Interventionists to model small group instruction for teachers using aligned student tasks.

Person Responsible: Jasmin Gomez (esparzaj@duvalschools.org)

By When: May 2024

Strategy #2 Action Steps: #2- Admin and instructional coaches will conduct instructional rounds using the Standards Based Walkthrough tool to calibrate within the first month of school. Following months, leadership team will conduct bi-monthly walkthroughs to assess aligned student tasks.

1. Admin and instructional coaches will conduct weekly walkthroughs to follow through with goals from common planning and monitor aligned student tasks.
2. Admin and instructional coaches will utilize the Standards Based Walkthrough tool.
3. Admin and instructional coaches will provide consistent feedback to teachers on delivering effective standards based instruction and the use of aligned student tasks.

Person Responsible: Jasmin Gomez (esparzaj@duvalschools.org)

By When: Fall 2023

Strategy #3 Action Steps: Admin and instructional coaches will lead standards based instruction trainings, common planning sessions and facilitate data chats to implement aligned student tasks.

1. Provide professional development opportunities for teachers gather a variety of data sources and making data informed decisions when grouping students.
2. Provide professional development opportunities for teachers for developing reading, math and science aligned student tasks.
3. Provide professional development on the utilization of additional instructional resources and technology resources to provide differentiated aligned student tasks.
4. Invite teacher leaders and interventionists to lead PD for teachers on effective student engagement strategies.

Person Responsible: Jasmin Gomez (esparzaj@duvalschools.org)

By When: May 2024

Strategy #4 Action Steps- #4- Admin and instructional coaches will provide opportunities during the school day for teachers to observe each other's instruction and discuss aligned student tasks.

1. Teachers will participate in instructional rounds to examine standards and student tasks being given within their same grade level.
2. Teachers will also observe teachers in the grade level below and grade level above to examine progression of standards and engage in vertical articulation around standards and student tasks.
3. Teacher will engage in thoughtful self-reflection to improve teaching and learning.
4. Media specialist will also support when not on the resource schedule to push in and provide intensive intervention support to struggling learners in primary grades (specifically K-1st) to help boost reading proficiency in primary grades.

Person Responsible: Jasmin Gomez (esparzaj@duvalschools.org)

By When: May 2024

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)).

Duval County Public Schools has a tiered system of support to align interventions for CSI, TSI and ATSI schools. The first tier of support begins with the Superintendent's cabinet of executive leaders who represent all district departments (Human Resources, Academic Services, Division of Schools, Operations, Finance, Technology, etc.). At a minimum, this team meets on a weekly basis to develop, monitor, and implement the district's strategic plan initiatives. The next level of the tier branches out with the Chief of Schools who oversees the district's Division of Schools. Schools are divided by region (Elementary, Middle, High, and Turnaround/Fragile (ISI Region)). Each region has a Regional Superintendent, Executive Directors, and Content Area Specialists who work to ensure that the support is aligned and implemented.

Ensuring adequate funding, resources, and support is available to CSI, TSI and ATSI schools is a driver for district-wide collaboration. To accomplish this, the Division of Schools works with multiple district departments to further tier support for CSI, TSI and ATSI schools.

This support includes but is not limited to the following:

Academic Services provides curriculum support and additional content specialists for schools. Academic Services also oversees our district professional development department and coordinates professional development for instructional and non-instructional personnel.

Title I – Coordinates the use of funds to best support the barriers that research has shown negatively impacts disadvantaged students. In addition, Title I provides professional development to teachers to improve their pedagogy.

The Division of Schools conducts school visits that include instructional reviews and instructional walks. These visits occur on a weekly basis and serve as an opportunity to observe instructional delivery, student learning, and provide feedback to school staff.

Finance – Finance provides the funds to provide resources and the personnel needed to address individual school needs.

Human Resources – Human Resources works to recruit quality personnel for our most needy schools. This includes a dedicated staffing team to our Turnaround School Region (ISI), priority hiring, and monitoring teacher VAM rating percentage by school. They also work with unions to collective bargain memorandums of understanding that provide for incentives, professional development, and additional strategies to address school needs.

Though the above examples are not comprehensive of all support provided to School Improvement schools, they do provide a snapshot of the layers of support that are available and used to improve student outcomes. Through this layered approach, the district's team along with each school's academic leadership team, teachers, staff, parents, and other stakeholders collaborate on methods of improvement and monitor implementation on a continuous basis.

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

The percentage of K-2 students who are not on track towards scoring a Level 3 or above on the state assessment is as follows: Kdg.: 61%, 1st: 73%, and 2nd: 66%. Our goal for instructional practice is to implement prescriptive literacy centers and ensure that they are each aligned to standards. Core instruction will be taught on grade level while centers instruction will allow for differentiation.

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

The percentage of 3rd-5th students who are not on track towards scoring a Level 3 or above on the state assessment is as follows: 3rd: 76%, 4th: 67%, and 5th: 79%. Our goal for instructional practice is to implement prescriptive literacy centers and ensure that they are each aligned to standards. Core instruction will be taught on grade level while centers instruction will allow for differentiation.

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

Increase percentage of K-2 students scoring "At Grade Level" or above by 3-4 percentage points.
Decrease
number of "Below Grade Level" students by 3-4 percentage points.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Increase percentage of 3 -5 grade students scoring Level 3 on the 2023-24 statewide, standardized English
Language Arts assessment by 3-4 percentage points. Decrease number of "Below Grade Level"

students by 3-4 percentage points.

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.

Our school literacy leadership team, district content specialist support, and teachers will review ELA data from district assessments. Our school literacy leadership team will also collaborate with our State Regional Literacy Director to monitor data and implement immediate action steps.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Gomez, Jasmin, esparzaj@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?

Data Driven Lesson Planning: Understanding where students are with mastery of BEST standards, using data from informal and formal assessments, planning clear objectives, implementation, and checking for understanding when lesson planning.

Differentiated Instruction: Based on data, breaking groups of students into smaller groups to ensure Tier II support is given. Small group instruction will allow teachers/interventionists to meet students at their level to support their needs. The Title I grant funds will be leveraged by having salaried positions support Tier 2 and Tier 3 students. The media specialist will also be used to support students in primary grades through RtI supports.

Progress Monitoring: Ensuring whole group lessons, interventions, and assessments are done with fidelity.
Checking effectiveness from student data.

Instructional Reviews with Action Plans: Collecting data from classrooms in real time and providing immediate and clear feedback for teachers and school leadership teams to work together to ensure effectiveness.

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?

Data-driven Lesson Planning: Effective lesson planning requires teachers to determine three essential components such as the objective, the implementation (materials and instructional delivery), and a reflection. <https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/howto-plan-effective-lessons>

Small Group/Differentiated Instruction: Small group instruction is the key to data-driven results and is the gateway to meeting the needs of all learners. <https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/turn-small-reading-groups-intobig-wins>

Progress Monitoring: Student progress monitoring helps teachers evaluate how effective their instruction is, either for individual students or for the entire class. <https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/how-student-progressmonitoring-improves-instruction>

Instructional Reviews with Action Plans: The implementation review is a plan designed to 1) recognize accomplishments, 2) track actions, 3) measure implementation impact, 4) evaluate the plan, 5) determine next steps. It may be used by the school alone or with the assistance of the support lead. <https://institutionalresearch.syr.edu/what-we-do/student-ratings/creating-an-action-plan/action-plan-teachingstrategies/>

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 |
|---|---|
| Ensure teachers are equipped and comfortable with all four strategies listed above. Professional Development during Early Release Days and Common Planning will be essential for our literacy leadership team to support teachers. Based on observational data and teacher feedback, PD topics will be set before each Early Release and Common Planning. | Gomez, Jasmin, esparzaj@duvalschools.org |
| Monitoring of unit assessment data to guide prescriptive literacy centers each month. Allot time during common planning to review unit assessment data and generate ideas for centers for each team to implement. | Gomez, Jasmin, esparzaj@duvalschools.org |

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.

San Jose Elementary’s SAC committee is the primary parent/stakeholder advisory council to provide all matters related to school improvement. It is important that we communicate with our families about the state of our school and invite their ideas, comments, and concerns. During SAC, families can provide feedback on school wide academic and behavior efforts.

Our SIP will be made available in our Parent Resource Room and will also be provided in multiple languages. The SIP will be available in printed format to families that request it.

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))

- Families will be informed on school matters utilizing Blackboard, phone blasts, and Bloomz to keep them informed and updated of schoolwide events.
- Families will also be invited to participate and serve on the SAC and PTA to provide feedback on school wide events that benefit them and their families. Information regarding these events will be distributed via e-blast, school newsletters, flyers, webpage, school messenger, and the school's marquee. Parental input is documented through minutes, evaluation forms and sign in sheets. All information is shared through school flyers, monthly newsletters, school website, OneView and/or SAC minutes.
- Parents are invited to complete an evaluation rubric to gauge the overall effectiveness of the plan at the conclusion of parental involvement events. Feedback provided will be discussed at monthly SAC

meetings to improve events moving forward as well as amend the Parental Involvement plan as necessary.

- The annual Title I meeting is held at the beginning of the school year to discuss parents right to know, explain and discuss Title I programs and requirements, involvement opportunities and recruit and retain parents and families. This is also an opportunity to discuss the responsibility of the parents to maintain stamina and stay encouraged to be involved throughout the school year.
- The Title 1 Developmental Meeting held in the spring is also an opportunity for families to provide input on the PFEP events and funds for the upcoming school year. Families are invited to offer feedback on how the current year events went and decide if we would like to host again for the upcoming school year.
- In addition, the Title I Parent Involvement plan will be available for parents and the surrounding community to access via the school's website. Copies of the plan will also be made available in our parent resource center #306.
- Teachers and Administration will be responsible for reviewing the compact agreement with parents during family nights, literacy workshops and parent teacher conferences.

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)

San Jose Elementary will strengthen the academic program by engaging in unpacking standards, item specifications and achievement level descriptors (ALDs) to ensure that students are being provided aligned, on grade level instruction in reading, math, and science. Evidence will include the Standards Based Walkthrough Tool data, student work, etc. The Title I grant project and funds will be leveraged for supplemental programming and will be used to implement salaried and non-salaried activities. The activities and strategies include meeting with each grade level team for collaborative planning, conducting classroom walkthroughs to ensure standards aligned instruction is in motion, invite teachers/interventionists to observe their colleagues, have interventionists model lessons for novice teachers, have interventionists conduct push in and pull out intervention support to target students, etc.

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))

We will invite and involve families participating in our VPK program to ensure they are provided with opportunities to provide input and feedback to our school improvement efforts and use of Title 1 funds.