

Duval County Public Schools

Oak Hill Academy 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	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	21
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Oak Hill Academy

6910 DAUGHTRY BLVD S, Jacksonville, FL 32210

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

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.

The mission of Oak Hill Academy is to continually motivate and encourage all students to achieve their goals using highly engaging curricula and technology while incorporating the use of research-based instructional strategies and interventions.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Oak Hill Academy is to provide students with autism spectrum disorders or related disabilities a unique educational environment that is dedicated to providing individualized, intensive and effective instruction that will allow students to maximize progress in the areas of academics, communication, social skills, and behavior.

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
Smith, Stephanie	Principal	Work in conjunction with the classroom teachers and support staff to be sure that students are working towards expected goals. Conduct frequent focus walks to ensure implementation of specific instructional components and best practices. Mentor teachers and staff; provide training and/or in class support; design plans of action and next steps to support progress towards school improvement goals
herring, rodney	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal is responsible for creating plans and monitoring behaviors and classroom environments to ensure we are meeting student needs. Methods for assessing needs include: focus walks geared towards specific instructional components; mentoring teachers and staff; providing training and/or in class support; designing plans of action and next steps to support progress towards school improvement goals.

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.

Teachers and staff meet with leadership team to review school data. Through data discussions, areas of focus are determined and included in the SIP. Brainstorming sessions are conducted to identify action steps needed to address goals. Through SDM meetings, any materials, scheduling adjustments and/or other needs are presented and consensus is reached prior to including plans on SIP. Community members and parents are invited each month to attend SAC meetings. During these meetings, data is reviewed and input is collected for next steps towards improvement.

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))

Quarterly schoolwide data review will be conducted to identify any areas of concern. Leadership team will review baseline data, and other school wide data sources and make note of trends. During regularly scheduled collaboration meetings, staff will be given an opportunity to provide additional input towards the SIP. Any concerns will be addressed through an update to the plan. SIP will reviewed with SAC each month and updates will be made as needed to address areas of need.

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)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	72%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	92%
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) 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.	
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: COMMENDABLE 2020-21: COMMENDABLE 2018-19: UNSATISFACTORY 2017-18: MAINTAINING

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	0	13	17	12	2	10	1	4	2	61
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	13	17	12	2	10	1	4	2	61
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students identified retained:

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

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	13	17	12	2	10	1	4	2	61
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students identified retained:

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

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	45	53	68	47	55	38		
ELA Learning Gains				77			57		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				93			79		
Math Achievement*	63	46	55	67	40	42	45		
Math Learning Gains				77			57		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				88			69		
Science Achievement*	52	45	52	56	45	54	33		
Social Studies Achievement*	82	62	68	73	50	59	38		
Middle School Acceleration		73	70		45	51			
Graduation Rate		72	74		41	50			
College and Career Acceleration		54	53		65	70			
ELP Progress		47	55		68	70			

* 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	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	334
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	75
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	599
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	67			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	56			
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	60			

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	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	75			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	75			
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	65			
FRL	67			

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			63			52	82				
SWD	62			63			52	82			5	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	58			66			43				3	
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	56			60			64				3	
FRL	60			62			47				3	

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	68	77	93	67	77	88	56	73				
SWD	68	77	93	67	77	88	56	73				
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	70	81	90	63	84	92	47					
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	66	68		69	64		58					
FRL	59	72		62	76	80	54					

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	38	57	79	45	57	69	33	38				
SWD	38	57	79	45	57	69	33	38				
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	27	39		33	43		21					
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	48	80		52	67							
FRL	37	45		41	48		31					

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.

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.

Data indicates that the lowest performing component is overall Science Achievement at 56%. Current district- assigned curriculum materials that are utilized for Access courses are not fully aligned to standards and pacing.

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

No decline noted, however the component with the least improvement is Math Achievement at 22%.

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.

No state average available

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

Social Studies Achievement had growth of 35% and ELA Achievement showed growth of 30%. Improvement can be attributed to a heavy focus on effective grade level common planning and lesson development. We also held schoolwide monthly professional development sessions targeting emergent literacy and the incorporation of strategies for improving reading.

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

Attendance in grades k- 8 highlighted a need for improved practices and deeper attendance intervention. A total of 61 students were absent 18 or more days. Upon further review, students in grades 3-8 with higher absenteeism reflecting smaller growth and decline in state test scores.

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

- Improve Science Achievement
- Improve overall learning gains in ELA and Math
- Improve overall attendance for students in grades k-8

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.

Data review showed that overall science achievement was an area of focus. 44% of students are not proficient scoring a 2 or below on the state assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

70% of students will demonstrate proficiency on the Science FAA by scoring a 3 or higher achievement rating.

Monitoring:

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

Regularly scheduled professional learning will be provided to staff. Lesson plans will be reviewed weekly and regularly scheduled walk-throughs will occur. Consultation with district-support staff will be arranged and will include teachers and support staff. Instructional coaches will conduct check-ins and staff will complete surveys to provide feedback for future planning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephanie Smith (smiths1@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.)

Implementation of facilitated common planning sessions will be held weekly to ensure that lessons and activities are planned to align with standards and the pacing guide. The common planning sessions will include discussion of upcoming standards and focus on activity and lesson alignment to the standards and benchmarks. Overall review of school designed pacing guide will be conducted and adjustments and alignment needs will be updated.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Lesson plans and activities must be aligned appropriately to standards in order for students to receive instruction in the appropriate content. Collaboration and coordination across grade levels will allow teams to

This will lead to improved learning gains for all students.

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.

Schedule regular consultation with district science specialist to help with alignment and development of content specific lessons aligned to Access Points.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Smith (smiths1@duvalschools.org)

By When: August 15, 2023

Create schedule of common planning sessions and assign member of leadership team to attend and facilitate discussion.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Smith (smiths1@duvalschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

Facilitate monthly common planning sessions to ensure alignment of science standards to current FAA blueprints.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Smith (smiths1@duvalschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

Review current curriculum materials to determine what is additionally needed to address required content.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Smith (smiths1@duvalschools.org)

By When: First 9 weeks

#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.

Following data review, it was noted that there is a correlation to students in grades 3-8 who have been identified under the EWS for attendance, showed a decline in their overall achievement and learning gains in ELA and Math. Students with chronic absenteeism are missing instruction in the classroom and therefore not able to demonstrate understanding of content.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will decrease the number of students identified on the EWS for missing 10% or more of days by 50% across all grade levels.

Monitoring:

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

Weekly attendance audits will be conducted by teachers. Students missing more than 3 days will be reported to the guidance specialist for follow-up. We will follow AIT recommendations and schedule meetings with parents to identify barriers and develop solutions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephanie Smith (smiths1@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.)

Deeper attendance monitoring and identification of students at risk. When students have missed more than five days, parents will be contacted for a conference. Further attendance issues will be addressed utilizing the district AIT process to address barriers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Attendance issues need to be addressed earlier so assistance can be provided to families encountering barriers. These barriers could be behavior related, transportation specific or a general misunderstanding of the impacts of poor attendance.

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.

Develop a process for monitoring attendance by front office clerk. Weekly report will be generated and communication will be sent to teachers who need to contact parents to address attendance.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Smith (smiths1@duvalschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

Complete district AIT process with students who have exceeded to attendance requirements of 10 days.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Smith (smiths1@duvalschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

Schedule and present a parent training that discusses the importance of attendance and the impacts that poor attendance can have on student progress on IEP goals.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Smith (smiths1@duvalschools.org)

By When: October 23

#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.

In schools with strong Collaborative Practices, teachers observe each others' practice, and work together to review assessment data and develop instructional strategies. A significant decline of 39 points identified on the 5 Essentials survey in the area of Collaborative Practices-Collaborative Teachers

Measurable Outcome:

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

Ratings on Collaborative Practices indicator in 56 Essentials will improve by 40 points by the 23-34 survey administration.

Monitoring:

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

Quarterly surveys will be collected to determine effectiveness of strategies and monthly Support Team Collaboration meetings will include an opportunity to discuss needs related to Collaborative Practices.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephanie Smith (smiths1@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.)

Regularly scheduled walk-throughs will be conducted and will include teachers and follow-up feedback sessions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers indicated that they are not receiving enough opportunities to observe each other and provide feedback to one another.

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.

Conduct monthly Support Team Collaboration meetings with time dedicated to walk-through feedback.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Smith (smiths1@duvalschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

Develop a calendar of walk-throughs that will occur with teachers and a process for feedback sessions.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Smith (smiths1@duvalschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

Survey teachers to determine what they are looking for that will help strengthen this domain.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Smith (smiths1@duvalschools.org)

By When: September 23

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.

Once completed, a copy of the SIP will be placed in their main office. There will also be an additional copy place in our Title 1 resource room for Parent to review and on the school's website. During our title one events and parent trainings we will reiterate access to the document.

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))

<https://dcps.duvalschools.org/oakhill>

Besides Open House the school will provide opportunities for parents to take an active role in their child's education. We offer several parent trainings and Activities that foster parent involvement and knowledge. We highlight the positive happenings' that takes place On our campus. We also identify and spotlight the positive things students are doing on campus. We offer community partners monthly opportunities through our SAC meetings to share things that are happening in the community and the services they can offer to help parents' and students. In addition we offer daily home notes either by their daily folders or messaging software.

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)

The schools plan highlights the areas of improvement. It includes professional development to train faculty and staff to prevent loss of instructional time. We will also offer Parent trainings and other resources to meet students where they are according to the data. Then be intentional in filling academic gaps by using different or new curriculum to teach or reteach skills to improve student academic success.

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