

Duval County Public Schools

Rufus E. Payne 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	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	18
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	18
VI. Title I Requirements	20
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	22

Rufus E. Payne Elementary School

6725 HEMA RD, Jacksonville, FL 32209

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

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.

Our mission at Rufus E. Payne is to establish and promote an environment that caters to the total needs of the child, our parents, and the community. This environment will stimulate and motivate learning through a positive behavior system that promotes student achievement and instills restorative justice. It is through these efforts that our students foster a strong desire to unearth their greatest potentials in life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

It is our vision as educators that we will provide a meaningful, comprehensive educational program. Through prescriptive and cooperative learning, hands on, and inquiry based instruction, the students of Rufus E. Payne Elementary will grow and ultimately come to discover the special talents they each possess to become global learners.

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
Day, Weisha	Principal	Weisha Day-Killette, Principal: Provides a common vision for the use of databased decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS (RTI), conducts assessment(quarterly status reports) of MTSS (RTI) skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS (RTI) implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS (RTI) plans and activities.
Warren, Carrie	Assistant Principal	Carrie Warren, Assistant Principal: Provides a shared vision for the use of databased decision-making, ensures that the school-based team conducts an assessment of MTSS and PBIS systems for of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS and PBIS implementation, and communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS and PBIS plans and activities.
Rochay, Angela	Other	Angela Rochay, Math Interventionist: Provides math instructional support to all teachers, as well as conducts PLCs based on both teacher and student need. Supports teachers by assisting with analyzation of data, model lessons, and coaching cycles.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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

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

The stakeholders are invited to attend the School Advisory Council meetings monthly giving them the opportunity to voice their suggestions for the improvement of the school climate, culture and environment. The stakeholders include, but not limited to: School SAC Committee, Parent/Teacher Associate Members, community members, teachers, parents and Business Partners. The input from these organizations, support the school climate and culture to assist with getting parents more involved within the school.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be monitored monthly through the monthly SAC meetings. The stakeholders are inviting to attend the School Advisory Council meetings monthly giving them the opportunity to voice their suggestions for the improvement of the school climate, culture and environment. The stakeholders include, but not limited to: School SAC Committee, Parent/Teacher Associate Members, community members and Business Partners. The input from these organizations, support the school climate and culture to assist with getting parents more involved within the school.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	99%
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) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B

	2019-20: C
	2018-19: C
	2017-18: D
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	3	12	28	19	29	36	0	0	0	127	
One or more suspensions	2	0	3	0	5	2	0	0	0	12	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	19	13	0	0	0	32	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	18	12	0	0	0	30	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	11	33	18	0	0	0	0	0	65	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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	2	5	23	12	22	14	0	0	0	78

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	3

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	31	18	17	20	18	0	0	0	104	
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	5	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	6	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	5	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	11	11	0	0	0	27	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	8	11	0	0	0	22	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	14	15	19	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	0	16	16	19	6	9	0	0	0	66

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	5	1	1	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	4	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	31	18	17	20	18	0	0	0	104	
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	5	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	6	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	5	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	11	11	0	0	0	27	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	8	11	0	0	0	22	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	14	15	19	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	0	16	16	19	6	9	0	0	0	66

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	5	1	1	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	4	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	29	50	56	20		
ELA Learning Gains				62			32		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				80					
Math Achievement*	43	58	59	48	48	50	42		
Math Learning Gains				73			47		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				88					
Science Achievement*	44	52	54	22	59	59	39		
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	39
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	154
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	402
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	28	Yes	1	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	38	Yes	1	
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				

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%
FRL	35	Yes	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	52			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	57			
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	55			

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			43			44					
SWD	25			30							2	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	36			42			41				4	
HSP												
MUL												

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
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	35			40			36				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	29	62	80	48	73	88	22					
SWD	25	67		38	79							
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	28	61	80	48	72	87	23					
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	25	58	77	45	73	87	18					

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	20	32		42	47		39					
SWD	13	18		38	36		50					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	18	30		42	45		37					
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	18	31		39	47		41					

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	50%	47%	3%	54%	-4%
04	2023 - Spring	39%	50%	-11%	58%	-19%
03	2023 - Spring	31%	46%	-15%	50%	-19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	26%	59%	-33%	59%	-33%
04	2023 - Spring	55%	58%	-3%	61%	-6%
05	2023 - Spring	43%	52%	-9%	55%	-12%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	43%	48%	-5%	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 data components that showed the lowest performance this year was math with 40%. The contributing factor(s) varies:

There were circumstantial factors that hindered student's performance were, excessive-chronic absences and tardies and being one to two years academically behind.

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

The component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was math, with a 8% decrease from the prior year.

There were circumstantial factors that hindered student's performance were, excessive-chronic absences and tardies and being one to two years academically behind.

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

The factor with the greatest gap is reading, when compared to the state average.

The circumstantial factors that contributed to this gap is excessive chronic absences and tardies, and student's being one to two years academically behind.

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

The component that showed the most improvement was science with a 43% proficiency average, which is an increase of 14% from the previous year.

The actions that we took were to achieve this increase was looping our students up with the same teachers, have a targeted group of students that we built their science knowledge, incorporating science within the reading center block, and utilizing science blending learning platforms.

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

Daily Attendance and Tardies

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

Highest Priorities for the 2023-2024 School Year:

1. Math Proficiency
2. Reading Proficiency
3. Student Daily Attendance
4. Students' tardies

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 Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Focusing on Instructional Practices specifically focusing on math emphasizing the need to address the teacher's ability to implement remediation in a timely manner through structured center plans. In a review of student's FAST Math proficiency performance, third thru fifth grade math performance was 43%. Title 1 funds will be used to add additional and supplemental materials to provide classroom instruction, specialized instruction and additional support to increase student achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on summer planning with intermediate math teachers with a focus on remediating and small group focused instruction, we will increase teacher implementation by 66.6%. As a result, math proficiency will increase from 43% to 47%.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored (weekly and bi-weekly) by classroom walk thru tool and a data monitoring system. Results of the walk thru and data monitoring system will be discussed weekly during leadership meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Angela Rochay (rochaya@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.)

Monitoring K - 5 student groups engaged with the Teacher Led group.

Monitoring K - 5 student groups work samples.

Monitoring teacher implementation of the remediation model with student groups.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale is using the researched based strategies outlined in the book "Best Practices".

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 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.

In the upcoming school year, Rufus E. Payne will foster a positive culture and environment for students, teachers, and parents. With the utilization of the new outreach system, Bloomzs, teachers, students and parents will be informed of different activities that will occur in school and after school. Through these new platforms, parents will be able to communicate directly with the school. Incorporating PBIS within the schools with the teachers and students, will foster a positive environment and build strong, positive relationships with our teachers and students. Incorporating Parental Involvement, we will utilize information from Parent Academy to foster the community partnership with the school.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Teachers and parents implement the new communication platforms (Bloomzs) in an effort to increase school/parent communication relationship. With monitoring of these platforms, we will increase our school/parent communication by 75% that will continue to promote a positive culture and environment.

Monitoring:

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

Monthly or bi-weekly monitoring of the new platforms by admin will be used.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carrie Warren (warrenc@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.)

Monitoring of K - 5 teachers and parents with Bloomzs and utilizing PBIS.

Quarterly monitoring of school/parent activities through Parental Involvement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The Parent Academy is a tool that parents could use to learn how support their child at home. It is important to build a healthy school/parent relationship.

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.

1. Use and monitoring of Bloomz communication platform.
2. Parent Involvement Activities with promoting Parent Academy

Person Responsible: Carrie Warren (warrenc@duvalschools.org)

By When: April 30, 2024

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

Focusing on the Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA emphasizes the need to address the teacher's ability to implement Guided Reading within a small group. In a review of student's FAST PM3 reading proficiency performance, third through fifth-grade reading proficiency achievement was 43%.

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

Focusing on the Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA emphasizes the need to address the teacher's ability to implement Guided Reading within a small group. In a review of student's FAST PM3 reading proficiency performance, third through fifth-grade reading proficiency achievement was 43%.

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

Based on the increased teacher knowledge and application of the Guided Reading protocol and increased progress monitoring of differentiating small groups, 72% (8) of the Kindergarten through Fifth-Grade classroom teachers will utilize Guided Reading and provide the students with grade level experiences. As a result, reading proficiency will increase from 43% to 48%.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Based on the increased teacher knowledge and application of the Guided Reading protocol and increased progress monitoring of differentiating small groups, 72% (8) of the Kindergarten through Fifth-Grade classroom teachers will utilize Guided Reading and provide the students with grade level experiences. As a result, reading proficiency will increase from 43% to 48%.

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.

This area of focus will be monitored by utilizing the Class Walk thru Tool as the teachers conduct their Guided Reading lessons during the work period. Successful and consistent implementation of Guided Reading will be monitored weekly or bi-weekly. Results of the walk thru will be discussed with the Leadership Team for next steps.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Warren, Carrie, warrenc@duvalschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Monitor K-5 targeted student groups engaged in Guided Reading with the teacher.

Provide K-5 teachers with the Guided Reading framework.

Monitor the teacher's implementation of the Workshop Model and the Work Period component with Guided Reading.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

"The Next Step Forward in Guided Reading" speaks to the opportunity for teachers to embed ongoing reading strategies that will support all learnings during Guided Reading.

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**

1. Follow the prescribed schedule for the reading block.
2. Lessons aligned to the Benchmark with the designation of Guided Reading.
3. Instructional focus walks with the focus on Guided Reading.
4. Professional development with a focus on the implementation of Guided Reading.

Warren, Carrie,
warrenc@duvalschools.org

Title I Requirements**Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements**

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

We will disseminate information on our SIP to our parents via our parent involvement activities, which occur quarterly, through Bloomz, our new parent communication platform, through parent conferences and AIT meetings. Before or after each parent meeting, the facilitator will explain the "why" of importance for parents to have their child in school daily and to do well in each subject.

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))

With the use of the new parent communication system, Bloomz, and teacher/parent weekly newsletters that will be sent home weekly with our students. The school also has a weekly communication folder that is sent home weekly for parents to view upcoming events. Parents will also be invited to the different parental involvement activities that will be held quarterly.

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))

Rufus E. Payne will strengthen the academic program by utilizing after-school tutoring sessions, by specifically targeting small groups, providing remediation for targeting small groups during center time, and provide an incentive for students that consistently comes to school daily.

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))

This plan is developed with the support of Communities in School that will be our after-school program to provide our students with academic resources. CIS will mentor students during the day with their academics and behavioral health.

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))

N/A

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))

N/A

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).

N/A

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))

N/A

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))

N/A

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: Math	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes