

Duval County Public Schools

# Westview K 8 School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>                                   | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>I. School Information</b>                                       | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>                            | <b>9</b>  |
| <b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>                               | <b>14</b> |
| <b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>                       | <b>24</b> |
| <b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b> | <b>24</b> |
| <b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>                                    | <b>27</b> |
| <b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>                       | <b>0</b>  |

## Westview K 8

5270 CONNIE JEAN RD, Jacksonville, FL 32210

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

### 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),<br>(7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B)<br>ESSA 1116(b-g) |                        |

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

## I. School Information

### School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement.**

The mission of Westview K-8 is to develop life-long learners using the best teaching practices and involving all stakeholders in creating an environmentally conscious community promoting green practices.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

The vision of Westview K-8 is to create an environmentally responsible and diverse learning community in which all stakeholders effectively collaborate to enhance student achievement and create life-long learners.

### 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   |
|----------------|---------------------|---|
| Griffin, Jamie | Principal           | The principal oversees all operational aspects and development and management of school faculty and staff. They create a safe learning environment and set performance goals for students and teachers, and actively monitors the process so that the goals are attained. They ensure academic policies and curriculum are adhered to while also tracking benchmarks for measuring the success of the school. |
| Barnes, Vicki  | Assistant Principal | To assist the principal in completing all administrative tasks that include building management, leading and monitoring instruction, and facilitating the adult learning that impacts student achievement.  |

**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.

Stakeholder involvement is vital with our creation of the School Improvement Plan. The initial process began with the feedback and reflection from faculty and staff on the strengths and weaknesses of the previous year, a review of previous and most recent data, and the creation of goals and instructional strategies to correct the areas of opportunity observed. This included the leadership team and academic

council. Once established, our school PTSA/SAC teams will also have an opportunity to provide input on strategies for student achievement improvement.

**SIP Monitoring**

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

The school improvement plan will be updated on a consistent basis. This will allow the administration team and instructional support personnel the opportunity to monitor progress towards established goals and make adjustments as necessary, real time. We will revisit the progress of goals and the outlined implementation of instructional strategies determined by all stakeholders. We will review all available student data points and provide appropriate supports to students displaying instructional gaps. The school improvement plan will be updated at the conclusion of the 1st, 2nd and 3rd nine weeks.

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

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2023-24 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Combination School<br>PK-8  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>   | Yes   |
| <b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>   | 85%   |
| <b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>   | 100%  |
| <b>Charter School</b>  | No  |
| <b>RAISE School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>ESSA Identification</b><br>*updated as of 3/11/2024   | ATSI  |
| <b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>  | No  |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)<br>English Language Learners (ELL)*<br>Asian Students (ASN)<br>Black/African American Students (BLK)<br>Hispanic Students (HSP)<br>Multiracial Students (MUL)<br>White Students (WHT)<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| <b>School Grades History</b><br>*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.  | 2021-22: B<br>2019-20: D<br>2018-19: D<br>2017-18: C  |
| <b>School Improvement Rating History</b>   |   |
| <b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>   |   |

## 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           | 82 | 80 | 74 | 91 | 56 | 54 | 61 | 53 | 551   |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 3  | 10 | 11 | 9  | 22 | 29 | 36 | 46 | 166   |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 7  | 0  | 0  | 1  | 1  | 1  | 10    |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 6  | 0  | 1  | 1  | 2  | 8  | 18    |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 3  | 66 | 47 | 69 | 79 | 67 | 331   |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 2  | 46 | 35 | 62 | 42 | 42 | 229   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 4           | 63 | 80 | 70 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 217   |

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           | 41 | 59 | 54 | 58 | 50 | 70 | 70 | 63 | 465   |

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

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 2 | 2 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 19    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 6     |

### 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0     |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0     |
| Course failure in ELA   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0     |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0     |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0     |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0     |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0     |



**The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0     |

**The number of students identified retained:**

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

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

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

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

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

**The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0     |

**The number of students identified retained:**

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

**II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**

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

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

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

| Accountability Component        | 2023   |          |       | 2022   |          |       | 2021   |          |       |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                                 | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement*                | 31     | 45       | 53    | 33     | 47       | 55    | 30     |          |       |
| ELA Learning Gains              |        |          |       | 51     |          |       | 35     |          |       |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile      |        |          |       | 51     |          |       | 32     |          |       |
| Math Achievement*               | 49     | 46       | 55    | 43     | 40       | 42    | 39     |          |       |
| Math Learning Gains             |        |          |       | 61     |          |       | 49     |          |       |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile     |        |          |       | 73     |          |       | 58     |          |       |
| Science Achievement*            | 32     | 45       | 52    | 30     | 45       | 54    | 24     |          |       |
| Social Studies Achievement*     | 74     | 62       | 68    | 71     | 50       | 59    | 44     |          |       |
| Middle School Acceleration      | 74     | 73       | 70    | 92     | 45       | 51    | 89     |          |       |
| Graduation Rate                 |        | 72       | 74    |        | 41       | 50    |        |          |       |
| College and Career Acceleration |        | 54       | 53    |        | 65       | 70    |        |          |       |
| ELP Progress                    | 27     | 47       | 55    | 53     | 68       | 70    | 24     |          |       |

*\* 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           | 45   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 3    |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 318  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 7    |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index |     |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Percent Tested             | 100 |
| Graduation Rate            |     |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index                     |      |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)               | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students           | 56   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 1    |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 558  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 10   |
| 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                                | 24                              | Yes                | 1   | 1   |
| ELL                                | 36                              | Yes                | 4   |   |
| AMI                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| ASN                                | 54                              |                    |   |   |
| BLK                                | 46                              |                    |   |   |
| HSP                                | 46                              |                    |   |   |
| MUL                                | 36                              | Yes                | 1   |   |
| PAC                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| WHT                                | 56                              |                    |   |   |
| FRL                                | 42                              |                    |   |   |

| 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                                | 43                              |                    |   |   |
| ELL                                | 38                              | Yes                | 3   |   |
| AMI                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| ASN                                | 73                              |                    |   |   |
| BLK                                | 56                              |                    |   |   |
| HSP                                | 48                              |                    |   |   |
| MUL                                | 57                              |                    |   |   |
| PAC                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| WHT                                | 57                              |                    |   |   |
| FRL                                | 54                              |                    |   |   |

**Accountability Components by Subgroup**

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

| 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
|--|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|--------------|
| Subgroups                                      | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
| All Students                                   | 31       |        |             | 49        |         |              | 32       | 74      | 74        |                   |                     | 27           |
| SWD  | 17       |        |             | 35        |         |              | 16       | 40      |           |                   | 5                   |              |
| ELL  | 13       |        |             | 33        |         |              | 25       | 82      |           |                   | 5                   | 27           |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  | 43       |        |             | 64        |         |              |          |         |           |                   | 2                   |              |
| BLK  | 30       |        |             | 46        |         |              | 29       | 70      | 72        |                   | 6                   |              |
| HSP  | 31       |        |             | 49        |         |              | 33       | 83      | 70        |                   | 7                   | 29           |
| MUL  | 19       |        |             | 53        |         |              |          |         |           |                   | 2                   |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 38       |        |             | 60        |         |              | 56       | 80      |           |                   | 5                   |              |
| FRL  | 29       |        |             | 45        |         |              | 31       | 65      | 72        |                   | 7                   | 19           |

| 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                                   | 33       | 51     | 51          | 43        | 61      | 73           | 30       | 71      | 92        |                   |                     | 53           |
| SWD  | 22       | 48     | 53          | 37        | 64      | 71           | 26       | 37      |           |                   |                     | 27           |
| ELL  | 15       | 34     | 29          | 34        | 56      | 68           | 10       | 40      |           |                   |                     | 53           |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  | 55       |        |             | 91        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  | 30       | 50     | 55          | 40        | 61      | 78           | 25       | 70      | 91        |                   |                     |              |
| HSP  | 31       | 52     | 43          | 39        | 62      | 66           | 27       | 57      |           |                   |                     | 53           |
| MUL  | 45       | 58     |             | 58        | 74      |              | 50       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 41       | 57     | 55          | 52        | 60      | 71           | 44       | 79      |           |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  | 31       | 50     | 54          | 42        | 61      | 74           | 30       | 66      | 86        |                   |                     | 46           |

| 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                                   | 30       | 35     | 32          | 39        | 49      | 58           | 24       | 44      | 89        |                   |                     | 24           |
| SWD  | 22       | 30     | 29          | 34        | 50      | 60           | 23       | 20      |           |                   |                     |              |
| ELL  | 7        | 31     | 32          | 22        | 52      | 56           | 21       |         |           |                   |                     | 24           |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  | 50       |        |             | 100       |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  | 27       | 31     | 29          | 34        | 47      | 58           | 20       | 39      | 89        |                   |                     |              |
| HSP  | 27       | 32     | 37          | 32        | 45      | 62           | 30       |         |           |                   |                     | 25           |
| MUL  | 41       | 45     |             | 53        | 55      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 39       | 42     | 32          | 49        | 51      | 54           | 28       | 58      |           |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  | 27       | 34     | 34          | 35        | 46      | 55           | 21       | 47      | 87        |                   |                     | 35           |

**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 | 24%    | 47%      | -23%                       | 54%   | -30%                    |
| 07    | 2023 - Spring | 35%    | 40%      | -5%                        | 47%   | -12%                    |
| 08    | 2023 - Spring | 24%    | 41%      | -17%                       | 47%   | -23%                    |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 32%    | 50%      | -18%                       | 58%   | -26%                    |
| 06    | 2023 - Spring | 20%    | 38%      | -18%                       | 47%   | -27%                    |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 26%    | 46%      | -20%                       | 50%   | -24%                    |

| MATH  |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06    | 2023 - Spring | 41%    | 43%      | -2%                        | 54%   | -13%                    |
| 07    | 2023 - Spring | 52%    | 40%      | 12%                        | 48%   | 4%                      |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 56%    | 59%      | -3%                        | 59%   | -3%                     |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 55%    | 58%      | -3%                        | 61%   | -6%                     |
| 08    | 2023 - Spring | 36%    | 45%      | -9%                        | 55%   | -19%                    |
| 05    | 2023 - Spring | 36%    | 52%      | -16%                       | 55%   | -19%                    |

| SCIENCE |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade   | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08      | 2023 - Spring | 28%    | 35%      | -7%                        | 44%   | -16%                    |
| 05      | 2023 - Spring | 29%    | 48%      | -19%                       | 51%   | -22%                    |

| ALGEBRA |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade   | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A     | 2023 - Spring | 79%    | 52%      | 27%                        | 50%   | 29%                     |

| CIVICS |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|--------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade  | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A    | 2023 - Spring | 73%    | 63%      | 10%                        | 66%   | 7%                      |

### 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 areas that show the greatest need of improvement are: Language Arts Proficiency and Science Proficiency. The previous achievement spiral and virtual learning set back (created by the global pandemic) has significant contribution to the lower performing proficiencies. Vacancies in both content areas previously also contributed to a lack of continuity in instruction.

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

ELA in grades 4 and 6 showed the greatest decline when compared to the previous year achievement. Grade 4 ELA declined from a 48% to a 32% and grade 6 ELA declined from a 35% to 20% achievement proficiency. Teacher attendance and multiple vacancies contributed to this decline.

**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.**

ELA achievement is the data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the states average. The State average is 50% proficiency, the district's average is 46% proficiency and our school's proficiency is 30%. This is a 20% proficiency gap when comparing the school to the state's average. Teacher attendance and ELA teacher vacancies attributed to this gap and the overall 2% decline in ELA, when compared to ELA proficiency last year. Significant declines in grades 4 and 6.

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

The mathematics proficiency showed the most improvement when compared to the proficiency of the previous school year. Proficiency increased from 43% in the 2021-2022 academic year, to a 54% proficiency in 2022-2023. The implementation of standards-based instruction and aligned instructional resources contributed to the improvement in mathematics. The mathematics department planned collaboratively.

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

As we reflect on the EWS data, there are at least two areas of concern that we must work to address.

- The quantity of students absents 10% or more days, and
- The number of students with a substantial reading deficiency.

These number significantly affect our progress with literacy, which is a number one priority.

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

Our highest priorities for school improvement this year are:

- 1) Focus on literacy schoolwide, emphasis placed on grades 2nd, 3rd, 5th and 7th grade students at the very least. Increase overall student achievement in ELA to at least 35% overall.
- 2) Ensure the consist implementation of phonemic awareness at the primary level (grades K, 1 & 2) and comprehension at all levels in ELA
- 3) Ensure consistent and standards aligned science instruction with lab activities in all grades.
- 4) Increase acceleration to 90% or higher and maintain progress in mathematics in all areas at the very

least.

5) Significantly reduce the number of students absent 10% or more days.

**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.

In review of the FAST data, ELA is identified as a critical area. Language Arts instruction will use the new state standards and curriculum resources to improve academic proficiency by at least 5%. A school-wide literacy focus will inevitably increase achievement in other areas.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

ELA declined in achievement 3% when compared to the previous year. ELA proficiency has to be increased to at least a 35% overall proficiency. A 5% increase for the 2023-24 academic year is accessible with the implementation of the new standards, the consistent monitoring of all assessment data, and the implementation of small group instruction with fidelity.

**Monitoring:**

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

This area of focus will be monitored using, walkthrough observation, feedback and data collection, standards-based assessments within the curricula and the tri-FAST assessments data. Our administrative team, academic counsel, district support specialist, and teachers will monitor student progress and student data regularly.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jamie Griffin (griffinj1@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.)

Data Driven Lesson Planning: Understanding where students are with mastery of standards, using data from informal and formal assessments, planning clear objectives, implementation, and checking for understanding when lesson planning.

Small Group/Differentiated Instruction: Based on data, breaking groups of students into smaller groups to ensure Tier II support is given. Not all students are on the same level, but all standards must reach mastery.

Small group instruction will allow teachers to meet students at their level to support their needs.

Progress Monitoring: Ensuring whole group lessons, interventions, and assessments are done with fidelity. Checking effectiveness from student data.

Instructional Reviews with Action Plans: Collecting data from classrooms in real time and providing immediate and clear feedback for teachers and school leadership teams to work together to ensure effectiveness and continuous instructional improvement (Project LEAD.)

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Strategy:

Data-driven Lesson Planning: Effective lesson planning requires teachers to determine three essential

components such as the objective, the implementation, and a reflection.  
<https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/howtoplan-effective-lessons>

Small Group/Differentiated Instruction: Small group instruction is the key to data-driven results and is the gateway to meeting the needs of all learners.  
<https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/turn-small-reading-groups-intobigwins>

Progress Monitoring: Student progress monitoring helps teachers evaluate how effective their instruction is, either for individual students or for the entire class. <https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/how-studentprogressmonitoringimproves-instruction>

Instructional Reviews with Action Plans: The implementation review is a plan designed to:  
1) recognize accomplishments,  
2) track actions,  
3) measure implementation impact,  
4) evaluate the plan,  
5) determine next steps. It may be used by the school alone or with the assistance of the support lead.  
<https://institutionalresearch.syr.edu/what-we-do/student-ratings/creatingan-action-plan/action-plan-teachingstrategies/>

#### **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.

Title I funds will be used to add supplemental personnel (teachers, math and reading interventionists, dean) or supplemental materials to provide classroom instruction, specialized instruction and additional support to increase student achievement. Title I funds will also be used for tutoring funds as well as purchase technology to support instruction. Additional action steps include:

- Ensure teachers are equipped and comfortable with outlined instructional strategies.
- Provide quality professional learning during early release days and common planning that address instructional delivery opportunities observed.
- Frequently explore content training offered by the district content leaders and recommend those opportunities to build teacher capacity.

**Person Responsible:** Jamie Griffin ([griffinj1@duvalschools.org](mailto:griffinj1@duvalschools.org))

**By When:** Ongoing

## #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

BEST math standards K-8 and new BEST ELA standards 3-8, it is critical we focus on understanding the benchmarks and prioritize professional development around planning and delivery and data analysis towards benchmarks. Instructional practice specifically relating to standards-aligned instruction will focus on supporting teachers with researched-based practices that follow state adopted standards within core and assessed content areas.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

- By October 2023, at least 75% of teachers will provide students with instruction and tasks that are standards-aligned. By April 2024, 85-95%- of teachers will provide students with instruction and tasks that are standards aligned.
- In ELA, district and state assessments data, and blended learning computer-assisted instructional program reports, will be utilized as predictors towards a 35-40% proficiency goal, 55-60% growth, and 55-60% LPQ gains.
- In Math, district and state assessments data, and blended learning computer-assisted instructional program reports, will be used as predictors towards a 55-60% proficiency goal, 60-65% growth, and 65-70% LPQ gains.
- In Science, district and Penda assessments will be used as predictors towards a 35-40% proficiency goal.
- In Civics, common assessment data will be used as a predictor towards 75-80% of students performing at or above proficiency.
- In Algebra 1 common assessment data will be used as a predictor towards 85-90% of students performing at or above proficiency.

### Monitoring:

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

The Area of Focus will be monitored weekly through data chats with teachers during common planning, data chats with students, and leadership meetings. We will also monitor through ongoing weekly walk throughs and observations and coaching cycles.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Vicki Barnes (barnesv@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.)

Great administrative involvement in common planning & Professional Learning Communities is paramount for school improvement.

1. Our weekly common planning sessions will be focused on standards-based planning, tiered differentiated activities/tasks, student work analysis protocols, development of common assessments, and analysis of formative data. Teachers will collaborate in the production of Standards-based lesson plans/activities during these sessions.
2. Our professional learning community sessions will be driven by the mission of building the capacity and practices of our faculty. Each PLC session will be focused on improving both instructional practices and student achievement goals.
- 3) Our administrative and instructional coaches will engage calibrated monitoring, observations, feedback and developmentally appropriate supports of teachers' Standards based planning, implementation of instruction and practices towards student achievement.

The supplemental support (positions) we will receive from our Title I funds (Social Studies Teacher, Math Interventionist, Math Coach, Reading Coaches, Dean of Students, Paraprofessional Elementary, Paraprofessional ESOL, Librarian (PT), and Parent Involvement Liaison (PT) will directly support and impact the implementation of the action steps below.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teacher efficacy and practice thrive when they have dedicated and consistent opportunities to collaborate and develop their instructional planning, practices, and impact on student grade level content area achievement. Collaboration and data analysis are key to success and necessary for tracking progress.

**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.

The following action steps will be implemented:

- 1) Instructional Coaches will provide tiered support during weekly grade level sessions.
- 2) Instructional Coaches will complete weekly classroom walks as follow up support of the planning sessions in efforts to continuously calibrate teacher needs, next steps, and potential coaching cycle efforts.
- 3) Administrators will conduct weekly instructional reviews with teachers.
- 4) Administrators and instructional coaches will identify professional development needs during their weekly calibration meetings.
- 5) Administrators and instructional coaches will develop professional learning focuses and implementation calendar.
- 6) Administrators and Instructional coaches will facilitate and/or seek external experts to provide professional development learning sessions.
- 7) Administrators and instructional coaches will develop tiered teacher support plans weekly.
- 8) Administrators will participate in a weekly common planning review with each core content area teacher to provide feedback and next steps on standards-based planning and practice.

**Person Responsible:** Vicki Barnes (barnesv@duvalschools.org)

**By When:** By October 2023 and ongoing.

### #3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

#### 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.

Our ESSA subgroup for ELLs is at 0% proficiency for the FAST-Reading assessment. When compared to the FSA reading assessment from the previous year, this subgroup declined 2%. Our ELL population is rapidly increasing as we are over 10% ESOL at Westview PK-8.

#### Measurable Outcome:

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

Our ESOL subgroup will move above 43% as it pertains to Florida expectations. 100% of Westview teachers will know how to modify lessons and grading to accommodate ESOL students. Students will increase to at least 5% proficiency on the ELA FAST-Reading.

#### Monitoring:

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

We will monitor reading and writing progress for this subgroup using WIDA, and district and FAST assessments.

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jamie Griffin (griffinj1@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.)

We will hire multiple ESOL paras to support instruction and planning. More professional learning opportunities will be available for teachers to build their capacity to support our ESOL students instructionally.

#### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students especially at WIDA level 1 and 2 levels benefit from direct language support and clustering in schedules. ESOL students struggling with course content will benefit significantly from push-in language support and intervention.

#### 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.

Greater student achievement will occur when:

- 1) Increased instructional strategies will be shared with all core teachers more consistently.
- 2) More professional learning opportunities will be presented to all faculty.
- 3) ESOL students will also have content related intervention opportunities.
- 4) Data for our ESOL subgroup will be discussed with other academic data on a consistent basis.

5) Additional support from district ESOL supports and computer assisted instruction opportunities will be explored frequently.

**Person Responsible:** Jamie Griffin (griffinj1@duvalschools.org)

**By When:** By November 2023.

#### #4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

##### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

At Westview K-8 School, we will address building a positive school culture and environment involving all stakeholders by implementing best practice activities and strategies. The number of students absent 10% or more days, and the number of students with a substantial reading deficiency must be significantly reduced.

##### Measurable Outcome:

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

The number of students absent 10% or more days will be decreased by 10% overall. The number of students with a substantial reading deficiency will be reduced by 5%. Both goals will be obtained by June 2024.

##### Monitoring:

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

Student attendance data will be discussed every nine weeks. School counselors and the administrative team will monitor data on a consistent basis, contact parents, and offer support to students that develop a concerning path or negative attendance trend.

All literacy data will be reviewed from all assessments. We will more consistently monitor achievement data of students at the primary level and offer immediate supports and intervention. The adoption of a supplemental phonics curriculum will be implemented with fidelity, as we work to ensure students can decode and read before the academic year concludes.

##### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Vicki Barnes (barnesv@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 intervention being implemented is as follows:

- 1) Create a welcoming and engaging environment
- 2) Develop and enforce a student attendance policy
- 3) Connect with at-risk students
- 4) Involve parents when addressing poor attendance

##### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

- 1) Create a welcoming and engaging environment - Establishing the right school climate can start at the class door with greetings and extend to bringing students together in a circle to talk through problems and conflict.
- 2) Develop and enforce a student attendance policy - Such a policy is useful when chronic absence is a school-wide problem because it'll monitor school attendance, establish the root cause of chronic absence, and address it.
- 3) Connect with at-risk students - As a school, we might identify chronically absent students and build a relationship to understand the underlying problem. These students might be undergoing life experiences that require a solid school connection to solve.
- 4) Involve parents when addressing poor attendance - Family problems like divorce and financial instability, may put stress on a student's emotions and cause them to lose focus or act out at school.



**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**

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

- 1) Monitor the attendance data at least every nine weeks and reach out to the parents of all students absent 8% or more days by the fourth week of each grading period.
- 2) Coordinate with district ELA support and DOE Literacy support to plan a cohesive reading plan for Westview including vision for reading intervention, professional development scope and sequence, and ongoing progress monitoring systems.

**Person Responsible:** Vicki Barnes (barnesv@duvalschools.org)

**By When:** By October 2023

**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).

Prior to the distribution of allocated school improvement funding, it is imperative that a comprehensive needs assessment is completed based on assessment results and the desired goals to be achieved. One must focus on the priorities to improve instruction, and the resources necessary to achieve all established goals. An action plan should be established, which outlines the steps to take to reach those established goals. We look at the amount allocated, prioritize actionable goals, then determine how to achieve all goals and the supports necessary to get the most impact for success. We must be strategic with planning. By linking assessments, strategic planning, and budgeting processes, results are better utilized, strategic plans reflect the real needs and priorities of the institution, and resources are distributed more effectively.

**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

In grades Kindergarten through 2nd grade, students will be actively involved in and monitored in letter sounds, letter knowledge, and sight words (FRY Words) to promote fluent and comprehensive reading in addition to the use of Benchmark Advance curriculum that is aligned to the Florida B.E.S.T. Standards. Teachers and students will also utilize UFLI Foundations intensive small group interventions. Students will also be completing i-Ready blended learning to boost their reading proficiency in phonemic awareness, vocabulary, fluency, phonics and comprehension.

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

In grades 3 through 5, students will be actively engaged in evidence-based literacy instruction aligned to the Florida B.E.S.T standards using Benchmark Advanced while utilizing UFLI Foundations for intensive small group instruction. Students will also be utilizing Freckle and i-Ready for supplemental and intervention support to boost their reading proficiency, particularly in phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension.

### 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

ELA Proficiency was identified as a critical need based on our end of the year assessment data. There was a severe deficiency in these grade levels. Student achievement in reading impacts a student's overall achievement and academic success in all subjects at school. 80% of Kinder through 2nd grade students should meet proficiency to progress to the next grade level. 100% of teachers will plan and

deliver standards aligned lessons in alignment to the BEST standards to support ELA and RAISE goals. KG through 2nd graders will make stretch growth as measured by iReady in reading and math.

### Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

ELA Proficiency was identified as a critical need based on FAST Assessment data. There was a severe deficiency in these grade levels. Student achievement in reading impacts a student's overall achievement and academic success in all subjects at school. As compared to the 2022-2023 State Assessment Data, 75% of all students grades 3-5 should have, according to the state goals, met a level 3 or higher. Reading overall proficiency will move to at least 35%.

## 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.

ELA Progress Monitoring will be monitored by analyzing benchmark assessment data to determine trends and deficiencies. Targeted intervention will occur based on patterns of deficiencies identified. We will use iReady and UFLI Foundations, along with Benchmark Advanced to determine growth and proficiency. Weekly standard walkthroughs will monitor teacher planning and instructional delivery.

### Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Griffin, Jamie, griffinj1@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?

1. Guided Reading aligned to student data including UFLI lesson guidelines to include extension tasks and core curricula resources
2. Fluency and comprehension instruction and progress monitoring including core reading instruction that adheres to the depth and rigor of the Florida BEST Standards
3. Modeling specific skills for students to master during core reading instruction, differentiated small group instruction, and core writing instruction using Benchmark Advanced's writing component
4. Daily differentiated literacy centers including the use of leveled libraries and data driven lessons according to curricula guidelines that include extension task
5. Admin and student data chats
6. After-School Tutoring

- 7. Appropriate use of technology to support instruction, including blended learning programs Daily Usage, I-Station
  - Daily Usage, and I-Ready lessons to remediate Tier II and Tier III skills daily.
- 8. Use of small group interventions and instructions for Tier II and Tier III as well as ELL and ESE students using Benchmark Advanced using B.E.S.T. standards.
- 9. Weekly common planning sessions which focus on standards-based planning and delivery methods in alignment to highly effective teaching
- 10. Monthly PD that focuses on vertical alignment (planning) and PLCs which focus on instructional delivery

**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?

Research shows that guided reading and differentiated instruction improve student achievement in reading. According to Fountas & Pinnell guided reading and small group teaching for differentiated instruction in reading is an effective strategy for increasing student reading achievement. The United States Department of Education's "Use of Technology in Teaching and Learning" states that technology ushers in fundamental structural changes that can be integral to increasing student engagement and motivation and accelerating learning.

**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             |
|--|---|
| 1) Ensure Literacy Training of Benchmark Advanced using B.E.S.T. standards from Benchmark Advanced<br>2) Provide continuous support via Literacy Coaching from Literacy Coaches/ Interventionists (school based and District office)<br>3) Conduct timely and appropriate assessments using common teacher assessments, along with STAR and FAST assessments<br>4) Pursue professional learning opportunities about UFLI best practices from District support, ensure teachers obtain understanding of grade level standards and course content. | Griffin, Jamie,<br>griffinj1@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.

Ensuring the school improvement plan is our working plan is vital. The SIP will be provided to all faculty and staff members. We will revisit the SIP and the strategies imbedded within it at least three times an academic year. Copies of the SIP and additional feedback will be extracted and shared with our PTA and SAC committees. Copies will be made available in our parent resource room and posted where parents can have access. We will explore opportunities to have the SIP translated into the Spanish language. The SIP will also be accessible online for the community to review and contribute if they desire.

**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))

**Student Involvement:**

The implementation of the Schoolwide PBIS Plan will increase positive interactions and relationships between students and staff members. Weekly, monthly, and quarterly incentives will be used to promote academic and social accomplishments.

**Parent Involvement:**

A Parent Liaison is on campus every day and ensures that any and all parent needs are addressed and that information and Title 1 funded resources are available to parents as needed.

Bloomz, Newsletters, and/or School Messenger Robo Calls will be used to ensure that information related to school and parent programs are properly disseminated to update parents on a consistent basis.

**Community Involvement:**

Westview PK-8 will include business partners, faith-based partners & community leaders to participate and be active members in school events and SAC meetings. As a result, the community will be involved and granted a voice at Westview PK-8.

**Teacher Involvement:**

Along with teacher accomplishment being recognize by the school and the principal as they occur at Westview PK-8. "Lunch and Learns" will occur. These meeting along with PLC's will provide teachers with opportunities to increase and gain knowledge in his/her pedagogy causing an increase in confidence as an instructional leader for our students. Teachers and staff will use the improvement of the Intake and

Dismissal procedures to assist in being more efficient for all stakeholders both at Westview PK-8 and in the community.

**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)**

There is great academic progress in Westview PK-8. There are always ways to continuously improve. The following plans will strengthen the academic program in our school:

- 1) Implement strategic planning weekly at all grade and content levels.
- 2) Support instruction through the use of instructional coaches at each content (ELA/ Reading, math and science)
- 3) Monitoring student progress and achievement data based on district and school created assessments that are aligned to state standards and with achievement level descriptors.
- 4) Ensure small group instruction and interventions are intentional and data driven.

**If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))**

Not Applicable at this time.