Arlington Heights Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Arlington Heights Elementary School

1520 SPRINKLE DR, Jacksonville, FL 32211

http://www.duvalschools.org/ahe

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.

Every student is inspired and prepared for success in college or a career, and life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To provide educational excellence in every school, in every classroom, for every student, every day.

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
Scott, Vondeira	Principal	
Augustine, Dorothy	Instructional Coach	
Jenkins, Jacquelyn	Assistant Principal	

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.

All stakeholders are given an opportunity to provide input regarding the development of the SIP through surveys, informal conversations, and/or during monthly parent and community engagement events.

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's leadership team, which is comprised of: school administration, a teacher from each grade level, school counselor, reading interventionist, and a varying exceptionalities teacher, reviews the SIP monthly to determine progress with meeting the goals of the SIP. The plan is revised to include various best practices to improve student achievement, particularly with the ELL students. students with a learning disability. and African American students. These strategies will include teacher-led small group instruction, providing supplemental learning materials in the students' native language to assist with acquiring the English language, and/or scaffolded instructional support.

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	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	81%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
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	24	31	25	23	21	0	0	0	124
One or more suspensions	0	2	2	2	0	3	0	0	0	9
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	17	15	0	0	0	34
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	9	15	0	0	0	25
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	23	34	28	0	0	0	0	0	85
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	15	19	20	15	17	0	0	0	86

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	29	20	16	14	16	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	1	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	12	18	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	10	14	0	0	0	26
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	13	21	19	0	0	0	0	0	53

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	13	19	13	9	16	0	0	0	70

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	4	0	0	0	0	4
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	0	29	20	16	14	16	0	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	1	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	12	18	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	10	14	0	0	0	26
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	13	21	19	0	0	0	0	0	53

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	13	19	13	9	16	0	0	0	70

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	4	0	0	0	0	4
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*	38	48	53	37	50	56	27		
ELA Learning Gains				53			26		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53			50		
Math Achievement*	51	58	59	50	48	50	47		
Math Learning Gains				68			39		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				67					
Science Achievement*	30	52	54	33	59	59	24		
Social Studies Achievement*					63	64			
Middle School Acceleration					53	52			
Graduation Rate					46	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	58	54	59	70			54		

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	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	221
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	431
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98
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	19	Yes	4	2
ELL	34	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	30	Yes	1	1
HSP	40	Yes	1	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	40	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	24	Yes	3	1
ELL	58			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	51			
HSP	49			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	74			
FRL	44			

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	38			51			30					58
SWD	14			23							2	
ELL	14			29							3	58
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	26			49			20				4	
HSP	30			39			33				4	57
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	73			65							2	
FRL	32			48			26				5	54

| 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	37	53	53	50	68	67	33					70
SWD	5	43	45	6	33		10					
ELL	47	58		47	67							70
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	34	54	50	49	70	70	33					
HSP	40	60		36	58							
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	47			75	100							
FRL	27	43	47	44	65	60	24					

| 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	27	26	50	47	39		24					54
SWD	21			32								
ELL	25			38								54
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	20	19		49	38		17					
HSP	32			32								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	45			60								
FRL	24	23		46	35		19					

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	36%	47%	-11%	54%	-18%
04	2023 - Spring	36%	50%	-14%	58%	-22%
03	2023 - Spring	31%	46%	-15%	50%	-19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	56%	59%	-3%	59%	-3%
04	2023 - Spring	51%	58%	-7%	61%	-10%
05	2023 - Spring	39%	52%	-13%	55%	-16%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	29%	48%	-19%	51%	-22%

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.

3rd grade ELA and 5th grade Science showed the lowest performance of 31%. This is a decline of 10 and 2 percentage points, respectively, from the prior year. The major contributing factor is students regarding below grade level, student attendance, and teacher vacancy.

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

3rd grade ELA showed the greatest decline of 10 percentage points from the prior year. The major contributing factors are students reading significantly below grade level, student attendance, and teacher vacancy.

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.

Still waiting for state results to make comparison.

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

Overall Math proficiency in grades 3-5 showed the most improvement of 12 percentage points from the year prior. The school consistently focused on the student performance data to inform instruction and to provide targeted/differentiated intervention for the students.

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

Student daily attendance is an area of concern. During the last school year, 46% of the students missed 20 or more days of school.

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

1. 5th grade Science Proficiency 2. 3rd grade Reading Proficiency 3. 2nd grade Reading Proficiency 4. Student Daily Attendance

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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

The majority of the classrooms lacked benchmark aligned instruction with comparable experiences to the benchmarks. This observational data established a correlational relationship between benchmark-aligned instruction and proficient students.

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

90% of our current core teachers will engage in successful benchmark aligned instruction, tasks, and assessments.

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

Daily classroom walkthroughs will be conducted using the Benchmark Walkthrough Tool. Immediate feedback will be provided to teacher for instructional improvement. Student performance data will be reviewed to determine adjustments in instruction and/or learning tasks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Vondeira Scott (scottv2@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.)

Instructional delivery ensure that students are exposed to standards aligned instruction, tasks, and assessments. Based on Benchmark Walkthrough Tool, our instructional leadership team can measure classrooms that have aligned benchmark experiences in core classes.

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

As expressed in the Opportunity Myth, schools need to ensure students are getting benchmark-aligned and grade appropriate instruction, so that they are prepared to face the assessments designed by the state along with the following year's progression 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.

School Administration will facilitate common planning sessions with teachers that will focus on the "how" of teaching the benchmark effectively to ensure students are provided with benchmark aligned tasks and assessments.

Person Responsible: Vondeira Scott (scottv2@duvalschools.org)

By When: This will occur weekly during common planning sessions.

The Administrative Team will use a Benchmark Walk-through Tool to determine alignment of the instruction, tasks, and assessments to the benchmark. According to the observational data, adjustments will be made to the instruction, tasks and/or assessments to ensure there is alignment to the benchmarks and students receive equivalent experiences.

Person Responsible: Vondeira Scott (scottv2@duvalschools.org)

By When: Classroom observations will occur weekly.

Classroom observations will be conducted by teachers together with administrators after planning of a lesson for further professional development.

Person Responsible: Vondeira Scott (scottv2@duvalschools.org)

By When: September 30, 2023

Professional development will be provided to teachers and the instructional leadership team to reinforce best practices when using A.V.I.D. strategies during classroom instruction. Teachers and support team will attend AVID conferences to gain more knowledge and experiences to further assist with implementing the AVID program at the school. In addition, professional development will be provided by Read USA to assist teachers with implement research based reading strategies to improve overall student performance in reading.

Person Responsible: Vondeira Scott (scottv2@duvalschools.org)

By When: September 30, 2023 and will occur monthly thereafter.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

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

The majority of the Science classrooms lacked benchmark aligned instruction with comparable experiences to the benchmarks. This observational data established a correlational relationship between benchmark-aligned instruction and proficient students.

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

90% of our current core teachers will engage in successful benchmark aligned instruction, tasks, and assessments.

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

Daily classroom walkthroughs will be conducted using the Benchmark Walkthrough Tool. Immediate feedback will be provided to teacher for instructional improvement. Student performance data will be reviewed to determine adjustments in instruction and/or learning tasks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Vondeira Scott (scottv2@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.)

Instructional delivery ensure that students are exposed to standards aligned instruction, tasks, and assessments. Based on Benchmark Walkthrough Tool, our instructional leadership team can measure classrooms that have aligned benchmark experiences in the Science classes.

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

As expressed in the Opportunity Myth, schools need to ensure students are getting standards-aligned and grade appropriate instruction, so that they are prepared to face the assessments designed by the state along with the following year's progression 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.

School Administration will facilitate common planning sessions with teachers that will focus on the "how" of teaching the benchmark effectively to ensure students are provided with benchmark aligned tasks and assessments.

Person Responsible: Vondeira Scott (scottv2@duvalschools.org)

By When: August 22, 2023 and will continue weekly thereafter.

The School Administration Team will use a Benchmark Walk-through Tool to determine alignment of the instruction, tasks, and assessments to the benchmark. According to the observational data, adjustments will be made to the instruction, tasks and/or assessments to ensure there is alignment to the benchmarks and students receive equivalent experiences.

Person Responsible: Vondeira Scott (scottv2@duvalschools.org)

By When: September 4, 2023 and will continue weekly thereafter.

Classroom observations will be conducted by teachers together with school administrators after planning of a lesson for further professional development.

Person Responsible: Vondeira Scott (scottv2@duvalschools.org)

By When: September 30, 2023 and will continue monthly thereafter.

Title I funds will be used to add supplemental personnel and supplemental materials to provide classroom instruction, specialized instruction and additional support to increase student achievement.

Person Responsible: Vondeira Scott (scottv2@duvalschools.org)

By When: September 30, 2023

#3. 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.

Increase the student average daily attendance. During the 2022-23 school year, students with 20 or more days absent was 46%.

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

The student average daily attendance will increase to 95% or better.

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

Teachers will contact parents if students are absent 2 or more days. Students with excessive absences the school counselor will contact the family to inquire about the absences. Also, for excessive absences, AIT (Attendance Intervention Team) meetings are conducted, attendance contracts are implemented, and truancy worker/social worker is contacted.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Vondeira Scott (scottv2@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 school will recognize good and improved attendance. School will work with ART (Attendance Response Team) to help parents remove barriers for their child's attendance, conduct home visits, and locating families

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

These strategies will assist with improving chronic absenteeism for students facing the greatest challenges with getting to 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.

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.

Our Students With Disabilities showed the lowest performance and is an area of focus. In
This subgroup has historically performed lower than any other group at the school. A major contributing factor is the below grade level reading for these students. The students continue to show a decline in math as well.

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

50% of Students with Disabilities will show proficiency on the state reading and math assessment.

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

Daily classroom walkthroughs will be conducted using the Benchmark Walkthrough Tool. Immediate feedback will be provided to teacher for instructional improvement. Student performance data will be reviewed to determine adjustments in instruction and/or learning tasks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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

Instructional delivery ensure that students are exposed to standards aligned instruction, tasks, and assessments. Based on Benchmark Walkthrough Tool, our instructional leadership team can measure classrooms that have aligned benchmark experiences in core classes.

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

As expressed in the Opportunity Myth, schools need to ensure students are getting benchmark-aligned and grade appropriate instruction, so that they are prepared to face the assessments designed by the state along with the following year's progression 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.

During common planning sessions tasks and assessments will be planned that are aligned to the standards. The administrative team will conduct daily classroom walk-throughs to ensure the implementation of benchmark aligned instruction. Frequent progress monitoring of student progress will also be a point of focus to drive instructional delivery of the teachers.

Person Responsible: Vondeira Scott (scottv2@duvalschools.org)

By When: September 30, 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).

The school improvement funding allocations are reviewed monthly during the School Advisory Council meetings and during School Leadership Team meetings. Members of each group discuss how the allocations are being used to determine effectiveness and if there is a need to reallocate funds for a different need or continue with the current allocation.

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

The majority of the classrooms lacked benchmark aligned instruction with comparable experiences to the benchmarks. This observational data established a correlational relationship between benchmark-aligned instruction and proficient students.

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

The majority of the classrooms lacked benchmark aligned instruction with comparable experiences to the benchmarks. This observational data established a correlational relationship between benchmark-aligned instruction and proficient students.

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

50% of the students in grades K-2 will show adequate progress in Reading as measured by the Waterford and/or S.T.A.R. end of year assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

50% of the students in grades 3-5 will be proficient in Reading as measured by the state progress monitoring assessment #3 (F.A.S.T.)

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.

The Administrative Team will use the Classroom Walk-through Tool to determine alignment of the instruction, tasks, and assessments to the standards, according to the Learning Arc. According to the observational data, adjustments will be made to the instruction, tasks and/ or assessments to ensure there is alignment to the standards.

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

Scott, Katrice, scottv2@dvualschools.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?

Frequent monitoring of Instructional delivery and teacher-led small group instruction to ensure that students are exposed to standards aligned instruction, tasks, and assessments. In addition, we will also work collaboratively with teachers during professional learning communities to plan standards-based aligned tasks and assessments, and review student performance data to inform future lessons.

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?

A review of student performance on district and state assessments, in reading, indicated teachers and students need more support during small group instruction and during guided reading activities.

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
During professional learning communities and common planning sessions, the administrative team and the instructional coaches, will conduct professional development using the learning arc protocol to ensure lessons created have tasks and assessments that are aligned to the standards. Frequent progress monitoring of student progress will also be a point of focus to drive instructional delivery of the teachers.	Scott, Katrice, scottv2@dvualschools.org
We will continue our work with constructing tasks and assessments that are aligned to the benchmarks. The administrative team will conduct daily classroom walk-throughs to ensure implementation of benchmark aligned instruction is occurring.	Scott, Katrice, scottv2@dvualschools.org
Ensure our students with disabilities and our English-Language Learners are receiving scaffolded core instruction to participate in grade level instruction.	Scott, Katrice, scottv2@dvualschools.org
N/A	

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.

Information is dispersed through a variety of sources that include paper formats, OneView via email, school messenger via phone, and electronic format via the school's website. Important information shared in meetings will be provided in a handout and/or PowerPoint presentation. Parents and community members can also request a hard copy for future reference.

For the school's non-English speaking parents, our ESOL paraprofessionals will collaborate with staff to translate school newsletters and additional documents using TransAct. In some cases, students and teachers will translate for parents via telephone and/or in person. The school will ensure any parents with disabilities are fully supported, made to feel welcomed, and can access all the information necessary as well as can attend any event on campus. Once those parents are identified, the school will work collaboratively to ensure parents' and community members' needs are met and appropriate modifications are made to allow them to fully participate in meetings and school events. If needed, the school will contact the school district's ESOL specialist for further assistance.

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))

Arlington Heights Elementary will implement activities that will build capacity for meaningful parent and family engagement by incorporating the feedback that was given at our end of year meeting in May 2024. Parents will complete a survey to offer valuable feedback on the types of events they would want the school to host and ways to best communicate with them. The feedback will be reviewed carefully when developing our parent and family engagement plan.

Arlington Heights Elementary will provide materials and trainings throughout the school year to assist parents to work with their children. Teachers will host workshops for teaching parents about the current reading strategies aligning to the Florida reading benchmarks on teacher-parent conference nights. Teachers will send monthly newsletters home (or each time a new unit begins) to alert parents of the upcoming benchmarks being taught and tips for how to help their child(ren) succeed academically.

Arlington Heights Elementary commits to building community partnerships to support student achievement. The school will actively pursue additional partnerships by inviting community members to school events and our School Advisory Council meetings. When a partnerships are established, the school will complete the school-based partnership plan to outline the commitment and responsibilities for both parties. The school will invite community members to participate in a variety of events throughout the school year.

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))

School Administration, will facilitate common planning sessions with teachers that will focus on "how" we will teach the benchmarks to ensure there is benchmark aligned instruction, tasks and assessments. The Administrative Team will use a Benchmark Walk-through Tool to determine alignment of the instruction, tasks, and assessments to the benchmark. According to the observational data, adjustments will be made to the instruction, tasks and/or assessments to ensure there is alignment to the benchmarks and students receive equivalent experiences.

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))

N/A