

Duval County Public Schools

Mamie Agnes Jones 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	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	22
VI. Title I Requirements	25
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	27

Mamie Agnes Jones Elementary School

700 ORANGE AVE, Baldwin, FL 32234

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

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.

The mission of Mamie Agnes Jones Elementary School is to educate our students in a comfortable environment that promotes high levels of achievement, builds student self-esteem, and develops quality work ethics so students may reach their full potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Mamie Agnes Jones Elementary is a learning community committed to closing the achievement gap, celebrating diversity, and providing technological experiences that prepare our students to compete in a global society.

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
Kirkland, Katherine	Principal	As the instructional leader review school-wide student performance data through PLC, monthly meetings, monitor implementation of three tiered interventions and student data, identify further professional development needs.
Montgomery, Tisa	Assistant Principal	Instructional Management: Participate in development and evaluation of educational programs in the classroom. Promote the use of technology in the teaching and learning process. School Climate: Promote a positive, caring climate for learning. Communicate effectively with students and staff. Deal sensitively and fairly with persons from diverse cultural backgrounds. Personnel Management: Observe employee performance, record observations, and conduct evaluation conferences. Student Management: Help to develop a student discipline management system that results in positive student behavior. Ensure school rules are uniformly observed and that student discipline is appropriate and equitable.
Turano, Casey	School Counselor	Responsible for school counseling services, and small group testing.
Cooley, Amber	Reading Coach	Leading PLC's with administration and teachers, and monitoring and supporting effective reading and writing practices with teachers. Meeting with LPQ small groups three days per week to provide intervention.
Jackson, Charise	Math Coach	Leading PLC's with administration and teachers, and monitoring and supporting effective math practices with teachers. Meeting with LPQ small groups three days per week to provide intervention.

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.

Stakeholders will be included in the SIP development by actively engaging in scheduled stakeholder meetings. The following meetings provide opportunities for stakeholder input: Title I Annual Meeting, Mid-year Stakeholder Meeting, Developmental Meeting, and Monthly SAC Meetings. The input and information from stakeholders will be collected and used to improve and implement initiatives for future events.

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 by implementing checkpoints after district and state assessments. Assessment data will be analyzed to identify trends and progress towards school goals. Based upon the findings of the data analysis, adjustments will be made to ensure student academic achievement by closing the gap. LPQ student data will be closely monitored by administrators and Interventionists.

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	46%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
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)* 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: B 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: B
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	1	35	33	32	30	23	0	0	0	154	
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	2	2	4	0	0	0	11	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	28	21	0	0	0	49	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	26	15	0	0	0	41	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	50	40	40	0	0	0	0	0	131	

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	28	21	24	27	190	0	0	0	291

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	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	1	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	4

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	1	27	24	30	17	17	0	0	0	116	
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	6	3	7	0	0	0	20	
Course failure in ELA	2	5	2	2	1	3	0	0	0	15	
Course failure in Math	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	4	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	13	14	0	0	0	37	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	10	10	0	0	0	28	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	15	23	35	0	0	0	0	0	75	

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	2	17	22	26	10	8	0	0	0	85

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	1	1	10	1	1	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	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	1	27	24	30	17	17	0	0	0	116	
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	6	3	7	0	0	0	20	
Course failure in ELA	2	5	2	2	1	3	0	0	0	15	
Course failure in Math	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	4	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	13	14	0	0	0	37	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	10	10	0	0	0	28	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	15	23	35	0	0	0	0	0	75	

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	2	17	22	26	10	8	0	0	0	85

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	1	1	10	1	1	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	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*	45	48	53	51	50	56	54		
ELA Learning Gains				56			67		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38			43		
Math Achievement*	48	58	59	65	48	50	64		
Math Learning Gains				71			71		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				71			67		
Science Achievement*	54	52	54	48	59	59	48		
Social Studies Achievement*					63	64			
Middle School Acceleration					53	52			
Graduation Rate					46	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		54	59						

* 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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	194
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	400
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
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	36	Yes	3	
ELL	50			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	40	Yes	1	
HSP	53			
MUL	70			
PAC				
WHT	49			
FRL	50			

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	39	Yes	2	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	50			
HSP	64			

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	42			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	56			

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	45			48			54					
SWD	35			33			38				4	
ELL	50			50							2	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	38			27			57				4	
HSP	47			58							2	
MUL	67			73							2	
PAC												
WHT	46			54			52				4	
FRL	46			48			48				4	

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	51	56	38	65	71	71	48					
SWD	28	28	18	40	71	67	20					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												

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	40	63		43	63		42					
HSP	57			71								
MUL	42			42								
PAC												
WHT	54	55	46	74	71	77	59					
FRL	45	51	36	59	74	79	47					

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	54	67	43	64	71	67	48					
SWD	24	46		46	69		33					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	50	62		43	38		27					
HSP	50			75								
MUL	50			42								
PAC												
WHT	55	71		72	77		57					
FRL	44	63	45	57	67	70	40					

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	46%	47%	-1%	54%	-8%
04	2023 - Spring	50%	50%	0%	58%	-8%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	42%	46%	-4%	50%	-8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	48%	59%	-11%	59%	-11%
04	2023 - Spring	62%	58%	4%	61%	1%
05	2023 - Spring	46%	52%	-6%	55%	-9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	47%	48%	-1%	51%	-4%

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.

The ELA (LPQ) Proficiency data component has the lowest performance percentage. Our overall proficiency was 48% which is a 3 point decrease from the prior year. Proficiency decreased from the prior year in both 3rd and 5th grade, but was aligned to the percentages for their groups from the prior year (3rd to 4th, 4th to 5th). Contributing factors include a change in benchmarks, new curriculum, and student behavior. Due to a change the state standards, this is a baseline year; however, proficiency scores in reading have been trending down over the last three years. Math proficiency had increased last year, but dropped this year

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

The biggest decline from the prior year is in math from 65% to 52% proficiency. Contributing factors include a change in state standards, new curriculum, and student behavior.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Math as proficiency decreased and gains were not factored in.

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

The Math LPQ showed the most improvement. New actions included: morning math groups, reflex in the computer lab, intentional small groups, tutoring before and after school.

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

Attendance

Behavior

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

Targeted, differentiated instruction

Goals: Learning gains 50%+ and the LPQ

Positive Culture and Environment- Improving the 5-Essentials

PBIS- Zones of Regulations

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**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.

Data from formative and summative assessments will be used to plan targeted instruction to meet the needs of individual students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Student proficiency as demonstrated on the FAST PM3 will increase.

Monitoring:

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

School leadership and instructional coaches will provide support and feedback to teachers in common planning to support the development of explicit instruction to ensure alignment to benchmarks. School administration will monitor delivery of complements discussed during common planning. The leadership team will meet weekly to review trends and adjust as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Katherine Kirkland (kirklandk@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.)

Exit tickets, unit assessments, formal and informal assessments will be analyzed by classroom teachers to plan intentional small groups to close the achievement gap. Students in grades 3 - 5 who demonstrate a need will be provided with phonics/phonemic awareness instruction using UFLI. Students will also have individual learning paths through Lexia to supplement academic growth in reading. Measuring Up materials will be used in small groups for remediation in both reading and math.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers will bring assessment data to common planning to collaborate with administration and instructional coaches. This specific strategy will ensure teachers are informally and formally gauging student understanding in real time to make necessary instructional adjustments and plan differentiated instruction for students, particularly those with special needs.

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.

Common Planning will be held weekly to review assessment data and plan for targeted instruction.

Person Responsible: Katherine Kirkland (kirklandk@duvalschools.org)

By When: Common Planning will be held bi-weekly. Evidence of effectiveness will be monitored by mid December. The goals is to identify improvements in student beginning of the year assessments.

Analyze multiple data sources and make decisions for whole group/small group/ individual remediation if necessary.

Person Responsible: Katherine Kirkland (kirklandk@duvalschools.org)

By When: Evidence of effectiveness will be monitored continually.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**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.

The area of focus for culture and environment is creating a supportive environment where students feel safe and value hard work. This area of focus is based on the 5-Essentials Survey. Our weakest subgroup under a supportive environment was Student Teacher Trust. In this area students stated that their teachers do not always listen to student ideas. The specific data shows that based on student response our school scored very weak in this area of the 5-Essentials Survey. Students who have the tools to focus, stay calm, and work hard will have the capacity to dedicate more effort to academic success which is our rationale for choosing this area of focus.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on survey data in the area of supportive environment in which includes student teacher trust, peer support for academic work, and safety Mamie Agnes Jones Elementary scored very weak. Our goal for the 2023-2024 school year is to increase to neutral.

Monitoring:

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

Student surveys will be used quarterly to monitor perceptions of school climate and safety.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tisa Montgomery (montgomeryt1@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.)

We need to have a clear school-wide set of expectations and celebrate student success both academically and emotionally. We will also implement zones of regulation classroom techniques school wide to foster a supportive learning environment.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The Zones of Regulation organizes students feelings, states of alertness, and energy levels into four colored Zones – Blue, Green, Yellow, and Red. The program helps to make the complex skill of regulation more concrete for learners and those who support them. We learn to regulate our Zones to meet our goals and task demands, as well as support our overall well-being. Based on the zones of regulations curriculum will support mindfulness to empower students with mindfulness skills for social and emotional wellbeing.

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.

Schoolwide Implementation Training for teachers and staff. The Comprehensive training will prepare teachers and staff to successfully implement The Zones of Regulation as a Tier-1 social emotional learning program.

Person Responsible: Tisa Montgomery (montgomeryt1@duvalschools.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year.

Creating risk free environments where students feel comfortable expressing their need for help or providing ideas and suggests to classroom teachers.

Person Responsible: Tisa Montgomery (montgomeryt1@duvalschools.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year

Setting and communicating clear expectations for student participation within the classroom.

Person Responsible: Tisa Montgomery (montgomeryt1@duvalschools.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a 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.

ESSA subgroup Students with Disabilities is a focus because we are below the ESSA Federal Index of 41%. T

Measurable Outcome:

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

Monitoring:

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tisa Montgomery (montgomeryt1@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.)

SWD will receive intensive intervention through RtI daily for a minimum of 20 minutes. RtI will consist of small groups (2-5 students) and will use intervention materials based on individual need. This will be in addition to their IEP goals and their time spent with their ESE teacher.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

RtI is research-based and, done with fidelity, will increase a student's growth. Criteria is based on scores on several assessments (Freckle; i-Ready; District Benchmarks, FAST). These are used to place students into intervention groups. Resources are materials provided by the district (Freckle; i-Ready; LLI; Phonics for Reading).

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.

Collect data from diagnostics in Aug. (Freckle; Benchmark assessments).

Person Responsible: Tisa Montgomery (montgomeryt1@duvalschools.org)

By When:

Analyze the assessment data to form groups. Groups will be formed based on individual need.

Person Responsible: Tisa Montgomery (montgomeryt1@duvalschools.org)

By When:

Schedule an Rtl block for each grade level and provide extra assistance to ensure small group size. Implement Rtl.

Person Responsible: Tisa Montgomery (montgomeryt1@duvalschools.org)

By When:

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:

1. 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.
2. 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.
3. 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.
4. Finance – Finance provides the funds to provide resources and the personnel needed to address individual school needs.
5. 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

Based on the data from the Spring FAST Assessment, 50% or more of students in all three grade levels scored below the 40th percentile in reading.

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

Based on the data from the Spring FAST Assessment, 50% or more of students in grades 3 and 5 scored below a level 3 on the Spring FAST assessment.

Measurable Outcomes

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

- Each grade K -3, using the 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

At least 51% of students in each of the grades, K-2 will score above the 40th percentile on the end of year state assessment (FAST).

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

At least 52% of students in grades 3 and 5 will achieve proficiency as demonstrated by a level 3 or higher on the end of year state assessment (FAST).

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.

Data from both formative and summative assessments will be reviewed with teachers during weekly common planning in grades 3 - 5, and bi-weekly in grades K - 2. This data will be used to inform instruction including both whole and small group. By monitoring students level of understanding on each of the benchmarks, and tailoring individual student instruction to their needs, we will see an increase in student reading achievement.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Kirkland, Katherine, kirklandk@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?

Students will work in teacher-led small groups 3 to 5 days per week based on identified need. Teacher resources for small group include Benchmark Advance interventions, UFLI interventions, Heggerty, Heggerty Bridge the Gap, Seeing Stars, and LLI. Additionally, students will work independently on blended learning platforms (Kg - Waterford, 1st and 2nd grade - i_Ready, 3rd - 5th grade - Freckle). Students in grades K - 5 will also have access to Lexia as an additional resource to help improve reading skills based on individual areas of need.

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?

The above practices and resources will be specifically prescribed based on the students data-based needs. The materials are all research-based to support reading. These practices and resources will support the growth of all students, thereby increasing our level of proficiency at all grade levels.

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
Teachers will receive professional development on the use of Lexia. The reading coach and school administration will meet with reading teachers in grades 3 - 5 weekly and in grades K-2 bi-weekly to disaggregate data and plan for prescribed instruction for students.	Kirkland, Katherine, kirklandk@duvalschools.org
Teachers will lead small group prescribed instruction with students daily, meeting with struggling learners a minimum of 3 days each week and up to 5 days a week based on student demonstrated need. Targeted lessons taught will be followed with assessment to determine effectiveness and inform further instruction for the student.	Kirkland, Katherine, kirklandk@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.

Copies of the SIP will be housed in the main office and the parent resource area. Stakeholders requesting a copy of the SIP will be provided with one. Stakeholders will be included in the SIP development by actively engaging in scheduled stakeholder meetings. The following meetings provide opportunities for stakeholder input: Title I Annual Meeting, Mid-year Stakeholder Meeting, Developmental Meeting, and Monthly SAC Meetings. The input and information from stakeholders will be collected and used to improve and implement initiatives for future events.

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))

Our overall goal is to increase parental involvement and provide more opportunities for parents to learn more about curriculum and academic expectations for their children. We will plan more activities including Technology, Science, Literacy and Math Night that involve the whole family to increase attendance at events. To keep parents and families informed, we will send flyers in the Daily Communications Folder (red folder), monthly calendars, monthly newsletters, social media posts, information posted on the marquee, website calendar and Blackboard robocalls, and through Bloomz. All online formats can be translated by families.

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))

To support the focus on Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation, the majority of the school's Title I funds are going to provide instructional support positions. A .5 STEM instructor, reading coach, reading interventionist, math interventionist and paraprofessional will provide instructional support to teachers and students. These positions will support increased specialized and small group instruction.

Title I funds have been also been used to purchase supplemental materials to support targeted, differentiated learning. Storyworks magazine provides options for both remedial and enrichment learning through highly engaging and current articles and activities. Measuring Up materials will support differentiated instruction in math and reading. J & J Bootcamp Materials will provide support for 5th grade science instruction. Accelerated reader and Lexia online resources will be used to supplement and support reading instruction. Typing.com will provide students with support and practice in keyboarding skills. Classroom supplies are also being purchased to provide materials needed for instruction.

Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment.

The area of focus for culture and environment is creating a supportive environment where students feel safe and value hard work. This area of focus is based on the 5-Essentials Survey. Our weakest subgroup in a supportive environment was Student Teacher Trust. In this area students stated that their teachers do not always listen to student ideas. The specific data shows that based on student response our school scored very weak in this area of the 5-Essentials Survey. Students who have the tools to focus, stay calm, and work hard will have the capacity to dedicate more effort to academic success which is our rationale for choosing this area of focus.

Based on survey data in the area of supportive environment in which includes student teacher trust, peer support for academic work, and safety Mamie Agnes Jones Elementary scored very weak. Our goal for the 2023-2024 school year is to increase to neutral.

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))

Our Title I program supports all students including those who are covered or serviced under other programs.

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: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$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