

Duval County Public Schools

Waterleaf 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	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	19
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Waterleaf Elementary

450 KERNAN BLVD N, Jacksonville, FL 32225

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

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.

Waterleaf Elementary School develops inquisitive, independent thinkers and collaborative learners, who acquire the essential knowledge necessary to be career and college ready, and to be caring and creative contributors to the world around them.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Waterleaf Elementary School will foster an earnest passion for learning that inspires students to work with others in creating a better world for all.

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
Brady Hewitt, Lisa	Principal	
Eaton, Erin	Other	Works with students as a Math Interventionist.
Morris, Kaileigh	Other	Works with students as a Reading Interventionist.
O'Connor, Leah	Assistant Principal	Assists the principal and the teachers.
Kirkland, Monica	Other	Works with students as the ELA interventionist.
Shuke, Wesley	Other	Works with students as the Science Interventionist.

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.

SAC members are shown the draft of the SIP and are involved in the addition of or editing of information and needs.

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 monitored quarterly following district and state progress monitoring assessments. SIP action plan is adjusted accordingly.

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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	57%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	76%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	2	33	33	26	28	35	0	0	0	157
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	1	3	1	0	0	0	7
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	4	2	1	3	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	22	16	0	0	0	43
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	13	10	0	0	0	25
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	30	20	39	0	0	0	0	0	92

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	1	11	15	12	20	11	0	0	0	70

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	2	5	5	2	2	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	28	23	22	26	30	0	0	0	129
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	1	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	13	17	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	11	19	0	0	0	33
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	7	32	32	0	0	0	0	0	72

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	1	7	22	25	9	15	0	0	0	79

The number of students identified retained:

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

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	28	23	22	26	30	0	0	0	129
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	1	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	13	17	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	11	19	0	0	0	33
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	7	32	32	0	0	0	0	0	72

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	1	7	22	25	9	15	0	0	0	79

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	62	48	53	63	50	56	59		
ELA Learning Gains				54			58		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42			54		
Math Achievement*	69	58	59	73	48	50	63		
Math Learning Gains				65			63		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53			44		
Science Achievement*	61	52	54	56	59	59	55		
Social Studies Achievement*					63	64			
Middle School Acceleration					53	52			
Graduation Rate					46	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	72	54	59	66			43		

* 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	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	325
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	472
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	44			
ELL	54			
AMI				
ASN	82			
BLK	50			
HSP	61			
MUL	84			
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	56			

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	44			
ELL	47			
AMI				
ASN	76			
BLK	51			
HSP	56			

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	69			
PAC				
WHT	62			
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	62			69			61					72
SWD	42			57			27				4	
ELL	27			62							3	72
AMI												
ASN	70			93							2	
BLK	53			51			44				4	
HSP	57			57			69				5	71
MUL	81			81							3	
PAC												
WHT	63			75			63				4	
FRL	52			60			43				5	74

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	63	54	42	73	65	53	56					66
SWD	46	45	30	54	59	42	30					
ELL	33	30	38	59	68		36					66
AMI												
ASN	68	65		89	81							

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	59	56	27	60	64	48	44					
HSP	55	45	45	65	67		58					59
MUL	63	70		83	60							
PAC												
WHT	68	52	46	81	62		61					
FRL	56	49	38	66	67	42	55					58

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	59	58	54	63	63	44	55					43
SWD	39	45	44	50	52	57	27					
ELL	33			55								43
AMI												
ASN	63	67		70	75		67					
BLK	50	32		41	41		33					
HSP	56	56		68	50		67					45
MUL	47			60								
PAC												
WHT	67	67	70	77	74	80	58					
FRL	49	45	40	52	58	45	47					33

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.

Grade	Year	ELA				
		School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	59%	47%	12%	54%	5%
04	2023 - Spring	69%	50%	19%	58%	11%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	56%	46%	10%	50%	6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	67%	59%	8%	59%	8%
04	2023 - Spring	79%	58%	21%	61%	18%
05	2023 - Spring	63%	52%	11%	55%	8%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	59%	48%	11%	51%	8%

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 lowest performing data components were 3rd grade Reading (59%) and 5th grade Science (61%). Contributing factors for 3rd grade include new benchmarks and new curriculum. Contributing factors for 5th grade Science is correlated to the reading proficiency (63%).

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

3rd grade reading declined from 66% to 59%. New benchmarks and new curriculum contributed to the decline along with classroom management issues.

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.

Considering that all of our grade levels surpassed state proficiency average, our fifth grade reading proficiency was closest to the state's. Our school's proficiency was 59%, and the state's was 55%. Factors that contributed to this discrepancy included new benchmarks and new curriculum.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement from the 21-22 to 22-23 school year, was science with a point increase of 5 percentage points (56% - 61%). The fifth grade team designated an expert teacher who taught science to 4/5ths of the grade level.

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

Concerns are the 4th grade gains and the lowest 25% gains.

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

Our highest priorities for school improvement follows in this order; third grade reading proficiency, fifth grade science; SWD reading proficiency; ELL reading proficiency.

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 ELA**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 2022-23 data, 3rd grade and 4th grade Reading was identified as a critical need. Students at our school need support with learning the foundational skills of how to read and also understanding the content they are reading. As an Area of Focus, student success in ELA progress will also increase student achievement in other subject areas.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase percentage of 3rd grade students scoring Level 3 on the 2024 statewide, standardized English Language Arts assessment by 14 percentage points. Increase percentage of 4th grade students scoring Level 3 on the 2024 statewide, standardized English Language Arts assessment by 7 percentage points.

Monitoring:

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

Our school leadership team and district content specialist support will review ELA data from district and state assessments quarterly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Brady Hewitt (brady1@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.)

Data Driven Lesson Planning: Understanding where students are with mastery of benchmarks, 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 by teacher/interventionist/ESE teachers. Not all students are on the same level, but all benchmarks must be mastered. Small group instruction will allow teachers/ interventionists/ ESE 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.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Data Driven Lesson Planning: Effective lesson planning requires teachers to determine three essential components such as the objective, the implementation, and a reflection which makes sure that the teachers are aligning lessons so that students obtain mastery of benchmarks.

Small Group/Differentiated Instruction: Small group instruction is the key to data-driven results which allows a larger group of students to meet the benchmark. Utilizing interventionists will allow more students to be able to interact in a small group setting with a certified teacher.

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

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.

Ensure teachers are equipped and comfortable with all three strategies listed above. Professional Development during Early Release Days and Common Planning will be essential for Leadership to support teachers. Based on observational data and teacher feedback, PD topics will be set before each Early Release and Common Planning.

Person Responsible: Lisa Brady Hewitt (bradyl@duvalschools.org)

By When: This will be an ongoing event throughout the year.

During Common Planning and individual teacher data chats, specific data pertaining to ELA reading and student success will be discussed and analyzed with interventionists to ensure we are monitoring progress.

Person Responsible: Lisa Brady Hewitt (bradyl@duvalschools.org)

By When: This will take place after each set of District Progress Monitoring assessments and the Progress Monitoring assessment from the state. Roughly 3 times per year.

Give immediate feedback on any observations/walkthroughs conducted by school leadership, district content specialists, and district leadership.

Person Responsible: Lisa Brady Hewitt (bradyl@duvalschools.org)

By When: Within 5 days of the observation/walkthrough, feedback will be given to the teacher.

#2. 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.

5th grade students scored a 61% on the FSSAT.

Measurable Outcome:

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

5th grade students will increase the Science score from 61% to 63%.

Monitoring:

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

1. Monitor every 4-6 weeks for implementation and growth as assessed by District Monitoring Assessments and District Benchmark Assessments.
2. Analyze data; create plans based on the data; continue the process.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lisa Brady Hewitt (brady1@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.)

1. The fifth grade science teachers and interventionist will attend the 5th Grade Science cohort with the regional specialist.
2. Fifth grade science teachers will attend monthly science meetings with the district supervisor of science and their team to discuss curriculum and the implementation of all components of a science lesson.
3. Science Interventionist will provide small group science instruction for students that are just at or below proficiency.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1. The 5th Grade Science Regional Cohort will collaborate and plan for important components in science.
2. Monthly science meetings with the district supervisor of science and their team will support teachers knowledge of science concepts and the effectiveness of implementing the components of a science lesson.
3. Small group instruction is the key to data-driven results which allows a larger group of students to meet the benchmark. Utilizing interventionists will allow more students to be able to interact in a small group setting with a certified teacher.

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.

PLC meetings and Common Planning with 5th grade science teachers and the interventionist and district specialist as needed.

Person Responsible: Lisa Brady Hewitt (bradyl@duvalschools.org)

By When: This is ongoing throughout the school year.

Data from the Science DMAs will be disaggregated and small groups will be made based on needs.

Person Responsible: Lisa Brady Hewitt (bradyl@duvalschools.org)

By When: After every DMA and PM.

#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.

Reduce number of students with 20 or more days absent.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Reduce number of students with chronic absenteeism from 24% to 19%.

Monitoring:

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

Chronic absenteeism will be monitored with daily attendance taken by the teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Monthly attendance meetings with leadership, social worker, and school counselor to ensure students are coming to school on a regular basis.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Waterleaf has a 24% absenteeism rate.

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.

Monthly attendance meetings with leadership, social worker, and school counselor to ensure students are coming to school on a regular basis.

Person Responsible: Lisa Brady Hewitt (bradyl@duvalschools.org)

By When: Monthly

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.

The SIP will be disseminated through our SAC meetings, Open House, website, and our Title I Family meetings. We will provide a Spanish interpreter if needed. <https://dcps.duvalschools.org/waterleaf>

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))

We will build positive relationships by hosting several events where parents and community members can attend with their students and learn about curriculum, services, after school activities, etc. <https://dcps.duvalschools.org/waterleaf>

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)

Our Goals for this year are to 1. Increase 3rd and 4th grade Reading Proficiency by providing a 30 minute intervention block into each day. 2. Increase Science Proficiency in 5th grade by providing small group instruction with a Science Interventionist. and 3. To decrease absenteeism by working with families to ensure students are able to come to school ready to learn.

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))

Not Applicable.

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))

Waterleaf Elementary works with Full Service Schools to provide support for students.

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))

Not Applicable

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).

Behavior problems are addressed with the parent, the school counselor, the teacher, and administration. Together, a plan, such as an FBA, is agreed upon and implemented for a 6-week trial. After 6 weeks, the team meets again to discuss progress and strategies.

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))

Teachers and paraprofessionals receive Professional Development once a month during early dismissal. Teachers also attend Professional Learning Communities every other week and work with a coach or administration to discuss academic assessments.

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))

Waterleaf Elementary has a VPK class and a Deaf/Hard of Hearing Pre-K class to assist preschool students in the transition to elementary school.