

Duval County Public Schools

Venetia Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Venetia Elementary School

4300 TIMUQUANA RD, Jacksonville, FL 32210

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

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.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team, 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
Worthen, Monique	Principal	Develop and implement strategies for improving school areas of need.
McDaniel, Jason	Assistant Principal	Support implementation of the SIP.
Pennington, Penelope	School Counselor	Support implementation of the SIP

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.

There was a meeting during the summer and at preplanning to review goals and the development of strategies for the SIP. The SAC Team were shared the data and goals. They were able to provide suggestions to develop the SIP as well.

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 is placed in the weekly newsletter and reviewed monthly. We discuss strategy implementation through vertical articulations and grade level band discussions. Admin will observe teachers weekly to monitor effective implementation of the strategies that relate to academic standards and provide continuous improvement. We will use student achievement data to assess the effectiveness and make the necessary adjustments throughout the school year.

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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	72%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	74%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
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)* 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: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	3	22	18	21	13	13	0	0	0	90	
One or more suspensions	0	4	1	6	4	2	0	0	0	17	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	6	
Course failure in Math	0	0	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	9	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	11	16	0	0	0	31	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	2	12	0	0	0	16	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	25	21	28	0	0	0	0	0	78	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	3	13	12	18	4	12	0	0	0	62

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	3	1	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	23	17	20	14	18	0	0	0	93	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in ELA	2	0	3	2	0	1	0	0	0	8	
Course failure in Math	2	0	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	7	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	4	10	0	0	0	15	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	9	10	0	0	0	20	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	7	23	17	0	0	0	0	0	48	

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	10	15	17	5	7	0	0	0	56

The number of students identified retained:

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

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	23	17	20	14	18	0	0	0	93	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in ELA	2	0	3	2	0	1	0	0	0	8	
Course failure in Math	2	0	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	7	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	4	10	0	0	0	15	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	9	10	0	0	0	20	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	7	23	17	0	0	0	0	0	48	

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	10	15	17	5	7	0	0	0	56

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	52	48	53	62	50	56	46		
ELA Learning Gains				68			49		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56			20		
Math Achievement*	58	58	59	71	48	50	55		
Math Learning Gains				65			41		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58			20		
Science Achievement*	64	52	54	56	59	59	40		
Social Studies Achievement*					63	64			
Middle School Acceleration					53	52			
Graduation Rate					46	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		54	59	17			72		

* 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	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	225
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
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	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	453
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	35	Yes	4	
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	51			
HSP	67			
MUL	48			
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	53			

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	38	Yes	3	
ELL	40	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	56			
HSP	63			

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	76			
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	54			

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	52			58			64					
SWD	24			34			40				4	
ELL	25			58							2	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	49			54			43				4	
HSP	52			64			85				3	
MUL	41			55							2	
PAC												
WHT	64			60			65				4	
FRL	46			52			59				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	62	68	56	71	65	58	56					17
SWD	27	50	45	40	41	40	20					
ELL	24	53		45	60							17
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	61	63	45	65	56	45	57					
HSP	55	76		67	72		43					
MUL	75	69		83	77							
PAC												
WHT	63	72	70	76	66		53					
FRL	55	63	52	64	61	53	33					

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	46	49	20	55	41	20	40					72
SWD	17	15		32	38		23					
ELL	22			50								72
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	41	50		43	37		26					
HSP	34	50		60	45		33					67
MUL	58			64								
PAC												
WHT	60	45		65	45		73					
FRL	40	48	20	46	48		32					64

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	56%	47%	9%	54%	2%
04	2023 - Spring	58%	50%	8%	58%	0%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	51%	46%	5%	50%	1%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	66%	59%	7%	59%	7%
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	58%	48%	10%	51%	7%

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.

Kindergarten reading and math achievement, 3rd Grade ELA Achievement, & 5th Grade Math
One barrier or contributing factor was the online testing component and various technology issues. This lead to frustration from the students and a more difficult navigation. Beyond that, we had some instability with staffing in 3rd grade reading and 5th grade math. The benchmarks were all new for 3rd-5th grade and that presented some gaps in learning as we moved through teaching the new benchmarks.

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

The greatest overall decline was math achievement with 10% points and the greatest grade level decline was 3rd grade achievement with 17% point. In 5th grade math, factors that contributed to the decline was a change in teachers. There were major instructional issues and concerns with the initial teacher. We spent time reteaching and starting over after 6 weeks of instruction. There were gaps between prior knowledge of current benchmark to former benchmarks. In 3rd grade, there was an instructional challenge with the teacher who taught 1/3 of the students. Students had a hard time transferring reading strategies from paper based implementation to assessments online. Teaching students how to go back to the text on line presented a challenge.

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.

Compared to the state average, we outscored the state in ELA, Math and Science. Trends show we are above the average but still close to the state average in reading and math. The new state benchmarks contributed to this factor. Science standards remained the same and our data showed an increase in this area.

State Reading: 50% Venetia: 59%

State Math: 56% Venetia: 61%

State 5th Gr Science: 51% Venetia: 64%

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

The most improved area was 5th grade ELA with 10% increase and science achievement with 8% increase. We ensured that small group instruction was completed with fidelity. We used data from classwork, informal and formal assessments to make adjustments of groups and push in/pull out support. Consistent monitoring of data and strategy implementation.

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

Based on the EWS data, students in 3rd grade are an area of concern for attendance and having a substantial reading deficiency. Attendance below 90% is concern for all grade levels. They are all showing double digits for this category. The last area of concern is K-3 for the amount of students listed as being substantially below in reading.

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

Priorities for this school year:

3rd Grade Reading, 5th Grade Math, ELA Lowest 25%, & Early Warning Indicators such as Attendance & Reading Deficiencies.

Area of Focus

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

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

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

Based on the data reviewed, EWS will be an area of focus. Specifically the area of attendance below 90% and substantial reading deficiency in grade K-3. All grade levels were in the double digits for attendance below 90% and 1st-3rd grade had between 21-28% that were substantially below in reading.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Only 10% of students in grades K-5 will have attendance below 90%. This will be a 50% decrease of our current data.

Decrease the substantially below in reading to 10% for grade level 1st-3rd.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor by checking attendance quarterly per grade level. This will allow us to develop strategies for specific grade levels that are increasing in absences.

Monitor the Progress Monitoring Assessments and the District Monitoring assessments of the lower performing quartile.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Penelope Pennington (penningtonp@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.)

Attendance Intervention Team meetings with parents and administration.

We will goal set with students who are identified as an attendance concern.

Provide Tier 2 instruction using approved resources for students that are substantially below in reading.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Because our students are elementary age students, we must involve parents.

If we meet with the students and create a reward system with students, we believe we could encourage students to be present in school.

Resources are approved by the curriculum and instruction department.

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.

Use Focus to track attendance

Report to admin team

Plan meetings with parents and students

Person Responsible: Penelope Pennington (penningtonp@duvalschools.org)

By When: Quarterly by grade level Monthly by students

Data tracking when assessments are given during PLC/Common Planning.

Use data to adjust instruction based on student needs.

Plan with specific strategies for remediation or enrichment.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: After each PM/DMA -Quarter 1 -Quarter 2

#2. 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.

Based on our subgroup, students with disabilities are falling below average in several academic areas. Accommodations for those students must be followed with fidelity by classroom teachers. Also, teachers could benefit from using additional strategies when working with our students with disabilities. Teachers will create an environment of inclusivity, build trust and moral between teacher and student, and foster confidence in the students to achieve.

Measurable Outcome:

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

100% of our teachers will engage in strategies to support, foster and increase student achievement in students with disabilities.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored using data and assessment tracking. The data from assessments and task of our students with disabilities will be analyzed and compared across all students and then all students with disabilities subgroups.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Monique Worthen (worthenm1@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.)

Strategies for implementation include:

- Small group instruction
- Using interactive monitors to enhance instruction
- Assessing learning using multiple avenues
- Working collaboratively with our VE teachers

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If we focus on these evidence based strategies for our students with disabilities, then we will provide more support for our students and increase achievement. Working collaboratively with our VE Teachers will ensure needed support for students and ensure that we are meeting the needs each student specifically.

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.

Professional Development of evidence - based strategies to use with students with disabilities.

Person Responsible: Monique Worthen (worthenm1@duvalschools.org)

By When: 5/30/24

Analyze data and plan specifically for students with disabilities.

Person Responsible: Monique Worthen (worthenm1@duvalschools.org)

By When: Weekly with completion coming on or around 5/30/24

Administration and the VE teachers will monitor implementation of additional strategies used for enhanced instruction of our students with disabilities.

Person Responsible: Jason McDaniel (mcdanielj3@duvalschools.org)

By When: Weekly with completion coming on or around 5/30/24

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Our ELL students scored below 41% with a score of 40% on the Federal Index of current state assessment data.

Measurable Outcome:

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

100% of teachers will implement researched based ELL strategies to help improve student achievement on state assessments.

Monitoring:

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

ELL strategies will be monitored through the use of analyzing ELL plans and documentation for implementation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Monique Worthen (worthenm1@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based 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.)

Use ELL plans as a guidance for accommodations for each student. Incorporate ESOL strategies in class for each ELL student. Utilize Imagine Learning for all ELL students to enhance their learning capabilities.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The strategy aligns to state guidance for implementation of using ELL plans for accommodations.

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.

Professional development on the use of ELL plans, accommodation implementation, and how to document those implementations.

Person Responsible: Jason McDaniel (mcdanielj3@duvalschools.org)

By When: Weekly with completion coming on or around 5/30/24.

Professional development on ESOL strategies to use and implement during core and small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Monique Worthen (worthenm1@duvalschools.org)

By When: Weekly with completion coming on or around 5/30/24.

Consistently use Imagine Learning (Blended Learning Platform) for our ELP levels of 1.0-2.5 in grades K-5 for reading.

Monitor the use of this blended learning platform. Especially at BOY, MOY, & EOY Diagnostic Testing.

Person Responsible: Jason McDaniel (mcdanielj3@duvalschools.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year.

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention**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.

Based on the number of students reading substantially below in K-3 and a need to increase in 3rd grade ELA Achievement and 5th Grade Math Achievement, the focus will be on intervention provided for specific areas of needs for our students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

100% of teachers will engage in intervention strategies relating to increasing student achievement in reading and math.

Monitoring:

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

This area will be monitored through data tracking for ELA and Math data. We will monitor through analyzing classwork and assessments throughout the quarter to make sound instructional decisions about small group instruction and core based instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Monique Worthen (worthenm1@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.)

Response to Intervention for Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction. Use of Tier 2 resources-iReady, Freckle, Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI)

Group students by levels to provide targeted instruction. Start Response to Intervention grouping after first data set.

Admin will also monitor through walkthroughs and observation providing feedback and next steps.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Use of this strategy will help teachers focus on specific interventions to address the needs of students as soon as the need is identified.

The earlier the intervention the more time you can provide for students to close the achievement gap in learning.

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.

Training on identifying specific interventions (strategy & resources) for the instructional need

Person Responsible: Monique Worthen (worthenm1@duvalschools.org)

By When: End of the First Quarter, then ongoing.

Planning and monitoring interventions through small group instruction

Person Responsible: Monique Worthen (worthenm1@duvalschools.org)

By When: Quarter 1 then Ongoing.

Adjust grouping based on each PM/DMA data set and plan specific interventions being provided.
Push in and afterschool tutoring.

Person Responsible: Monique Worthen (worthenm1@duvalschools.org)

By When: End of Quarter 1 and Quarter 2

Math: Add bi-weekly math facts to increase automaticity of facts to aid with completing word problems

Person Responsible: Jason McDaniel (mcdanielj3@duvalschools.org)

By When: Twice monthly

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.