
Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	27
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	27
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Anchor Academy

555 WONDERWOOD DR, Atlantic Beach, FL 32233

www.duvalschools.org/anchoracademy

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.

Committed to providing a safe, healthy space for students to discover and explore their path to becoming a successful, global citizen through comprehensive, insightful instruction. Here, Dreams Begin!

Provide the school's vision statement.

Committed to providing a safe, healthy space for students to discover and explore their path to becoming a successful, global citizen through comprehensive, insightful instruction. Here, Dreams Begin!

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
Beale-Collier, Jennifer	Principal	<p>Jennifer Beale-Collier: provides leadership that motivates instructional and support personnel to strive for and provide the best possible opportunities for student growth and development both socially and emotionally. As the principal, she creates and maintains a safe, inviting environment for all students. Conducts faculty and staff evaluations to provide improvement to their professional practices. Continues to ensure a positive behavioral system that is fair and promotes restorative justice is provided to all students. Supports teachers' understanding and implementation of Florida's s Benchmarks for Excellent Student Thinking (B.E.S.T.) Standards for English Language Arts (ELA) and Mathematics which strategically supports our Districts mission "That every student is inspired and prepared for success in college or a career, and life."</p> <p>Facilitate and provide professional development opportunities for faculty and staff. Consistently communicates with all stakeholders regarding school-based decisions via parent-link, SAC, PTA, and social media.</p>
Barr, Adam	Assistant Principal	<p>Principal Designee, instructional leader, adheres to safety and discipline guidelines, ensures managerial operations are effective and consistent; supports daily operations of the school, serves as Testing Coordinator and Instructional Materials Manager; and monitors instruction with the use of the BWT during regularly scheduled classroom walkthroughs as well as the District's CAST system informal and formal components of the; serves as a consultant for the School Advisory Council; monitoring instruction, analyzing student data (cognitive and non-cognitive), providing individualized and prescriptive professional development for teachers and support staff members. In addition to these responsibilities, the assistant principal is responsible for increasing student achievement. The Assistant Principal will also, work collaboratively with stakeholders and community members with securing business partners.</p>
Keith, Eliese	School Counselor	<p>Mrs. Keith serves as the lead faculty member in supporting teachers in providing social/emotional supports for all students. She attends district trainings to learn how to effectively implement Resiliency curriculum (i.e. Calm Classroom, Child Safety Matters) and serves as part of the Threat Management Team (TMT). She conducts annual ALERT training for all faculty/staff in order to ensure that proper protocol is followed for students in crisis or exhibiting signs of neglect/abuse. Mrs. Keith also works collaboratively with teachers to develop small group programming focused on specific areas of student need (i.e. organizational skills, coping with anxiety/ stress, anger management). She also processes student services referrals (i.e. gifted, 504, speech).</p>
Maxwell, James	Teacher, K-12	<p>Mr. Maxwell serves as a lead teacher on the 5th-grade level and a content area expert in mathematics and science. He is our school's TIS, LEGO Robotics and Safety Patrol Sponsor. He attends various district meetings and professional development to learn more about new district initiatives and curricular expectations. This year he will lead collaborative planning sessions with grades</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		2,3 & 4 Math Teachers, as well as provide professional development to others through early release training sessions and/or committee meetings.

Price, Chantel Teacher, ESE

Guides the learning process toward the achievement of curriculum goals and in harmony with the goals, establishes clear objectives for all lessons, units, projects, and the like to communicate these objectives to students. Employs a variety of instructional techniques and instructional media, consistent with the physical limitations of the location provided and the needs and capabilities of the individuals or student groups involved. Strives to implement, by instruction and action, the District's philosophy of education and instructional goals and objectives.

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.

Our SAC which consists of: school administrators, Leadership Team members, faculty/staff, PTA Board Members, Parents, faith-based and community partners review our action plan goals, and provide feedback on our whether or not we should continue on the course identified in our school improvement plan.

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))

During our monthly SAC meetings, members will receive a summary of school-wide assessment data, and assess and provide feedback relating to instructional next steps and impact. Additionally, PM1, PM2 & PM3 assessment data will be reviewed upon completion and used to re-evaluate our action plan steps. Continuous progress monitoring will ensure we achieve the presented SIP goals and provide insight into progress made.

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	59%

2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	29%
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) 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: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
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	17	14	15	11	16	0	0	0	73
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	0	0	5
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	11	18
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	11	14
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	13	22	21	0	0	0	0	0	56

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	30	36	36	12	19	0	0	0	133

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days							1	0	0	0	3
One or more suspensions				1	3	1	1	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math				0	0	0	5	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment				0	6	10	8	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment				0	3	13	13	0	0	0	29
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.				5	2	4	7	8	0	0	26

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	1	1	2	2	3	0	0	0	12

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	3
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	3	1	1	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	10	8	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	13	13	0	0	0	29
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	5	2	4	7	8	0	0	0	0	26

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	1	1	2	2	3	0	0	0	12

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	57	48	53	67	50	56	66		
ELA Learning Gains				63			67		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41					
Math Achievement*	70	58	59	63	48	50	62		
Math Learning Gains				60			55		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				35					

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	64	52	54	67	59	59	71		
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	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	250
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	396
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	28	Yes	4	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	53			
HSP	64			
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	37	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	37	Yes	3	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	63			
HSP	65			
MUL	86			
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	62			

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	57			70			64					
SWD	17			38							2	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	44			59			56				3	
HSP	57			68							3	
MUL	60			70							2	
PAC												
WHT	64			76			77				4	
FRL	39			35							2	

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	67	63	41	63	60	35	67					
SWD	35	18		50	45							
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	66	70		59	55		64					
HSP	60			70								
MUL	86			85								
PAC												
WHT	65	63		59	64		71					
FRL	71	67		61	50							

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	66	67		62	55		71					
SWD	63			50								
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	73			46								
HSP	58			58								
MUL	57			71								
PAC												
WHT	66	60		66	50		67					
FRL	43			39								

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	63%	47%	16%	54%	9%
04	2023 - Spring	58%	50%	8%	58%	0%
03	2023 - Spring	50%	46%	4%	50%	0%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	82%	59%	23%	59%	23%
04	2023 - Spring	72%	58%	14%	61%	11%
05	2023 - Spring	52%	52%	0%	55%	-3%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	65%	48%	17%	51%	14%

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 which showed the lowest performance overall was our ELA Proficiency which decreased from 67% in 2022 to 58% in 2023. The contributing factors for this low-performance result could be the implementation of a new ELA curriculum (Benchmark Advanced); administration of the new FAST State Assessment which was now computer-based for the first time; 4th grade ELA Teacher was new to the grade level and the content as she was moved from Kindergarten.

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

3rd grade Reading Proficiency declined from 67% in 2022 to 50% in 2023. The contributing factors which led to this decline were the adoption and implementation of the new BEST Standards, and Benchmark Advance Curriculum. The curriculum materials were unaligned with the new FL BEST Standards. Much planning time was spent aligning the curriculum to the standards and creating aligned lessons, activities, and assessments.

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.

All of our FSA Assessment Data results components were above the state average, except our number of Level 2's in Math which was 19.7% versus the State's 18.2% according to the 2021-22 FSA Math Assessment Data Results. Some factors that may have contributed to the gap could be not enough focus on differentiated instruction based on student's identified needs based on math assessment data.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was our 3rd-grade and 4th-grade Math proficiency. When analyzing Spring FAST PM3 Math results (pre-evaluation of cut scores) 82% of 3rd graders, 72% of 4th graders scored proficient. Math teachers met with Region 1 Math Specialist Nicole Cannon and were introduced to Spiral Reviews and created Focus Calendars and followed the Unit Lesson Plans.

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

Upon reflection of the 2023 EWS data in Part I, I have identified the following 2 areas of concern:

1. That there are 12 students by current grade level who had two or more early warning indicators.
2. Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. totaled 26 in grades K-5.

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

1. Increase 2nd grade Reading Proficiency from 45% to 60%; 3rd grade Reading Proficiency from 50% to 55% and increase 4th grade Reading Proficiency from 58% to 63% on the 2024 FAST PM3 ELA Assessment.
2. Increase ELA Learning Gains from 63% to 64% and LPQ Gains from 41% to 56%.

3. Increase 5th-grade Math Proficiency from 52% to 60% and LPQ Gains from 35 to 56%.
4. Establish and effectively implement MTSS and CPST processes to support ESE Subgroups.
5. School-wide Implementation of PBIS strategies to become a PBIS model school.

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 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.

Increase Reading proficiency in 2nd through 5th grades. The data shows the need for increased proficiency across all grade levels in ELA. Furthermore, the low level of proficiency in these categories presents the need for remediation to achieve the gains necessary for students to show more than a year's worth of growth on the 23'-24' FAST PM3.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase 2nd-grade Reading Proficiency from 45% to 60%; 3rd-grade Reading Proficiency from 50% to 55% and increase 4th-grade Reading Proficiency from 58% to 63% on the 2024 FAST PM3 ELA Assessment.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring will occur on multiple levels. Using data from the '22-'23 school year and '23-'24 beginning-of-year assessments, students will be grouped according to their targeted needs. Teachers will meet on a weekly basis during common planning to review data, plan tiered instruction, and reevaluate student goals as needed. Data will be reviewed quarterly after each assessment given to reevaluate student goals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Beale-Collier (bealej@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.)

Kg-2nd: Continue implementation of UFLI (30 mins.) as well as teacher-led small groups and differentiated centers (40 mins.) 3rd-5th: Add 30 minutes per day of WIN time to master schedules to provide students with targeted intervention based on individual reading deficiencies identified on PM1.

Send all 3rd & 4th grade ELA teachers to UFLI training so they can use this intervention resource during a teacher-led, small group as needed.

Weekly common planning focused on embedding the 4 Principles of Learning into all core lesson plans.

VE Teacher will work with students on caseload who need Tier 2 & 3 support.

Data Chats with all ELA teachers after each new PM data set is received.

Create a walkthrough tool to use during small group instruction implementation to provide consistent teacher feedback on effective small group instruction.

Implement Instructional Rounding on a quarterly basis to determine the effectiveness of small group instruction.

Progress monitoring Student Assessment Data and School-wide Assessment Data are consistently analyzed, and intervention groups will be created based on students' identified needs i.e., Level 2 "Bubble" students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To increase proficiency, tier-one standards-based instruction will be the main priority. Teachers will use BEST Standards to plan/guide instruction using Benchmark Advance (ELA), and other research-based instructional tools. Students will be provided with tier-one support in all subjects and assessed regularly to ensure mastery of standards.

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.

While tier-one instruction remains a priority, small-group instruction will be the focus of this year's instructional goals. During common planning, staff will review data from a multitude of sources (FAST, STAR, District DMA, etc.) to group students based on specific needs. Teachers will design small-group instruction that targets these specific needs for remediation and enrichment. Data will be reviewed/analyzed on a consistent basis to ensure students are receiving the most appropriate tier 2 instruction.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Beale-Collier (bealej@duvalschools.org)

By When: May 2024

#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.

Increase ELA learning gains and LPQ gains through targeted small-group instruction. According to the Spring FAST PM3 ELA results (raw data) 50% of 3rd graders, 58% of 4th graders, and 62% of 5th graders scored proficient. The data shows the need for increased proficiency across all grade levels in ELA. Additionally, the low level of proficiency in these categories presents the need for remediation to achieve the gains necessary for students to show more than a year's worth of growth on the 23'-24' FAST PM3.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase ELA Learning Gains from 63% to 64% and ELA LPQ Gains from 41% to 56% in grades 4 & 5.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring will occur on multiple levels to include the use of student assessment data from the '22-'23 school year and '23-'24 beginning of year assessments. Then, students will be grouped according to their identified instructional needs. Teachers will meet on a weekly basis during common planning to review data, plan targeted tiered instruction, and re-evaluate student goals as needed. Student's assessment data will be reviewed and monitored after each assessment is administered given to reevaluate student goals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Beale-Collier (bealej@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.)

To increase learning and LPQ gains tier two standards-based instruction will be the main priority. Teachers will use the BEST standards to plan/guide instruction using Benchmark Advance (ELA), and other research-based instructional tools. Students will be provided with tier-two support in all subjects and assessed regularly to ensure mastery of standards. While tier-one instruction remains a priority, small-group instruction will be the focus of this year's instructional goals. During common planning, staff will review data from a multitude of sources (FAST, STAR, District DMA, etc.) to group students based on specific needs. Teachers will design small group instruction that targets these specific needs for remediation and enrichment. Data will be reviewed/analyzed on a consistent basis to ensure students are receiving the most appropriate tier 2 instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To best meet the needs of each individual student, a more targeted/intentional approach is needed. While tier one instruction will meet most needs to students who are on level, it does not provide the necessary time for targeted interventions. Data analysis, coupled with small group instruction provides a way for teachers to differentiate learning in a more focused setting, so that students needing remediation or enrichment can receive it on their own level. Resources to be used in this process will include Benchmark Advance Tiered Instruction tools, Measuring Up, Heggerty, UFLI, etc.

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. Review FAST PM3 data from the '22-'23 school year and target student needs.
2. With faculty, review student FAST PM assessment data and create beginning stages of small group plan including targeted skills and resources to be used.
3. Administer beginning of year assessments and review data.
4. Create initial student small groups and plan for instruction/assessment.
5. Re-evaluate instruction based on student assessments and plan accordingly.
6. Continue cycle during common planning sessions throughout year and adjust as needed

Person Responsible: Jennifer Beale-Collier (bealej@duvalschools.org)

By When: May 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.

Targeted Small Group instruction implementation. While tier-one instruction remains a priority, small-group instruction will be the focus of this year's instructional goals.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Weekly Admin. common planning focused on continuous progress monitoring of students' assessment data (informal/formal)

Monitoring:

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

During common planning, staff will review data from a multitude of sources (FAST, STAR, District DMA, etc.) to group students based on specific needs. Teachers will design small group instruction that targets these specific needs for remediation and enrichment. Data will be reviewed/analyzed on a consistent basis to ensure students are receiving the most appropriate Tier 2 instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Beale-Collier (bealej@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.)

Targeted Small Group Lesson plan development to ensure tasks and assessments are aligned to B.E.S.T standards. (Approved Form #9)

Teachers will work with small groups to provide remediation on the identified standards students show deficiencies in when scoring below 70% on an assessment. After re-teaching the identified skill or concept, students will be re-assessed and if mastery isn't achieved, the teacher will provide the students with additional remediation to ensure evidence of mastery of the standard(s) at 70% or above.

Progress Monitoring of student mastery of B.E.S.T ELA/Math and NGSS Standards

Implementation of Student Data Chats and progress monitoring to create ownership of their learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To best meet the needs of each individual student, a more targeted/intentional approach is needed. While tier one instruction will meet most needs to students who are on level, it does not provide the necessary time for targeted interventions. Data analysis, coupled with small group instruction provides a way for teachers to differentiate learning in a more focused setting, so that students needing remediation or enrichment can receive it on their own level. Resources to be used in this process will include Benchmark Advance Tiered Instruction tools, Reveal Math small group tools, Heggerty, UFLI, etc.

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

#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.

Due to our ATSI identification, we plan to successfully implement MTSS and CPST processes to support our ESE Subgroups. According to the 2022 Federal Percent of Points Index, the “students with disabilities” subgroup was identified as scoring below 41% for that year. This data shows an increased need for the targeted interventions stated in SIP Goal 1 and a reassessment of Anchor Academy’s MTSS/CPST Protocols. To do this, Anchor Academy will set in place MTSS (Multi-Tiered System of Supports) protocols that will review student data to identify the needs of the school, along with students requiring intervention. These students will in turn be monitored by the CPST (Collaborative Problem Solving Team) to assess the effectiveness of interventions and make adjustments as needed.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The goal of Implementing proper and consistent MTSS/CPST protocols will be to reduce the percentage of “students with disabilities” scoring below the federal index from 41% to 20%.

Monitoring:

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

The success of the goal itself will be monitored by the admin team (Principal/Assistant Principal). The execution of the MTSS/CPST protocols however will be monitored by the staff members who are a part of said teams. With the MTSS team being comprised mainly of the leadership team, the MTSS Team will meet weekly or bi-weekly to discuss schoolwide data trends as laid out in the MTSS protocols. Based on the analysis of trends, plans of action will be created to address concerns. These plans, along with their results will be discussed during each MTSS meeting. The CPST will operate on a similar schedule but will only be required to meet once a month during early release. The CPST will assist teachers in providing Tier 2/3 support to students requiring more targeted interventions, such as students falling into the “students with disabilities” subgroup. The CPST, however, can meet as much as needed depending on the caseload. Student progress will be monitored during each meeting to evaluate the efficacy of the interventions being prescribed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Adam Barr (barra2@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.)

The evidence-based strategy being used is the MTSS/CPST protocols themselves. The MTSS team is comprised of faculty members who usually hold some type of leadership capacity within the school. The team meets to analyze school-wide data pertaining to academics, behavior, attendance, or any other significant metric affecting the school. During meetings, the team looks for data trends and creates plans of action to address concerns. The CPST (Collaborative Problem-Solving Team) takes a narrower approach and is used to support teachers by providing help with Tier 2/3 interventions for students in need. The team is usually comprised of teachers, counselors, coaches, etc. During meetings, the CPST analyzes students’ data, pinpoints specific needs, and helps develop interventions to meet those needs. Students are monitored and plans are adjusted as needed.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

As stated above, the 2022 Federal Percent of Points Index specified that the success of students in the subgroup “students with disabilities” was an area of concern for Anchor Academy. Addressing this area of concern is of the utmost importance when considering the success of these students and how test scores will be calculated now that gains are factored in. Initiating Duval County Public Schools’ MTSS/CPST protocols will help shift focus to a more data driven approach to addressing school wide and student specific deficits.

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. During pre-planning, meet with school staff to discuss MTSS/CPST protocols. Ensure all staff members are aware of the differences between the two and how each team operates.
2. Give opportunities for staff to join each team and set dates for initial meetings. Ensure Admin has given each team the necessary resources to operate.
3. Upon start of school year, ensure teams are meeting at selected times and protocols are being followed.
4. In faculty emails, meetings, etc., remind faculty of the MTSS/CPST process and protocols to ensure teachers understand they are a beneficial resource.
5. Re-evaluate the effectiveness of implementation at least quarterly to ensure teams/resources are being utilized efficiently.

Person Responsible: Adam Barr (barra2@duvalschools.org)

By When: May 2024

#5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Implement PBIS strategies to become a 2023-2024 PBIS Model School.

According to referral data from the '22-'23 school year, a total of 14 disciplinary referrals were written. The top two categories of referrals were coded as "teasing/intimidation/ridicule" and "intentionally striking a student." With the physical/emotional safety of students being a top priority as seen from our 5 Essentials results, embracing Positive Behavior Intervention Strategies by becoming a PBIS Model School will help to decrease unwanted student behaviors by creating a positive teacher/student school culture.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The goal of implementing PBIS strategies to become a PBIS Model School will be to decrease referrals in the areas of "teasing/intimidation/ridicule" and "intentionally striking a student" by 50%. The goal will also hope to increase the percentage of positive responses in the domains of "student safety" and "student teacher trust" on the 5 Essentials survey for the '23-'24 school year.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring of the overall PBIS Model School Process will occur in the beginning, middle, and end of the school year based on the timeline provided by the Florida PBIS Project. Specific dates for Model School deliverables will be provided once they are decided upon by the Florida PBIS Project. The MTSS team will review behavior data and completion of PBIS model school deliverables in weekly/bi-weekly meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Adam Barr (barra2@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.)

The implementation of Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports such as our Silver & Golden Anchor Programs and other student incentives programs, provides a way for schools to build positive school culture by implementing positive, proactive, and data-driven behavioral supports. It creates an environment where the behavioral success of students becomes the priority, instead of the implementation of rigid disciplinary measures.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

As stated above, student responses to the 5 Essentials survey in the domains of "student safety" and "student/teacher trust" trended in a negative direction. Furthermore, referral data shows that most referrals were coded in areas related to student safety. Using the PBIS Project's plan for PBIS implementation will help to create support systems that address these specific needs. Tier 1 strategies will help positively address the whole school through visuals, student engagement, reward systems, etc. Tier 2 and tier 3 interventions created/monitored by the MTSS/CPST teams will help address specific issues and find positive resolutions to issues that can prevent future situations from occurring.

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. (B.O.Y.) Complete PBIS Plan and Discipline flow chart. Share with faculty to gain insight and input.
2. (B.O.Y.) Ensure MTSS/CPST team is included in PBIS plan implementation.
3. (B.O.Y.) Complete FALL PIC to ensure implementation of PBIS plan and make changes where necessary.
4. (M.O.Y.) Review discipline data and implement interventions for Tier 2/3 students.
5. (M.O.Y.) Use the Problem-Solving Process to analyze the effectiveness of school wide systems.
6. (M.O.Y.) Use walkthrough document to assure the building is an environment that supports all students and families.
7. (E.O.Y.) Schedule Model School Walkthrough
8. (E.O.Y.) Submit BoQ Tier 2 & 3 TFI
9. (E.O.Y.) Prepare for Model School Application

Person Responsible: Adam Barr (barra2@duvalschools.org)

By When: May 2024

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

The process used to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs are presented to our Shared Decision-Making Team and then our School Advisory Council for voting and approval.

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

Based on 22/23 FAST EOY data, second grade was the only grade level where 54% of students scored below the 40th percentile on their EOY ELA FAST assessment. This lack of performance was due to a variety of factors, with the major ones being lack of phonics/reading ability and lack comprehension skills. With deficiencies in these literacy areas, the groups of students scoring below the 40th percentile will already be entering third grade at a disadvantage.

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

N/A

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

With 54% of second grade students from the previous year scoring below the 40th percentile on their EOY ELA FAST assessment, the goal will be to move from 54% to 34%. More specifically, our goal will be to increase overall phonics ability so that at least 80% of second graders are on a second grade reading level.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

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.

Monitoring of our area of focus will occur three times a year in the form of the FAST PM1, PM2, and PM3 Star Reading assessments. These assessments will give an overall view of students performance in all reading domains. There will also be weekly assessment of phonics skills in the form of UFLI progress monitoring.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Barr, Adam, barra2@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?

Our goal will be addressed in a two fold approach. Second grade teachers will implement the UFLI program to address phonics skills/ability. Teachers will provide daily UFLI instruction which addresses all areas of phonological awareness and phonics. Teachers will also implement targeted small group instruction. Using data gained from UFLI, state/district assessments, and classroom assessments, teachers will group students based on specific needs. Teachers will then provide instruction which targets those specific needs in small groups. Teachers will also monitor progress of these small groups to make sure the groups remain fluid.

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?

Phonics skills are the cornerstone of student's ability to read. Implementing UFLI and targeted small group instruction will allow teachers to address each student's specific phonological needs. Addressing these needs will create more fluent readers which will in turn help increase students ability to comprehend what they read.

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
<p>Literacy Leadership: A literacy leadership team will be created and be composed of at least three team members. The team members will be an ELA teacher, a VE teacher, and a member of administration. The team will meet on a monthly basis to discuss ELA instruction across the school, assessment results, and monitor progress of UFLI/Small Group Instruction. The team will also provide guidance to ELA teachers when necessary.</p>	<p>Beale-Collier, Jennifer, bealej@duvalschools.org</p>
<p>While we do not have a literacy coach, the administrative team will provide literacy coaching during common planning each week. Teachers will meet at least once a week in common planning to discuss ELA instruction, UFLI progress, and small group instruction. The admin team will help plan instruction, observe the instruction that is implemented, and provide feedback.</p>	<p>Barr, Adam, barra2@duvalschools.org</p>
<p>Students will be assessed in three different ways. First, students will take the FAST PM assessment three times throughout the year to assess overall reading abilities. Second, students will be assessed using DIBELs for initial UFLI placements. There are also weekly UFLI progress monitoring assessments. Last, small group instruction will be assessed weekly to ensure efficacy of small group instruction and fluidity of small groups.</p>	<p>Barr, Adam, barra2@duvalschools.org</p>
<p>Teachers will receive professional development on a regular basis throughout the year. Common planning will happen on a weekly basis where all teachers will be asked to meet with the admin team to discuss instruction. Teachers are also expected to attend monthly PD sessions provided by regional specialists.</p>	<p>Barr, Adam, barra2@duvalschools.org</p>