Hyde Park Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Hyde Park Elementary School

5300 PARK ST, Jacksonville, FL 32205

http://www.duvalschools.org/hydepark

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.

Hyde Park Elementary is a dynamic child-centered school committed to developing the whole child by providing high-quality instruction, which will enable students to reach their full potential and become successful citizens who value learning as a continual process throughout their lives.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Hyde Park Elementary students will become academically proficient problem solvers and life-long learners through the support of parents, peers, teachers, and the community.

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
Winfrey, Shirley	Principal	The Principal provides a common vision for the school, oversees data based decisions, ensures the school based team is implementing MTSS, conducts assessment of RTI skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation requirements, ensures adequate professional development to support implementation of curriculum, communicates with parents regarding school-based instructional plans and activities, and evaluates the progress at Hyde Park Elementary. The Principal is an instructional leader that consistently observes teachers, gives timely feedback and next steps with frequent follow-up. She also assists with and leads common planning and professional development. Mrs. Winfrey is also an active member of the school's shared decision making team.
Howard, Judy	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal is an instructional leader who assists with overseeing data based decisions, leads common planning sessions, provides professional development and observes teachers and gives timely feedback. Mrs. Howard takes the lead on ELA instruction. She operates as lead administrator in the absence of the Principal.
Felton, Jakesia	Other	The school's Math Interventionists participates in student data collection, assists in determining the need for further assessment, supports core instructional activities/materials into Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers. The school's interventionist is an important part of the schools decisions making process.
Monroe, Bervinda	School Counselor	The School Counselor provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students. She links community agencies to families to support the child's academic, behavioral, and social needs, monitors and evaluates the integrity of core guidance instruction, integrates core guidance instructional activities/ materials into Tier 2 and Tier 3 guidance instruction, and provides intensive individual guidance instruction.
Everson, Vicki	Teacher, ESE	The ESE Lead provides the team and teachers with instructional supplemental and intensive research based programs that supports core instructional activities/ materials in the

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Response to Intervention process. She also provides input to the teachers and team of differentiated strategies and accommodations that will assist the students in the learning environment. She ensures students receive their individualized accommodations that are stated in their IEP.
Wilinson, Sarah		The school's Reading Interventionists participates in student data collection, assists in determining the need for further assessment, supports core instructional activities/materials into Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 instruction, and collaborates with general education teachers. The school's interventionist is an important part of the schools decisions making process.

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.

Hyde Park Elementary will involve all stakeholders will include the school leadership team, teachers, staff, parents and student input to develop the School Improvement Plan. School administration will meet with parent representatives to plan, review, and improve the SIP. Parents will be equally chosen on a voluntary basis to represent both primary and intermediate grades on our SAC. These committees will discuss the development of the school's SIP. Our School Improvement Plan will be available in hard copy in the front office, parent resource room, and on our school website. The SIP will be reviewed during SAC monthly meetings and opportunities for input from all stakeholders will be invited throughout the year.

SIP Monitoring

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

The Hyde Park Elementary School Improvement Plan (SIP) will be monitored for effective implementation during leadership meetings and monthly SAC. Stakeholders will provide feedback to foster continuous improvements. These committees will discuss the development of the (SIP) and on-going progress towards implementation. Adjustments will be made based on schoolwide data.

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 3-5

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	87%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
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) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: F
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	47	58	29	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	15	8	10	0	0	0	33
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	40	33	0	0	0	77
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	40	25	0	0	0	69
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	62	0	0	0	0	0	62

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	45	47	30	0	0	0	122

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	6	1	1	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	35	29	33	0	0	0	97
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	11	2	3	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	27	33	0	0	0	69
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	60	23	28	0	0	0	111
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	53	0	0	0	0	0	53

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	48	23	24	0	0	0	95

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	9	2	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	6

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	0	0	35	29	33	0	0	0	97
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	11	2	3	0	0	0	16
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	27	33	0	0	0	69
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	60	23	28	0	0	0	111
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	53	0	0	0	0	0	53

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	48	23	24	0	0	0	95

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	9	2	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	6

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*	29	48	53	30	50	56	29		
ELA Learning Gains				50			34		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50			60		
Math Achievement*	37	58	59	42	48	50	32		
Math Learning Gains				57			35		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54			53		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	34	52	54	26	59	59	24		
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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	33
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	131
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	309
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
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	25	Yes	4	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	34	Yes	1	
HSP	38	Yes	1	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	33	Yes	1	
FRL	33	Yes	1	

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	33	Yes	3	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	41			
HSP	44			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	48			
FRL	44			

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	29			37			34					
SWD	23			24			10				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29			37			35				4	
HSP	30			45							2	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	24			32			42				3	
FRL	29			36			36				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	30	50	50	42	57	54	26					
SWD	12	34	55	19	44	50	19					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	27	51	48	38	55	48	21					
HSP	39	50		36	50							
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	33	43		56	65		45					
FRL	29	51	53	41	55	55	25					

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	29	34	60	32	35	53	24					
SWD	20	31		22	46		9					
ELL												

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	24	36	70	25	29	45	9					
HSP	8			23								
MUL	40			40								
PAC												
WHT	49	45		54	45		73					
FRL	26	35	64	31	34	50	20					

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	21%	47%	-26%	54%	-33%
04	2023 - Spring	31%	50%	-19%	58%	-27%
03	2023 - Spring	25%	46%	-21%	50%	-25%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	39%	59%	-20%	59%	-20%
04	2023 - Spring	39%	58%	-19%	61%	-22%
05	2023 - Spring	26%	52%	-26%	55%	-29%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	27%	48%	-21%	51%	-24%

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.

ELA showed the lowest performance of 29% proficiency. A 1% drop from the 2022-2023 school year. Contributing factors to last year's performance were new curriculum benchmarks and a new state accountability measure (FAST)

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

Math showed the greatest decline of 39% proficient from 42% for the previous year, a decline of 3%. Contributing factors to last year's performance were new curriculum benchmarks and a new state accountability measure (FAST)

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.

When reviewing the data and comparing to the state average scale scores, 5th grade ELA and 5th grade Math had the greatest gaps. Our ELA average scale score was 302 which was an 18 point deficit when compared to the state average and our Math average scale score was 304 which was a 17 point deficit. Some factors that contributed to this deficit were student attendance and teacher vacancies.

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

Science showed the most improvement for the 2022-2023 school year. Science proficiency moved from 26% to 33% which is an increase of 7%. Targeted small group instruction was implemented based on formal and informal data. Benchmarks that were not mastered were retaught differently and assessments were aligned to Item Specifications and clarifications.

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

When reflecting on our EWS data, the first area of concern that stands our the greatest to me is the number of students in 3rd grade who have substantial reading deficiency. There were 62 out of 106 students who had substantial reading deficiencies. The second area of concern is the number of students with attendance below
90 %. We had a total of 96 students in this category.

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

1. Reading Proficiency
2. Math Proficiency
3. Science

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

#1. 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.

Based on the PM - FAST data, our students with disabilities had a federal index below 41%. Our federal index is currently 33%.

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

At least 50% of our students with disabilities will be proficient. Our federal index for this sub-groups will be 41% or higher.

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

Consistent common planning with classroom and ESE teachers to ensure benchmark aligned activities and tasks utilizing the appropriate planning tools.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Vicki Everson (pullingsv@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.)

Increased data-based small group instruction that targets the identified benchmarks and the increased use of benchmark aligned blended learning experiences in all areas.

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

The tools utilized will ensure direct alignment to the benchmarks and assist with the monitoring of rigor while ensuring IEP goals are met. This will assist with the closing of our school's proficiency gap in the core areas as compared to the state and district.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

1. Teachers will meet bi-weekly (Aug. - Jun.) with our administrative team which includes our Reading and Math Interventionist for common planning to review upcoming lessons and ensure task alignment to the standards being taught.
2. Provide targeted professional development for teachers with a focus on small group instruction utilizing our measuring up workbooks.
3. School-wide implementation of Reflex Math and Generation Genius blended learning platforms.
4. Plan fieldtrips that lend themselves to hands on real-world experiences for our students.

Person Responsible: Shirley Winfrey (winfreys@duvalschools.org)

By When: Aug. 2023 - June 1, 2024

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

Area of Focus - Teacher Retention and Recruitment
After reviewing our 5 essential school report for 2023 the area of collaborative teachers was scored as 19% very weak. When broken down further withing this area, school commitment was marked the lowest at 9%.

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

We will have at least 60%(strong) in the area of collaborative teachers on our upcoming 5 essentials survey for 2022-2023 School year.

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

Survey results will be reviewed and action plans put in to place based on the survey results.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Judy Howard (howardj4@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.)

Consistent monitoring of survey results from teachers and documentation of notes during conversations. The analysis from these surveys and conversations will be utilized to put activities in place to create a positive school environment that teachers truly want to be a part of.

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

Evidence shows that when you have a strong Supportive Environment, teachers and staff function better. As stated in "Enhancing School Improvement" by Danielson as safe and positive environment is essential to school improvement.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

1. Surveys will be completed at least 3 times per year (beginning, middle and end) to keep a pulse on teacher needs in this area.

Person Responsible: Judy Howard (howardj4@duvalschools.org)

By When: August 2023, January 2024, May 2024

Team building activities will be consistently integrated into our faculty and early release meetings.

Person Responsible: Shirley Winfrey (winfreys@duvalschools.org)

By When: Aug. - June

Stay conversations will be had with all teachers.

Person Responsible: Shirley Winfrey (winfreys@duvalschools.org)

By When: Oct. 2023

Celebrations will be included in all staff meetings.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: Aug. 2023 - June 2024

#3. 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.

After reviewing school data, Reading proficiency was 29% a decline of 1% from 2022-2023. Math 39%, a 3% decrease from 2022-2023.

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

Increase Math proficiency by 10% on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST)

Increase Reading proficiency by 10% on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST)

Increase Science proficiency by 10% on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST)

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

The implementation of small groups will be monitored by administration through weekly benchmark walk throughs and consistent classroom observations with specific feedback, as well as weekly reviews of small group plans.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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

The Benchmark Advance Reading Program and interventions which were adopted by the district the previous school year will be implemented with fidelity. Mastery Education (Measuring UP ELA and Math BEST Standards aligned Workbooks) will be utilized to enhance small group instruction. The Blended Learning Platform which includes Generation Genius, Study Island and Freckle will be utilized for Reading, Math and Science. These programs will be monitored with fidelity. The Reading interventionist will work with our Lowest Performing Quartile and Bubble students several times per week to address their areas of deficiency using LLI (Leveled Literacy Instruction), Haggerty, and Phonics for Reading. Acaletics will be utilized for math.

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

All evidence-based interventions are aligned to Reading , math and science benchmarks. This standards-alignment will support increased proficiency levels in all content areas.

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.

Administrators and Reading Interventionist will assist with training teachers on small group instruction in their specific content area.

Person Responsible: Shirley Winfrey (winfreys@duvalschools.org)

By When: August - May 2024 (ongoing)

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).

The Benchmark Advance Reading Program and interventions which were adopted by the district the previous school year will be implemented with fidelity. Mastery Education (Measuring UP ELA and Math BEST Standards aligned Workbooks) will be utilized to enhance small group instruction. The Blended Learning Platform which includes Generation Genius, Study Island and Freckle will be utilized for Reading, Math and Science. These programs will be monitored with fidelity. The Reading interventionist will work with our Lowest Performing Quartile and Bubble students several times per week to address their areas of deficiency using LLI (Leveled Literacy Instruction), Haggerty, and Phonics for Reading. Acaletics will be utilized for math.

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

N/A

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

Each grade level scored well below 50% in proficiency for ELA. Our overall proficiency was 29% on the ELA FAST assessment for 2022-2023.

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

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

3rd grade ELA scored 29%
4th grade ELA scored 32%
5th grade ELA scored 25%

Our goal for the 2023-2024 year will be for each grade level to score 40% or higher.

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.

Benchmark Walkthroughs - Administrators will have weekly walkthroughs in each classroom to assess small group and whole group instruction.

Blended learning reports will be pulled and reviewed weekly to identify areas of need.

The Leadership Team will review data weekly in Performance Matters to monitor all assessments.

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

Winfrey, Shirley, winfreys@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?

The identified evidence- based programs strongly meet Florida's definition for evidence-based alignment with the district's K-12 Comprehensive based Reading Plan and 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?

UFLI program was adopted for the 23-24 school year to be implemented during WIN block with fidelity. The new Benchmark Advance Program and Interventions which were adopted by the district will be implemented with fidelity.
Freckle, a blended learning platform will be implemented and monitored with fidelity.
The Reading Interventionist will work with our Lowest Performing Quartile and Bubble students several times per week to address their areas of deficiency using LLI (Leveled Literacy Instruction).
Curriculum Associates (Learning Magnetic Reading workbooks) will be used to support our students in tutoring after school.
Mastery Education (Measuring up ELA BEST Standards workbooks) and UFLI will be utilized by our Interventionist and teachers for small group instruction.

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
Consistent Monitoring of Data: Literacy Leadership: Our leadership team will review data weekly to assess where students are and prepare a plan of action to remediate. Administrators will do weekly walkthroughs using our BWT tool to assess instructional delivery of the ELA standards and student participation and growth.	Winfrey, Shirley, winfreys@duvalschools.org
Literacy Coaching: My Reading Coach/Interventionist and Administrators will meet bi-weekly with grade level teams to review individual grade level data and adjust plans as needed.	Winfrey, Shirley, winfreys@duvalschools.org
Assessment: Weekly assessments will be given to assess student knowledge of the standard. Weekly blended learning reports will be pulled and reviewed from Freckle and the Benchmark on-line component to guided our next steps for re-teach and small group instruction.	Howard, Judy, howardj4@duvalschools.org
Professional Learning: Professional Development will be given monthly during our Early Release trainings and will be planned from noticing and next steps during administrative walkthroughs.	Winfrey, Shirley, winfreys@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.

Hyde Park Elementary will ensure that all stakeholders have access to the SIP and Title I programs through the school website, flyers, automated phone system, Bloomz and parent organizations such as SAC. The SIP will be shared during monthly SAC meetings and reviewed for feedback, We accommodate parents with limited English and Literacy proficiencies by publishing plans in English and Spanish.

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))

The school will build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders by facilitating monthly core subject meetings to explain grade specific curriculum expectations and strategies. During these meetings, parents will be informed of the assessments used and the expected achievement level they are striving for. Take home sheets and grade level activities will be provided at each meeting. Parent-teacher conferences are also available upon request to further explain specific student progress. Open house, content specific parent engagement activities, SAC meetings will be utilized to strengthen our parent school partnership. . Achievement level information will be presented during parent meetings and workshops. Spanish language students will be accommodated via interpreter.
Website: https://dcps.duvalschools.org Hyde Park Elementary Homepage

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 academic program will be aligned and equivalent to BEST Standards for ELA and Math and Next Generation State Science Standards (NGSSS) for science. The curriculum selected by the district is aligned to state standards and benchmarks. The Master Schedule was developed to ensure that the quality of learning time is implemented with fidelity. Benchmark Advance Interventions will be utilized within small groups to increase proficiency within our targeted group: Students With Disabilities (SWD).

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))

Hyde Park Elementary is a 3rd-5th grade only school for the 2023-2024 School year.

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))

The School Counselor provides quality services and expertise on issues ranging from program design to assessment and intervention with individual students. She links community agencies to families to support the child's academic, behavioral, and social needs, monitors and evaluates the integrity of core guidance instruction, integrates core guidance instructional activities/materials into Tier 2 and Tier 3 guidance instruction, and provides intensive individual guidance instruction and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic areas.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A Hyde Park is a 3rd-5th only school. The school counselor facilitates guidance lessons.

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).

Hyde Park implements a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior via the Positive Behavior and Support system guided by Student Guide Lines for Success. Guidelines: Respectful, Purposeful, motivated, safe and responsible. Students are incentivized for meeting or exceeding these guidelines. Tier 1 Interventions: Parent contact/conference, mentor partnering, Restorative Practice, goal setting.

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))

Professional learning for stakeholders to improve instruction is facilitated during Common Planning and Early Release Training.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A Hyde Park Elementary is a 3rd-5th only school.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	$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