Gregory Drive Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Gregory Drive Elementary School

7800 GREGORY DR, Jacksonville, FL 32210

http://www.duvalschools.org/gde

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.

Gregory Drive Elementary School is a school in which every child experiences SUCCESS in a
Safe and civil environment,
Unified in purpose,
Committed to making the community proud,
College and career bound,
Encouraged to excel,
Supported in all endeavors, to
Strive for success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every student will become a successful reader by integrating math, science, and technology across all academic areas to reach his or her highest potential, drawing on the child's entire community for support.

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
Sapp, Augena	Principal	AuGena Sapp, Principal - Will monitor standards taught and planned for core curriculum. Monitor and model the use of Gradual Release Model, and scaffolded instruction for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students. Student data will be monitored and analyzed through data chats and monitored during monthly RTI meetings. Instruction will be monitored through classroom observations(Perform) and frequent forms of feedback. Professional development will be determined based on all of the above. As needed, the principal will initiate growth plans for intensive professional development and monitor task completion.
Walton, Endia	Assistant Principal	Endia Walton, Assistant Principal - Will monitor standards taught and planned for core curriculum. Monitor and model the use of Gradual Release Model, and scaffolded instruction for Tier 2 and Tier 3 students. Student data will be monitored and analyzed through data chats and monitored during monthly RTI meetings. Instruction will be monitored through classroom observations(Perform) and frequent forms of feedback. Professional development will be determined based on all of the above. As needed, the assistant principal will initiate growth plans for intensive professional development and monitor task completion.
Jordan, Angela	Instructional Coach	Angela Jordan, ELA Coach - Provides professional development on effective instructional strategies and implementation of rigorous ELA instruction as it pertains to Common Core standards/ New Florida Standards. She provides daily support to teachers, models lessons as needed and requested and assists teachers with lesson planning. She also supports teachers by conducting intervention on a small group of students.
Clawson, Tamme	Administrative Support	Tamme Clawson - Reading Interventionist - Provides instructional support and intervention for students in the area of ELA. Analyzes data and plans next steps for instruction to move students towards being on grade level.
Brown, Tangela	School Counselor	Tangela Brown, School Counselor- Facilitates MRT meetings, Problem Solving/RTI meetings, 504 meetings. Serves as the school's liaison between the school and the district as it pertains to MRT (Multi-Referral Team) meetings on a monthly basis. Supports the needs of the whole child and provides resources to parents.

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

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

The administrative team, teachers, and parents reviewed the previous SIP to notate what worked and what still needs improvement to develop this plan.

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))

Once per month during the SAC meeting, we will revisit the SIP to share progress or lack thereof.

Demographic Data Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	85%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL)* White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: D
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	22	21	15	22	14	17	0	0	0	111
One or more suspensions	10	5	1	11	18	28	0	0	0	73
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	45	31	46	0	0	0	122
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	23	37	35	0	0	0	95
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	10	32	37	31	24	28	0	0	0	162

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	77	91	77	77	86	104	0	0	0	512

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	2	2	2	0	0	0	7

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	56	47	43	25	35	45	0	0	0	251
One or more suspensions	6	1	0	4	9	11	0	0	0	31
Course failure in ELA	28	26	36	47	20	40	0	0	0	197
Course failure in Math	21	15	37	5	10	29	0	0	0	117
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	32	41	0	0	0	81
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	21	30	0	0	0	58
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	17	30	40	27	32	0	0	0	148

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	68	68	63	51	53	73	0	0	0	376

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	1	8	9	2	1	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	1	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	9

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	56	47	43	25	35	45	0	0	0	251
One or more suspensions	6	1	0	4	9	11	0	0	0	31
Course failure in ELA	28	26	36	47	20	40	0	0	0	197
Course failure in Math	21	15	37	5	10	29	0	0	0	117
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	32	41	0	0	0	81
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	21	30	0	0	0	58
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	17	30	40	27	32	0	0	0	148

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	68	68	63	51	53	73	0	0	0	376

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	1	8	9	2	1	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	1	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	9

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*	25			24	50	56	23		
ELA Learning Gains				52	58	61	36		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				59	51	52	43		
Math Achievement*	44			43	59	60	26		
Math Learning Gains				61	63	64	37		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				56	57	55	33		
Science Achievement*	33			26	47	51	20		
Social Studies Achievement*					0	50			
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress	32			44			48		

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

See Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings.

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	33
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	163
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

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

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	365
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	15	Yes	4	4
ELL	40	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	29	Yes	1	1
HSP	38	Yes	1	
MUL	29	Yes	2	1
PAC				
WHT	47			
FRL	28	Yes	1	1

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	31	Yes	3	3
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	43			
HSP	44			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL	35	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	48			
FRL	41			

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	25			44			33					32
SWD	8			21							2	
ELL	22			65							3	32
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	22			38			25				4	
HSP	27			65			50				5	28
MUL	29			29							2	
PAC												
WHT	42			48			50				3	
FRL	24			40			27				5	23

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	24	52	59	43	61	56	26					44
SWD	17	41	55	26	36	33	9					
ELL	23	50		53	67		30					44
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	19	53	58	38	58	58	18					
HSP	31	45		51	63		27					47
MUL	30			40								
PAC												
WHT	35	59		48	67		30					
FRL	21	50	57	40	59	50	25					29

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	23	36	43	26	37	33	20					48
SWD	17	28		17	24	27	7					
ELL	23	60		50	60		27					48
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	20	27		20	33	23	15					
HSP	27	62		36	54		33					43
MUL	38			47								
PAC												
WHT	26	45		29	55							
FRL	22	34	33	24	38	35	19					58

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	23%	47%	-24%	54%	-31%
04	2023 - Spring	36%	50%	-14%	58%	-22%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	28%	46%	-18%	50%	-22%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	48%	59%	-11%	59%	-11%
04	2023 - Spring	42%	58%	-16%	61%	-19%
05	2023 - Spring	44%	52%	-8%	55%	-11%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	30%	48%	-18%	51%	-21%

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 & Science Componet showed the lowest performance based off SAS/Performance Matters. ELA 29% Math 45% Science 30% . Last year ELA 24%, Math 43% Science 26%. The ELA score increased by 5%, Math increased by 2% and Science increased by 4%. Trend indicates growth in all areas.

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

No components decreased; however Math had the smallest increase with only a 2% incline in data. Focus on New Curriculum that was implemented as to why Math didnt make a big incline.

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.

The largest gap occured in ELA (look at FAST portal and compare) factors that contributed include the NEW curriculum.

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

The most improved componet is ELA. The 4-step process help

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

Absences and reading proficency

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

1- # of students with substainal reading deficiencies.
2- Decrease the amount of Level 1 ELA students
3- Absentesism
4- Decrease the amount of Level 1 Math students
5- Decrease the amount of suspensions during the school year.

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 Small Group 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.

End of year ELA data for 22-23 school year shows that in ELA 36% of our Kindergarteners are proficient, 37% of our 1st graders are proficient, 41% of our 2nd graders are proficient, 28% of our 3rd graders are proficient, 36% of our 4th graders are proficient and 23% of our 5th graders are proficient. There is no grade level performing 50% or more proficient. There is a need for increased foundational skills with Guided Reading through small group instruction that is differentiated for each child based on their beginning of the year diagnostic.

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

The measurable outcome is specifically for every grade level to have 50% or more of their students performing on grade level by the end of the year.

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

1. There will be a sight word challenge school-wide where students will have a set number of FRY words to know by the end of each 9 weeks for a measurable grade. Knowing these sight words will make the ability to ready easier and strategies for decode non-sight words will be their remaining struggle.
2. Guided reading / Small group lesson plans will be due each week to guide students through a continuum of reading lessons to show a year's growth or more.
3. All students two or more years below grade level will be reviewed monthly through Response to Intervention meetings. A thorough review of the student's progress or lack thereof will take place with next steps for instruction determined. The goal is to see six weeks of remediation of a specific skill mastered.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Augena Sapp (sappa@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.)

The Fountas & Pinnell Leveled Literacy Intervention is a powerful, short-term intervention, that provides daily, intensive, small-group instruction, which supplements classroom literacy teaching. LLI turns struggling readers into successful readers with engaging leveled books and fast-paced, systematically designed lessons.

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

The Fountas & Pinnell Leveled Literacy Intervention System(LLI) is an intensive, small-group, supplementary literacy intervention for students who find reading and writing difficult. The goal of LLI is to lift the literacy achievement of students who are not achieving grade-level expectations in reading. The LLIsystems are designed to:

Advance the literacy learning of students not meeting grade-level expectations in reading
Deepen and expand comprehension with close reading
Elevate the expertise of teachers
Increase reading volume by engaging students in large amounts of successful daily reading
Increase student engagement with books that build knowledge
Intervene with small groups of struggling readers to maximize growth

Meet the needs of struggling readers
Monitor student progress.

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.

Each classroom teacher will be provided training on the effective implementation of small group instruction. Utilizing data from diagnostic assessments, teachers will be provided professional development on how to group students and provide them with individualized instruction in order to improve their reading performance.

Person Responsible: Angela Jordan (joradana@duvalschools.org)

By When: September 29, 2023

Frequent monitoring of small group instruction lesson plans and implementation.

Person Responsible: Augena Sapp (sappa@duvalschools.org)

By When: Beginning in September, these walks will occur weekly.

Monthly monitoring of small group data to track growth or lack thereof of the students who are 2 or more years below grade level.

Person Responsible: Tangela Brown (buttst1@duvalschools.org)

By When: This monthly monitoring will begin in September and last through the month of May.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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 end of year math data shows that proficiency in Math for 2nd grade was 49%, 3rd grade was 48%, 4th grade was 42%, and 5th grade was 44%. These grade levels scored lower than 50% proficient while kindergarten had 53% proficient and 1st grade had 71% proficient. The foundational skills of math need remediation in 2nd - 5th grades to reverse the struggle with mastery.

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

All grade levels will perform at 50% or higher for proficiency in math.

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

Students who are 2 years below grade level will be monitored monthly to review student Response to Intervention. Usage on Freckle as well as Red Bird data will be checked to monitor lessons passed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Endia Walton (waltone1@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.)

Red Bird allows students to experience the interactive instruction, practice item sets, digital manipulatives, skill-based games, and real-world STEM connections just as your students would.

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

The Duval County Department of Math is embedding strategic use of Red Bird

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. 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.

Student believing and knowing that they have a supportive environment through academic personalism, student-teacher trust, peer support for academic work, and safety.

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

The 5 Essentials survey will show that the data will improve from scoring a 16% to returning to our previous year's data of 71%

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

Students will have House Systems mimicking the Ron Clark Academy to enhance their support systems throughout the school and improve their peer culture. Monthly house meetings will create the atmosphere of unity while celebrating academic success, attendance, and group civic projects.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Augena Sapp (sappa@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.)

The Ron Clark Academy House System is a dynamic, exciting, and proven way to create a positive climate and culture for students and staff. Using RCA's methods will help our school confidently implement processes that build character, relationships, and school spirit. The guidelines are designed to give a streamlined framework that can be applied to any type of learning environment.

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

House systems will energize the students and staff and their outlook on learning will have positive results.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

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.

School-wide, science needs to be more of a priority. Although Science has increased, there is no reason that Science should not be performing at 50% or higher.

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

5th Grade Science will be 50% or higher on the state assessment.

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

Science instruction will be monitored with walkthrough observations and feedback weekly. Benchmark assessments will be monitored, charted, and remediated.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Augena Sapp (sappa@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.)

Fluency Study Guide practice along with Study Island and Generation Genius will engage students in instruction that will initiate their long term memory for proficiency.

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

Students understanding and memorizing the vocabulary coupled with the hands on application will provide better exposure for background knowledge when assessed.

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.

Media needs to insert Study Island into the lesson plan for increased usage for students.

Students need to make a 70% or higher on each monitored assessment.

Person Responsible: Augena Sapp (sappa@duvalschools.org)

By When: Usage and lesson checks will be monitored each quarter and students will graph their progress after every assessment.

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).

Following budget guidelines, resources are researched and submitted for approval to meet the needs of the school improvement program implementation. Once funds are available and the budget and items are approved, purchasing takes place. Items are used solely for the purpose of school improvement implementations as noted in the SIP.

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

K: 64% below proficiency
1: 46% below proficiency
2nd: 36% below proficiency

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

3rd: 57% Below proficiency
4th: 56% Below proficiency

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

Teachers will be provided professional development on gradual release and small group instruction. The implementation of this will be monitored by instructional coaches which will increase proficiency for all students. Increasing proficiency of K-2 students scoring on grade level or above will increase overall percentage points by decreasing the number of below grade level students.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Increasing percentage of 3rd-5th grade students scoring Level 3 on the 2023 statewide standardized English Language Arts assessment by 3-4 percentage points. While also decreasing the 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.

Gregory Drive Elementary's Leadership Team and District Content Specialist will track and monitor ELA assessment data to include Waterford, i-Ready, STAR, district and state assessment. Administrators will conduct data chats with teachers and students to review proficiency. School leadership, coaches, and teachers will track Waterford, STAR, i-Ready, and High Frequency words to evaluate impact quarterly.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Sapp, Augena, sappa@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 standards, using data from informal and formal assessments, planning clear objectives, implementation, and checking for understanding when lesson planning.

Small group/differentiated Instruction: Based on data, breaking groups of students into smaller groups to ensure Tier II support is given. Not all students are on the same level, but all standards must be mastered.

Small group instruction will allow teachers to meet students at their level to support their needs.

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?

Progress monitoring: Student progress monitoring helps teachers evaluate how effective their instruction is, either for individual students of for the entire class.

Instructional Reviews with action plans: The implementation review is a plan designed to recognize accomplishments, track actions, measure implementation impact, evaluate the plan, and determine next steps. It may be used by the school alone or with the assistance of the support lead.

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
Literacy Leadership - Attend weekly common planning, monitor implementation of common planning with frequent feedback. Monitoring of all challenges and data. Modeling. Literacy Coaching - Facilitating weekly common planning, coaching cycles, supporting the implementation of common planning within the classroom. Monitoring challenges and data. Assessment - Analyze all data in real time and respond immediately to the needs of the students. Professional Learning - Monthly Professional Learning Community (PLC) will take place to strengthen the instructional delivery within all classrooms.	Sapp, Augena, sappa@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.

Each month there will be a School Advisory Council (SAC) meeting and the agenda will always begin with SIP goals and initiatives. A copy of the SIP will be available at the front desk of the school as well.

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))

Monthly engagement during school Parent nights, monthly newsletters and quarterly Parent Conference days will be implemented to engage the parent community and stakeholders.

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))

Strong teacher professional development on instructional delivery and the alignment of benchmarks. Classroom walks will provide immediate feedback for weekly planning during common planning and professional learning communities.

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))

N/A

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))

Daniel Services, THRIVE Program, Girl Matters, and L.E.G.A.C.Y. Us are all available to students with early warning system signals as well as referral process by teachers and parents.

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))

Career Day and for 5th Grade, visits from Middle school for enrollment.

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).

Response to Intervention (RtI) processes are visited monthly which sometimes lead to MRT meetings for services to be requested.

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))

Weekly Common Planning, Monthly Professional Learning Community, Monthly Early Dismissal Professional Subject Area training, District Curriculum training, District specialist support.

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))

Early learning classrooms will differentiate to support all students whether they entered from preschool or home.

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: Small Group Instruction	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$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.

Yes