

Duval County Public Schools

Kernan Trail 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	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	21
VI. Title I Requirements	23
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	24

Kernan Trail Elementary School

2281 KERNAN BLVD S, Jacksonville, FL 32246

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

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.

To provide educational excellence in every classroom, for every student, everyday

Provide the school's vision statement.

Kernan Trail Elementary is a standards-based learning community focused on investing in our people, leading with passion, planning with purpose, and taking pride in our performance.

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
Shall, Suzanne	Principal	
Crews, Amanda	Other	CSS Site Coach
Mondestin-hillamng@duvalschools.org, Georgine	Other	School Counselor
Lamberson, Ricky	Other	Teacher, Extended Day Director

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 SAC Team and Teachers review the preliminary raw data from state exams and discusses areas of strength and weakness. The Principal drafts the SIP according to the preliminary raw data, and discussion from the SAC and Staff Teams, and shares the draft with the Leadership Team. The Leadership Team offers feedback and revise the SIP. The Principal shares the data and intended goals with a District Lead Team Cohort of Principals to check for alignment. The Principal uses the feedback to make revisions and presents the finalized draft to Teachers and SAC before submitting.

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))

Regular monitor takes place as follows:
 Monthly at a Leadership Team Meeting
 Quarterly at Shared-Decision Making
 In September, January, and March with School Advisory Council

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	59%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	69%
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: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
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	6	40	35	20	22	22	0	0	0	145
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	1	1	3	0	0	0	7
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	1	5	0	2	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	5	1	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	16	20	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	11	22	0	0	38
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	9	47	41	29	0	0	0	0	0	126

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	84	116	124	98	96	107	0	0	0	625

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	8	4	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	2	32	25	25	24	34	0	0	0	142
One or more suspensions	0	4	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	2	11	3	1	2	2	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	1	5	1	2	3	2	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	18	18	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	11	19	0	0	0	30
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	24	21	24	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	3	28	18	17	12	16	0	0	0	94

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	5	0	5	1	2	0	0	0	15
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	2	32	25	25	24	34	0	0	0	142
One or more suspensions	0	4	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	2	11	3	1	2	2	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	1	5	1	2	3	2	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	18	18	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	11	19	0	0	0	30
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	24	21	24	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	3	28	18	17	12	16	0	0	0	94

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	5	0	5	1	2	0	0	0	15
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*	66	48	53	62	50	56	64		
ELA Learning Gains				60			68		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				49			63		
Math Achievement*	71	58	59	77	48	50	74		
Math Learning Gains				66			55		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48			44		
Science Achievement*	74	52	54	61	59	59	58		
Social Studies Achievement*					63	64			
Middle School Acceleration					53	52			
Graduation Rate					46	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	74	54	59	62			65		

* 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	72
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	359
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	61

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	485
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	41			
ELL	62			
AMI				
ASN	81			
BLK	61			
HSP	66			
MUL	51			
PAC				
WHT	83			
FRL	62			

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	41			
ELL	48			
AMI				
ASN	62			
BLK	50			
HSP	54			

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	73			
PAC				
WHT	68			
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	66			71			74					74
SWD	42			39			35				4	
ELL	59			57			58				4	74
AMI												
ASN	79			83							2	
BLK	55			60			70				4	
HSP	64			61			56				5	72
MUL	38			42			73				3	
PAC												
WHT	74			86			83				4	
FRL	52			62			67				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	62	60	49	77	66	48	61					62
SWD	29	44	41	43	54	50	29					
ELL	47	51	40	69	57	31	27					62
AMI												
ASN	58	42		81	67							

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	46	44	46	68	62	45	40					
HSP	53	58	50	62	61	45	48					56
MUL	71	71		75	75		73					
PAC												
WHT	73	69	50	89	69	55	71					
FRL	53	52	40	65	65	57	49					

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	64	68	63	74	55	44	58					65
SWD	38	60	53	47	48	44	31					40
ELL	40			57								65
AMI												
ASN	91			87								
BLK	48	57		66	50		40					
HSP	61	60		66	44	50	36					66
MUL	77	82		74	55		82					
PAC												
WHT	65	76		81	55		75					
FRL	52	59	53	63	49	38	40					52

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	62%	47%	15%	54%	8%
04	2023 - Spring	62%	50%	12%	58%	4%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	70%	46%	24%	50%	20%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	76%	59%	17%	59%	17%
04	2023 - Spring	69%	58%	11%	61%	8%
05	2023 - Spring	73%	52%	21%	55%	18%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	76%	48%	28%	51%	25%

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.

Considering only 22-23 proficiency data, FAST Reading is our lowest performing area with 67% proficiency. Pre-covid, we were at 71% proficiency. Virtual instruction impacted us greatly, particularly our most vulnerable students, dropping reading proficiency to 62%. To regain pre-pandemic achievement, we focused on reading proficiency. Teachers worked collaboratively to align daily instruction to new standards, plan lessons together, do checks for understanding, and pull prescriptive small group instruction daily. We had a Literacy Coach and hired two certified reading tutors who pulled bubble students 2 to 3 x weekly for targeted small group instruction. We increased by 5% points this past year, but reading proficiency continues to lag behind math and science proficiency for the 22-23 year.

However, if you consider historical data, our biggest area of deficit is in Lowest Performing Learning Gains in both Reading and Mathematics. These two areas are greatly impacted by the lack of proficiency with our Students with Disabilities and ELL students and must remain a focus. Our lowest performing gains from 21-22 were 49% in Reading and 48% in mathematics. We contribute this to the achievement gap between ESE and Regular Education students and the significant increase of ESE students in our self-contained CSS classes from 48 students to 63 students. In fact, only 29% of our ESE students performed at proficiency.

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

Mathematics proficiency declined two percent from 77% to 75%. For 22-23 proficiency was the only state exam measure. FAST Mathematics showed a 2% decrease. We attribute the loss to a change in state math standards, a change to our curriculum tool from Eureka to Reveal, a lack of an intervention support, and the loss of iReady Mathematics for intermediate blended learning. Considering all the changes, and with a returning math staff, we are confident that the proficiency will increase this year.

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.

State and District comparison data is missing from the Data Review.

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

Science proficiency went from 61% to 74%. this 13 point increase. We attribute the increase to:

- Two science teachers who aligned instruction to standards and collaborative planned instruction
- Sixty-percent of the students looped as a cohort from Grade 4 to Grade 5
- Sixty-percent of the students participated in a three way departmentalized split rather than a two way giving more time and teacher concentration to science instruction

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

1. Number of Students with Significant Reading Deficits
2. Attendance

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

1. Lowest Performing Learning Gains in Reading
2. Lowest Performing Learning Gains in Math
3. Reading Proficiency
4. Reading Learning Gains
5. Attendance

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 Small Group 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.

Lowest Performing Quartile Learning Gains in Reading & Mathematics

Measurable Outcome:

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

Lowest Performing Quartile Learning Gains in Reading and Mathematics will increase to 52% through daily prescriptive small group instruction for identified students.

Monitoring:

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

1. Implementation of the daily Instructional Model as seen through classroom observations, Teacher Meeting planning, and BWT.
2. Daily small group instruction with documentation including the targeted students
3. Daily push in small group instruction provided by an ESE teacher as seen in ESE teacher schedules
4. Reading tutoring provided by two certified PT reading teachers.
5. Select ESE/ELL students will participate in Tier III reading tutoring
6. Data chats with teachers about performance of LPQ students in reading and math
7. Weekly Teacher Meetings with classroom and ESE teachers participating to plan instruction and assessment
8. Hire an experienced ESE reading teacher
9. Implement phonics instruction when needed
10. BWTs and Feedback on Small Group Instructional Practices
11. AIT meetings for Students with Attendance challenges

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Suzanne Shall (shalls@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. Daily Instructional Model
2. Guided Reading, Leveled Literacy Intervention, UFLY, Math Strategy Groups
3. PT Reading Tutors

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Daily aligned Tier I instruction using an Instructional Model to allow for small groups is the structure needed to support our programs. We can hire PT Reading Tutors. Our instructional coach is no longer district funded.

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.

Implementation of the daily Instructional Model as seen through classroom observations, Teacher Meeting planning, and BWT.

Person Responsible: Suzanne Shall (shalls@duvalschools.org)

By When: Ongoing weekly

Daily small group instruction with documentation including the targeted students

Person Responsible: Suzanne Shall (shalls@duvalschools.org)

By When: Ongoing, Daily

Daily push in small group instruction provided by an ESE teacher as seen in ESE teacher schedules

Person Responsible: Carrie Wallace (wallacec1@duvalschools.org)

By When: Ongoing, Weekly

Reading tutoring provided by two certified PT reading teachers.

Person Responsible: Suzanne Shall (shalls@duvalschools.org)

By When: Ongoing, Weekly beginning September 11

Select ESE/ELL students will participate in Tier III reading tutoring

Person Responsible: Suzanne Shall (shalls@duvalschools.org)

By When: Weekly

Data chats with teachers about performance of LPQ students in reading and math

Person Responsible: Suzanne Shall (shalls@duvalschools.org)

By When: Quarterly

Weekly Teacher Meetings with classroom and ESE teachers participating to plan instruction and assessment

Person Responsible: Suzanne Shall (shalls@duvalschools.org)

By When: Weekly September - April

Hire an experienced ESE reading teacher, hold monthly ESE meetings

Person Responsible: Suzanne Shall (shalls@duvalschools.org)

By When: August 2023, Monthly

Implement phonics instruction when needed

Person Responsible: Suzanne Shall (shalls@duvalschools.org)

By When: Starts in September

Feedback on Small Group Instructional Practices

Person Responsible: Suzanne Shall (shalls@duvalschools.org)

By When: Ongoing, Weekly

AIT meetings for Students with Attendance challenges

Person Responsible: Georgine Mondestin-hillamng@duvalschools.org (mondestin-hillmang@duvalschools.org)

By When: Ongoing, Monthly

#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.

In the Early Warning Indicators 145 students missed 10% or more days. School attendance is critical to school success.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In the Early Warning Indicators Attendance will increase from 145 students missing 10% or more to 100 students missing 10% or more.

Monitoring:

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

Attendance will be monitored through our Front Office. Students missing 5 or more days in a quarter, will receive a letter. Parents will be required to attend a meeting with students missing 6 or more days. Reasons for absences will be documented and monitored. Students missing more than 10 days will go to an AIT meeting for an attendance contract.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Carrie Wallace (wallacec1@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Attendance Monitoring and Tracking, parent letters, parent conferences, and Attendance Intervention Meetings will be conducted. Attendance contracts will be put in place when necessary.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Student learning is impacted negatively by school absence.

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.

Attendance Tracking through Focus

Person Responsible: Carrie Wallace (wallacec1@duvalschools.org)

By When: Monthly

Letters Sent monthly

Person Responsible: Carrie Wallace (wallacec1@duvalschools.org)

By When: Monthly

Parent Phone Calls and Conferences

Person Responsible: Carrie Wallace (wallacec1@duvalschools.org)

By When: Monthly

Parent Attendance Meetings

Person Responsible: Georgine Mondestin-hillamng@duvalschools.org (mondestin-hillmang@duvalschools.org)

By When: Quarterly

Attendance Contracts

Person Responsible: Georgine Mondestin-hillamng@duvalschools.org (mondestin-hillmang@duvalschools.org)

By When: Quarterly

#3. 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.

Reading proficiency impacts all areas of instruction. Students with reading stamina, volume, and engagement will continue to be proficient readers and will excel in the area of reading and other academic subjects.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Reading proficiency will increase from 62% proficiency to 70% proficiency.

Monitoring:

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

- Teacher Meeting topics and attendance
- Benchmark Walk Throughs
- CAST
- Instructional Rounds
- Common Assessments
- Student Work

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Suzanne Shall (shalls@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.)

- Daily Instructional Model
- Standards-Aligned Instruction, Tasks, Assessment Checks
- Common Assessments
- Guided Reading and Strategy Groups
- Reading Tutoring for Identified Students
- ESE Services
- ELL Services

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Aligned Core Reading instruction with two differentiated reading rotations, and a check for understanding is critically important to meet students' needs. Using LLI, Guided Reading, Strategy Groups, tutoring, and ESE services will help expose students to grade level content while scaffolding their learning to reach proficiency.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

Not applicable

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

Not applicable

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

Not applicable

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

Not applicable

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Not applicable

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.

Not applicable

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Shall, Suzanne, shall@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?

Not applicable

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?

Not applicable

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
-------------	-----------------------------------

Not applicable	Shall, Suzanne, shall@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.

Not Title I

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))

Not Title I

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)

Not Title I

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 Title I

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))

Not Title I

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 Title I

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).

Not Title I

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))

Not Title I

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))

Not Title I

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: Small Group Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$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