Neptune Beach Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Neptune Beach Elementary School

1515 FLORIDA BLVD, Neptune Beach, FL 32266

http://www.duvalschools.org/nbe

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.

We fully commit ourselves to every child's individual pathway to success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every student will know how to apply the skills they learn to their life.

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
Kavanagh, Elizabeth	Principal	The school-based Leadership Team will meet weekly. The meetings will be designed to review data and to help with plans and instructional decisions; review progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the above information, the team will identify professional development and resources. The team will also collaborate regularly,problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions, and practice new processes and skills. The team will facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation. The aforementioned team (or select members thereof) will review all Tier 2/3, Overage & One Plus year retained students. Formative and summative diagnostic material will be reviewed to determine areas of focus and to develop prescriptive measures. Evaluation will then occur and the cycle will repeat or expand as needed. Any student referred to Multi-Tiered Support Systems (MTSS) for consideration of Exceptional Student Education (ESE) will be reviewed by the Collaborative Problem Solving Team (CPST) leadership team for supporting documentation.
Baxter, Kevin	Assistant Principal	The school-based Leadership Team will meet weekly. The meetings will be designed to review data and to help with plans and instructional decisions; review progress monitoring data at the grade level and classroom level to identify students who are meeting/exceeding benchmarks, at moderate risk or at high risk for not meeting benchmarks. Based on the above information, the team will identify professional development and resources. The team will also collaborate regularly, problem solve, share effective practices, evaluate implementation, make decisions, and practice new processes and skills. The team will facilitate the process of building consensus, increasing infrastructure, and making decisions about implementation. The aforementioned team (or select

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		members thereof) will review all Tier 2/3, Overage & One Plus year retained students. Formative and summative diagnostic material will be reviewed to determine areas of focus and to develop prescriptive measures. Evaluation will then occur and the cycle will repeat or expand as needed. Any student referred to Multi-Tiered Support Systems (MTSS) for consideration of Exceptional Student Education (ESE) will be reviewed by the Collaborative Problem Solving Team (CPST) leadership team for supporting documentation.
Darcy, Marylou	Teacher, ESE	
Forte, Brooke	School Counselor	
Wine, Shannon	Teacher, K-12	

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.

Throughout the school year, the school improvement plan will be discussed during bi-weekly PLC's. Any revisions that are needed will be brought up during monthly faculty meetings.

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))

School improvement goals and student data will be discussed bi-weekly with all grade level teachers that will focus on all the goals of the school improvement plan. The plan will be revised when all stakeholders, teachers, and administration have discussed needed additions or revisions to the plan.

Demographic Data	
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education

2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	32%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	51%
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) 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: A 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	0	36	35	41	27	23	0	0	0	162
One or more suspensions	0	4	2	3	3	1	0	0	0	13
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	15	15	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	14	15	0	0	0	29
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	35	37	29	0	0	0	0	0	101

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	17	12	17	15	15	0	0	0	76

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	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	1	31	27	23	24	18	0	0	0	124
One or more suspensions	0	4	4	2	1	4	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	11	15	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	9	11	0	0	0	27
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	14	24	20	0	0	0	0	0	61

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	11	21	17	8	7	0	0	0	67

The number of students identified retained:

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

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	1	31	27	23	24	18	0	0	0	124
One or more suspensions	0	4	4	2	1	4	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	11	15	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	9	11	0	0	0	27
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	14	24	20	0	0	0	0	0	61

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	11	21	17	8	7	0	0	0	67

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	72	48	53	71	50	56	70		
ELA Learning Gains				65			60		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53			26		
Math Achievement*	79	58	59	77	48	50	75		
Math Learning Gains				69			63		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				65			36		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	77	52	54	61	59	59	56		
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	76
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	302
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	461
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

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	47			
ELL	40	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	55			
HSP	78			
MUL	79			
PAC				
WHT	78			
FRL	65			

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	49			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	58			
HSP	76			
MUL	70			
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	58			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

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	72			79			77					
SWD	37			54			61				4	
ELL	40			40							2	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	46			64			54				3	
HSP	77			80							3	
MUL	75			83							3	
PAC												
WHT	75			80			80				4	
FRL	61			65			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	71	65	53	77	69	65	61					
SWD	41	49	50	51	56	66	27					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	58	63	50	65	68	69	35					
HSP	75	56		89	83							
MUL	56	71		72	79							
PAC												
WHT	75	67	54	79	67	60	71					
FRL	59	55	48	70	63	69	43					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	70	60	26	75	63	36	56					
SWD	42	37	20	42	47	23	26					
ELL	54			62								

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	55	50	45	49	50	50	19					
HSP	63	52		73	67		36					
MUL	74	50		81	80		67					
PAC												
WHT	74	66		80	62	30	68					
FRL	55	50	26	58	48	30	38					

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	70%	47%	23%	54%	16%
04	2023 - Spring	77%	50%	27%	58%	19%
03	2023 - Spring	71%	46%	25%	50%	21%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	84%	59%	25%	59%	25%
04	2023 - Spring	77%	58%	19%	61%	16%
05	2023 - Spring	82%	52%	30%	55%	27%

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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was Kindergarten math. Being that the lowest performance was Kindergarten students first time taking the FAST test, this is not a trend yet. The contributing factors were a new curriculum, and the first time Kindergarten students took this assessment.

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

5th grade reading showed a 5% decline in reading proficiency compared to the previous year. This number is not a decline when compared to the state average of 54% and when looking at the cohort, the students did show growth. As we plan ahead, our focus will be on small groups to improve this number.

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.

While there is no gap, our lowest number is in 5th grade reading which is 70% proficiency. This number is not a decline compared to the state average and when looking at the cohort, the students did show growth. As we plan ahead, our focus will be on small groups to improve this number.

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

3rd grade math showed the most improvement with student proficiency comparing the 2021-22 and 2022-23 school year. 3rd grade proficiency improved by 6%. The school improved bi-weekly PLC's with an emphasis on math due to new curriculum. Common planning was strategically implemented to allow grade levels and subject specific teachers to meet and discuss how to improve and implement the new math curriculum.

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

Attendance is the biggest area of concern for the 2023-2024 school year. Last year 21% of students missed more than 10% of the school year.

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

Attendance
3rd grade ELA proficiency
Proficiency and growth for students with disabilities.
4th and 5th grade math gains for lower performing students and gains for all students.

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. 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.

Attendance rate went up a percentage point to 21% of students missing more than 20 days of school for the 2022-23 school year.

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

The desired outcome is to have students with 10% of school missed during the 2022-23 school year to decline by 5% for the 2023-24 school year.

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

Data will be monitored weekly during leadership team meetings. Bi-weekly PLC's will have discussion and strategies to improve student attendance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kevin Baxter (baxterk@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.)

Monthly reward system with all students leading to improved attendance. Monthly AIT meetings with parents to set strategies and importance of student's coming to school every day and on time.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

21% of students for the 2022-23 school year missed more than 20 days.

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. 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.

The proficiency level for 3rd graders in ELA from the 2021-2022 school year to the 2022-2023 school year increased by 4%. With 3rd graders counting 25% towards the school grade for the 2023-2024 school year, it's imperative that 3rd grade ELA students are monitored and focused on this upcoming school year.

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

With the emphasis of proficiency for 3rd grade ELA students, the goal is to increase the proficiency level by 5%.

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

The Area of Focus will be monitored with bi-weekly professional learning communities with teachers, and administration that targets data, small group instruction, team collaboration, and systems of support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kevin Baxter (baxterk@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.)

Through design, rigor, and implementation of professional development to engage and improve teacher knowledge throughout the school year in the areas of ELA, lower performing students, and disaggregating data (preplanning, PLC's, common planning, after school training's) will lead to increasing the proficiency level of all K-5 students in ELA.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

With the emphasis of proficiency for 3rd grade ELA students, the goal is to increase the proficiency level by 5%. Teachers viewing other teachers lessons, discussing collaboratively best practices they saw, and giving feedback to improve instruction. Bi-weekly professional learning communities where the main focus will be to collaborate, discuss, and review the new ELA and math curriculum. Direct and explicit grade level common planning, professional development, and coaching through the collection of data.

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.

Teachers meet bi-weekly with leadership team to discuss explicit points to improve student achievement.

Person Responsible: Kevin Baxter (baxterk@duvalschools.org)

By When: On going throughout 2023-2024 school year.

Implement professional development, when needed, for LLI, i-Ready, UFLI, Benchmark Advance, and Hands to Mind to assist with successfully incorporating these resources within the classroom.

Person Responsible: Kevin Baxter (baxterk@duvalschools.org)

By When: On going throughout 2023-2024 school year.

Weekly team common planning meetings to align key strategies, classroom data, and lesson plans to meet the needs of the students within each ELA classroom.

Person Responsible: Kevin Baxter (baxterk@duvalschools.org)

By When: On going throughout 2023-2024 school year.

#3. 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.

Math proficiency overall gained 4% from the previous year's state assessment. Further digging into the K-5 math data showed that KG and 4th grade students were well below the school average of 81%.

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

Students in grades K-5 will maintain or increase their FAST score in 2023-2024 school year 5%. The goal for the upcoming 1st graders and the incoming 1st graders will be to raise the overall proficiency scores in those grade levels 10%.

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

The Area of Focus will be monitored with bi-weekly professional learning communities with teachers, and administration that target data, small group instruction, team collaboration, and systems of support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kevin Baxter (baxterk@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.)

Through design, rigor, and implementation of professional development to engage and improve teacher knowledge throughout the school year in the areas of math lower performing students, and disaggregating data (preplanning, PLC's, common planning, after school training's) will lead to increasing the proficiency level of all K-5 students. Teachers viewing other teachers lessons, discussing collaboratively best practices they saw, and giving feedback to improve instruction. Bi-weekly professional learning communities where the main focus will be to collaborate, discuss, and review the math curriculum. Direct and explicit grade level common planning, professional development, and coaching through the collection of data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The goal is to increase the proficiency level of all students in math by 5%. The data for Kindergarten and 5th grade students proficiency percentages were below the percentages of the other grades within the school.

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.

Professional development with Kindergarten grade level teachers. Meeting bi-weekly to common plan, discuss data, and curriculum to improve student outcomes.

Person Responsible: Kevin Baxter (baxterk@duvalschools.org)

By When: May 2024

Small group lesson plans with specific reasoning and evidence for students participating with Reveal math, Redbird, STAR (3-5), I-Ready (1-2), and Waterford (KG).

Person Responsible: Elizabeth Kavanagh (kavanaghe@duvalschools.org)

By When: On going through May 2024

Weekly Team planning with Tier I evidence of instructional delivery.

Person Responsible: Shannon Wine (wines@duvalschools.org)

By When: On going through May 2024

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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.

The goal for the 2023-2024 school year is to improve students with disabilities proficiency and growth on state assessments.

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

The goal is to improve lower performing student gains by 5% in math and reading compared to the 2021-2022 school year.

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

The Area of Focus will be monitored with bi-weekly professional learning communities with teachers, and administration that targets data, small group instruction, team collaboration, and systems of support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Elizabeth Kavanagh (kavanaghe@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.)

Teachers will have intense daily small group instruction within the classroom. VE teachers will work with classroom teachers and set intentional goals for each student to show growth.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Gains and growth of the lower performing students and students with disabilities grew 20% from the 2020-21 to the 2021-22. The goal is to keep this growth moving forward for all students with a disability.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

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

Measurable Outcomes
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Monitoring

Monitoring
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

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

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

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

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

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

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring

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: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

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

No