

Duval County Public Schools

Atlantic Beach Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	25
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	25

Atlantic Beach Elementary School

298 SHERRY DR, Atlantic Beach, FL 32233

www.duvalschools.org/abe

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.

At Atlantic Beach Elementary we,

- Love to Learn
- Inspire Others
- Lead with Kindness

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every child at Atlantic Beach Elementary will lead with kindness, pursue primary greatness, and have the courage to achieve their goals.

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
Gallagher, Kimberly	Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure safety of all students and staff • Instructional leader • Facilitate staff professional development • Maintain and adhere to district and school calendar • Embrace community relationships
Thompson, Samantha	Assistant Principal	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ensure safety of all students and staff • Instructional leader • Facilitate staff professional development • Maintain and adhere to district and school calendar • Embrace community relationships

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.

The school leadership team developed a draft of the SIP using historical school data. School staff provided input. The SIP will be brought to the first SAC meeting for parent and stakeholder input.

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 SIP will be monitors after each new data set. The leadership team and teachers will analyze student data and revise small group instruction accordingly and students progress towards meeting the State's academic standards and making individual student reading and math gains.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	25%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	34%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	3	9	17	15	10	9	0	0	0	63	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	5	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	7	0	0	0	11	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	9	0	0	0	11	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	5	19	30	21	0	0	0	0	0	75	

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	3	4	8	9	2	6	0	0	0	32

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	16	10	4	9	8	0	0	0	47	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in ELA	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	7	0	0	0	12	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	8	0	0	0	11	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	13	13	0	0	0	0	0	26	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	15	8	2	5	0	0	0	30

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	
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	16	10	4	9	8	0	0	0	47	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in ELA	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	7	0	0	0	12	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	8	0	0	0	11	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	13	13	0	0	0	0	0	26	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	15	8	2	5	0	0	0	30

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	
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*	78	48	53	77	50	56	73		
ELA Learning Gains				63			53		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56			33		
Math Achievement*	80	58	59	83	48	50	77		
Math Learning Gains				80			52		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				65			26		
Science Achievement*	86	52	54	74	59	59	62		
Social Studies Achievement*					63	64			
Middle School Acceleration					53	52			
Graduation Rate					46	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		54	59						

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	82
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	328
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	71

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	498
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	52			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	37	Yes	2	
HSP	84			
MUL	83			
PAC				
WHT	85			
FRL	68			

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	55			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	33	Yes	1	
HSP	66			

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%
MUL	81			
PAC				
WHT	76			
FRL	65			

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	78			80			86					
SWD	41			50			70				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	42			32							2	
HSP	75			92							2	
MUL	83			83							2	
PAC												
WHT	82			85			88				4	
FRL	60			63			77				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	77	63	56	83	80	65	74					
SWD	46	49	50	57	70	63	47					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												

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
BLK	20	30		33	50							
HSP	58			73								
MUL	78	83		78	83							
PAC												
WHT	85	66	67	88	82	64	83					
FRL	59	57	63	65	76	73	65					

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	73	53	33	77	52	26	62					
SWD	48	17		57	33		25					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25			43								
HSP	50			54								
MUL	63			69								
PAC												
WHT	82	59	50	84	58	40	71					
FRL	52	37		59	38		38					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	79%	47%	32%	54%	25%
04	2023 - Spring	79%	50%	29%	58%	21%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	81%	46%	35%	50%	31%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	89%	59%	30%	59%	30%
04	2023 - Spring	73%	58%	15%	61%	12%
05	2023 - Spring	82%	52%	30%	55%	27%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	86%	48%	38%	51%	35%

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.

ABE's lowest data component for the 2022-2023 school year was 4th grade math. The 4th grade math proficiency was 73% which was a 7% decrease from the previous year.

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

ABE's greatest decline component for the 2022-2023 school year was 4th grade math. The 4th grade math proficiency was 73% which was a 7% decrease from the previous year.

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.

ABE continues to perform higher than state average in all areas.

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

ABE's 5th grade reading showed the most improvement. The 5th grade reading proficiency went from 67% to 79% in 2022-2023. This was a 12% increase from the previous year.

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

Reading and Math Gains
3rd Grade Reading Proficiency

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

Increase Reading Learning Gains and LPQ Gains in 4th -5th grade.
Increase Math Learning Gains and LPQ Gains in 4th-5th grade.
Increase 3rd Grade Reading Proficiency.
Reduce the number of students with 20 or more days absent.

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 Small Group Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Goal 1: Increase Reading Learning Gains and LPQ Gains in 4th -5th grade.

Rationale: Historically, one of ABE's areas of lowest performance has been Reading gains in both Learning Gains and LPQ Gains. If assigned learning tasks/activities are aligned with benchmarks and appropriately structured to meet the individual needs of students and are fully aligned with grade level expectations, then proficiency, gains and LPQ learning gains for reading will improve.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Measurable Outcome: Increase Reading Learning Gains from 63.3% (21-22) to 66% and Reading LPQ Gains from 56% (21-22) to 61%.

Monitoring:

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

The SIP will be monitored after each new data set. The leadership team and teachers will analyze student data and revise small group instruction accordingly and students progress towards meeting the State's academic benchmark making individual student reading gains. The Administrative team will conduct at least 5 standards walk-throughs per week in ELA classrooms.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kimberly Gallagher (gallagherk1@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.)

Interventions:

- Add 30 minutes per day of WIN time to master schedules to provide students with targeted intervention based on individual reading deficiencies.
- Send all 3rd-5th grade ELA teachers to UFLI Training
- Weekly common planning focused on embedding the 4 Principles of Learning into all core lesson plans.
- Data Chats with teachers after each new data set is received.
- Quarterly Instructional Rounding looking at effective small group instruction.
- Quarterly vertical reading small group lesson planning, including ESE teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Rationale: Historically, one of ABE's areas of lowest performance has been Reading gains in both Learning Gains and LPQ Gains. If assigned learning tasks/activities are aligned with benchmarks and appropriately structured to meet the individual needs of students and are fully aligned with grade level expectations, then proficiency, gains and LPQ learning gains for reading will improve.

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 leadership team and teachers will analyze student data and revise small group instruction accordingly and students progress towards meeting the State's academic benchmark making individual student reading gains. The Administrative team will conduct at least 5 standards walk-throughs per week in ELA classrooms.

Person Responsible: Kimberly Gallagher (gallagherk1@duvalschools.org)

By When: Weekly

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Goal 1: Increase Reading Learning Gains and LPQ Gains in 4th -5th grade.

Rationale: Historically, one of ABE's areas of lowest performance has been Reading gains in both Learning Gains and LPQ Gains. If assigned learning tasks/activities are aligned with benchmarks and appropriately structured to meet the individual needs of students and are fully aligned with grade level expectations, then proficiency, gains and LPQ learning gains for reading will improve.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Measurable Outcome: Increase Reading Learning Gains from 63.3% (21-22) to 66% and Reading LPQ Gains from 56% (21-22) to 61%.

Monitoring:

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

The SIP will be monitored after each new data set. The leadership team and teachers will analyze student data and revise small group instruction accordingly and students progress towards meeting the State's academic benchmark making individual student reading gains. The Administrative team will conduct at least 5 standards walk-throughs per week in ELA classrooms.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kimberly Gallagher (gallagherk1@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.)

Interventions:

- Add 30 minutes per day of WIN time to master schedules to provide students with targeted intervention based on individual reading deficiencies.
- Send all 3rd-5th grade ELA teachers to UFLI Training
- Weekly common planning focused on embedding the 4 Principles of Learning into all core lesson plans.
- Data Chats with teachers after each new data set is received.
- Quarterly Instructional Rounding looking at effective small group instruction.
- Quarterly vertical reading small group lesson planning, including ESE teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Rationale: Historically, one of ABE's areas of lowest performance has been Reading gains in both Learning Gains and LPQ Gains. If assigned learning tasks/activities are aligned with benchmarks and appropriately structured to meet the individual needs of students and are fully aligned with grade level expectations, then proficiency, gains and LPQ learning gains for reading will improve.

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

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Goal 1: Increase Reading Learning Gains and LPQ Gains in 4th -5th grade.

Rationale: Historically, one of ABE's areas of lowest performance has been Reading gains in both Learning Gains and LPQ Gains. If assigned learning tasks/activities are aligned with benchmarks and appropriately structured to meet the individual needs of students and are fully aligned with grade level expectations, then proficiency, gains and LPQ learning gains for reading will improve.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Measurable Outcome: Increase Reading Learning Gains from 63.3% (21-22) to 66% and Reading LPQ Gains from 56% (21-22) to 61%.

Monitoring:

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

The SIP will be monitored after each new data set. The leadership team and teachers will analyze student data and revise small group instruction accordingly and students progress towards meeting the State's academic benchmark making individual student reading gains. The Administrative team will conduct at least 5 standards walk-throughs per week in ELA classrooms.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kimberly Gallagher (gallagherk1@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.)

Interventions:

- Add 30 minutes per day of WIN time to master schedules to provide students with targeted intervention based on individual reading deficiencies.
- Send all 3rd-5th grade ELA teachers to UFLI Training
- Weekly common planning focused on embedding the 4 Principles of Learning into all core lesson plans.
- Data Chats with teachers after each new data set is received.
- Quarterly Instructional Rounding looking at effective small group instruction.
- Quarterly vertical reading small group lesson planning, including ESE teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Rationale: Historically, one of ABE's areas of lowest performance has been Reading gains in both Learning Gains and LPQ Gains. If assigned learning tasks/activities are aligned with benchmarks and appropriately structured to meet the individual needs of students and are fully aligned with grade level expectations, then proficiency, gains and LPQ learning gains for reading will improve.

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. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Goal 2: Increase Math Learning Gains and LPQ Gains in 4th-5th grade.

Rationale: Historically, one of ABE's areas of lowest performance has been Math gains in both Learning Gains and LPQ Gains. If assigned learning tasks/activities are aligned with benchmarks and appropriately structured to meet the individual needs of students and are fully aligned with grade level expectations, then proficiency, gains and LPQ learning gains for math will improve.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Measurable Outcome: Increase Math Learning Gains and LPQ Gains from 80% (21-22) to 83% and Math LPQ Gains from 65% (21-22) to 70%.

Monitoring:

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

Interventions:

- Send 3rd-5th grade teachers to Differentiated Math Centers Training.
- Weekly common planning focused on embedding the 4 Principles of Learning into all core lesson plans.
- Data Chats with teachers after each new data set is received.
- Quarterly Instructional Rounding looking at effective small group instruction.
- Quarterly vertical math small group lesson planning, including ESE teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kimberly Gallagher (gallagherk1@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.)

Interventions:

- Send 3rd-5th grade teachers to Differentiated Math Centers Training.
- Weekly common planning focused on embedding the 4 Principles of Learning into all core lesson plans.
- Data Chats with teachers after each new data set is received.
- Quarterly Instructional Rounding looking at effective small group instruction.
- Quarterly vertical math small group lesson planning, including ESE teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Rationale: Historically, one of ABE's areas of lowest performance has been Math gains in both Learning Gains and LPQ Gains. If assigned learning tasks/activities are aligned with benchmarks and appropriately structured to meet the individual needs of students and are fully aligned with grade level expectations, then proficiency, gains and LPQ learning gains for math will improve.

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 description entered

Person Responsible: Kimberly Gallagher (gallagherk1@duvalschools.org)

By When: Weekly

#5. 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.

Goal 4: Reduce the number of students with 20 or more days absent.

Rationale: If we collaborate with stakeholders (i.e. teachers, parents, community) to help meet all students' needs, then more students will be able to focus on learning, leading to an increase in attendance and positive school climate.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Measurable Outcome: Reduce number of students with chronic absenteeism from 12% of student to 7%.

Monitoring:

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

Interventions:

- Monthly Attendance meetings with leadership, social worker, and school counselor to modify focus lists if needed
- Monthly AIT meetings with parents to look for solutions
- Teachers will teach Leader in Me lessons on scheduled Wednesdays.
- All students will participate in Wellness Wednesdays and the Calm Classroom.
- Implement additional positive student supports, rewards and incentives (daily, weekly, monthly, quarterly)
- Communicate the list of support networks to all stakeholders at orientation and social media

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kimberly Gallagher (gallagherk1@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.)

Interventions:

- Monthly Attendance meetings with leadership, social worker, and school counselor to modify focus lists if needed
- Monthly AIT meetings with parents to look for solutions
- Teachers will teach Leader in Me lessons on scheduled Wednesdays.
- All students will participate in Wellness Wednesdays and the Calm Classroom.
- Implement additional positive student supports, rewards and incentives (daily, weekly, monthly, quarterly)
- Communicate the list of support networks to all stakeholders at orientation and social media

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Rationale: If we collaborate with stakeholders (i.e. teachers, parents, community) to help meet all students' needs, then more students will be able to focus on learning, leading to an increase in attendance and positive school climate.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

The SIP will be reviewed with SAC and community stakeholders. SAC will recommend and vote on how to best utilize SIP allocations.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus**Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus**

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

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

No