

Duval County Public Schools

Pinedale 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	17
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	17
VI. Title I Requirements	19
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	21

Pinedale Elementary School

4228 DIGNAN ST, Jacksonville, FL 32254

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

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

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

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

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

At Pinedale:

We are one team with one vision.

We are leaders, learners, believers in people.

We have goals and hustle hard to reach them.

We respect differences and empower each other to show up authentically.

We are ALL IN to MAKE IT HAPPEN for kids every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Pinedale, our future is BRIGHT.

Our students are:

Brilliant

Resilient

Inclusive

Goal-driven

Honest

Team Players prepared to lead and learn with confidence.

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
Willis, Andrea	Principal	Support all systems within the building - Support and monitor instructional leadership -Support and monitor school wide behavioral expectations -Support and build teacher capacity -Analyze schoolwide data regularly -Facilitate and support community and family engagement -Facilitate and support school safety systems
Jones, Latarsha	Assistant Principal	Support systems within the building - Support and monitor instructional leadership (Math) -Support and monitor school wide behavioral expectations -Support and build teacher capacity -Analyze schoolwide data regularly -Facilitate and support community and family engagement -Facilitate and support school safety systems -Community Partner Advocate -Title 1 compliance coordinator
Young, Virginia	Assistant Principal	Support systems within the building - Support and monitor instructional leadership (ELA) -Support and monitor school wide behavioral expectations -Support and build teacher capacity -Analyze schoolwide data regularly -Facilitate and support community and family engagement -Facilitate and support school safety systems -Schoolwide Testing coordinator -Title 1 compliance coordinator

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 are invited to join our team via phone calls, DOJO and other blast messages, parent notifications texts and emails, flyers and brochures and lastly marquee messages.

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))

Our SIP will be monitored quarterly and modified accordingly. We will monitor the lowest performing subgroups after each quarterly exam and adjust instructional groups to provide interventions as necessary. These groups will benefit from strategies that will be outlined in our SIP.

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	84%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) Black/African American Students (BLK) 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: D 2018-19: D 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	38	36	26	40	20	26	0	0	0	186	
One or more suspensions	8	7	7	6	11	19	0	0	0	58	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	11	24	0	0	0	43	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	11	21	0	0	0	35	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	18	23	37	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	0	19	21	30	10	21	0	0	0	101

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	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	3	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	0	40	25	23	20	30	0	0	0	138	
One or more suspensions	0	3	6	5	4	15	0	0	0	33	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	11	24	0	0	0	43	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	11	21	0	0	0	35	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	18	23	37	0	0	0	78	

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	0	19	21	30	10	21	0	0	0	101

The number of students identified retained:

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	40	25	23	20	30	0	0	0	138	
One or more suspensions	0	3	6	5	4	15	0	0	0	33	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	11	24	0	0	0	43	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	11	21	0	0	0	35	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	18	23	37	0	0	0	78	

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	0	19	21	30	10	21	0	0	0	101

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	37	48	53	44	50	56	32		
ELA Learning Gains				68			63		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54			67		
Math Achievement*	41	58	59	56	48	50	49		
Math Learning Gains				70			54		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				67			46		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	32	52	54	40	59	59	24		
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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	35
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	139
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	399
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
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	30	Yes	1	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	33	Yes	1	
HSP	46			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	49			
FRL	31	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	50			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	55			
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	57			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	37			41			32					
SWD	29			35			42				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35			41			31				4	
HSP	50			42							2	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	52			45							3	
FRL	33			38			26				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	44	68	54	56	70	67	40					
SWD	39	54	47	46	69	65	30					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	42	65	55	54	71	67	32					
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	67			67								
FRL	43	68	55	56	71	65	43					

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	32	63	67	49	54	46	24					
SWD	26	35		41	44		25					
ELL												

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
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29	62	60	45	54	50	23					
HSP	55			80								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	33			62								
FRL	28	63	64	45	52	45	21					

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	24%	47%	-23%	54%	-30%
04	2023 - Spring	49%	50%	-1%	58%	-9%
03	2023 - Spring	24%	46%	-22%	50%	-26%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	27%	59%	-32%	59%	-32%
04	2023 - Spring	55%	58%	-3%	61%	-6%
05	2023 - Spring	20%	52%	-32%	55%	-35%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	15%	48%	-33%	51%	-36%

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 data set from state testing with the lowest performance is 5th grade science. The contributing factor to 5th grade science being the lowest to perform was because the teacher resigned mid school year. Students did not have consistency with exposure to science standards, vocabulary and equivalent assessment opportunities.

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

The area that showed the greatest decline from the previous year was science. Science only had 15% of students proficient this past school year. In the prior year, Science was at 40%.

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.

Science had the greatest gap. The fifth-grade science teacher quit mid-year.

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

The data component that had the most improvement was math. Pinedale had a lot of support from in the area of math from both the district and the region. There were two specialist that came out weekly to support common planning as well as small group interventions.

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

The areas of concern are the amount of absences as well as the amount of school suspensions.

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

1. Science proficiency
2. ELA proficiency
3. ELA Gains
4. Attendance
5. Out-of-school suspensions

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 Benchmark-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Student Achievement data was below 45% in every content area. Science was the lowest at 33% followed by 40% in ELA and 40% in math.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Common planning will occur weekly. Teachers will be able to meet and plan benchmark aligned instruction with coaches and admin. All content areas will increase by 10-15% at the end of the school year.

Monitoring:

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

School admin. team will perform weekly walkthroughs and actively join common planning meetings weekly to ensure that benchmark aligned instruction is taking place. Monthly data chats between coaches, teachers and admin will also take place to constantly progress monitor. Leadership team will meet weekly to review trends and adjust as needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Andrea Willis (willisa@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.)

Weekly common planning agendas and sign-in sheets

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy was selected so I can easily see who is attending planning sessions and what content or strategies are being reviewed.

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

#2. 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.

Suspensions were high and attendance rates were low.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Suspensions will decrease by 20%. Attendance will increase by 20%.

Monitoring:

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

Data will be monitored weekly at leadership meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Collondra Reese (gibsonc3@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.)

Weekly house point winners as well as monthly house meetings will occur.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students will learn to hold themselves accountable for their actions and attendance as it relates to their houses.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

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**Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA****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**Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes****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.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

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?

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?

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****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.

SIP will be given out and reviewed during our school SAC meetings.

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

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

The school will communicate using Bloomz, push notifications, blasts and the marquee.

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)

Common planning will occur weekly. Data will be monitored and classrooms will be visited.

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

NA

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

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

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

NA

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

NA

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

NA

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

NA

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

NA

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$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