Hendricks Avenue Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Hendricks Avenue Elementary School

3400 HENDRICKS AVE, Jacksonville, FL 32207

http://www.duvalschools.org/hendricks

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.

We lead with compassion, creativity, and curiosity. We are HAE!

Provide the school's vision statement.

We are a school where all children realize their potential and are inspired to serve and lead in the community.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Edmunds, Darrell	Principal	Student achievement; instructional leadership; school safety and security; culture and climate; professional development
Daniel, Jessica	Assistant Principal	Academic achievement; instructional leadership, professional development; school safety and security, scheduling; school procedures ie: arrival and dismissal; school building maintenance and upkeep.
	School Counselor	Student services including wellness and mental health support; compliance with IEP/504 policy; facilitation of trainings for teachers.

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.

Stakeholders are engaged through the School Advisory Council which includes all requisite stakeholder groups (i.e. parents, community partners, faculty) and meets the demographic distribution commensurate with the diversity of the school community. Collaboration begins with fall SAC meetings with a major checkpoint at the mid-year stakeholder meeting, where monitoring data is shared and discussed.

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 monitored through the implementation of a four-step protocol aligned with the SIP in connection with state and district FAST (Florida Assessment of Student Thinking) Progress Monitoring sessions at the beginning, middle and end of the the year. The four-step plan will serve to identify target students for intervention and positively affect the achievement gap as reflected in the school's Lowest Performing Quartile 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 KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	36%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	39%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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) Asian Students (ASN) 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: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	12	19	13	15	12	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	0	3	0	0	0	5
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	7	15	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	8	13	0	0	0	21
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	13	31	16	0	0	0	0	0	62

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	8	5	5	14	0	0	0	34

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	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	0	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	22	10	15	8	11	0	0	0	66
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	7	3	2	1	1	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	6	11	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	11	0	0	0	17
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	6	14	20	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	8	10	14	3	9	0	0	0	44

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	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	22	10	15	8	11	0	0	0	66
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	7	3	2	1	1	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	6	11	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	11	0	0	0	17
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	6	14	20	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	8	10	14	3	9	0	0	0	44

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	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	7
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*	79	48	53	83	50	56	74		
ELA Learning Gains				72			64		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				64			54		
Math Achievement*	81	58	59	83	48	50	73		
Math Learning Gains				78			64		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				73			37		
Science Achievement*	82	52	54	78	59	59	69		
Social Studies Achievement*					63	64			
Middle School Acceleration					53	52			
Graduation Rate					46	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	55	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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	76
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	380
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	76
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	531
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	48			
ELL	48			
AMI				
ASN	82			
BLK	53			
HSP	87			
MUL	76			
PAC				
WHT	87			
FRL	52			

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	53			
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN	73			
BLK	57			
HSP	88			
MUL	86			
PAC				
WHT	78			
FRL	62			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	79			81			82					55
SWD	48			52			38				4	
ELL	40			50							3	55
AMI												
ASN	76			88							2	
BLK	50			60			46				4	
HSP	83			83			100				4	
MUL	76			76							2	
PAC												
WHT	85			86			86				4	
FRL	53			58			50				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	83	72	64	83	78	73	78					
SWD	50	52	50	50	66	64	36					
ELL	42	70		42	50							
AMI												
ASN	69	77		75	69							
BLK	55	67	62	58	50	50						
HSP	95	75		90	92							
MUL	77	100		77	91							
PAC												
WHT	88	69	59	88	80	83	82					
FRL	60	60	50	65	72	61	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	74	64	54	73	64	37	69					
SWD	34	50	56	34	55	42	43					
ELL	33			33								
AMI												
ASN	53			60								
BLK	47	46		39	31		47					
HSP	87			73								
MUL	76			71								
PAC												
WHT	78	69	59	80	72	41	73					
FRL	47	37	31	39	30	25	41					

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	82%	47%	35%	54%	28%
04	2023 - Spring	67%	50%	17%	58%	9%
03	2023 - Spring	83%	46%	37%	50%	33%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	85%	59%	26%	59%	26%
04	2023 - Spring	79%	58%	21%	61%	18%
05	2023 - Spring	78%	52%	26%	55%	23%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	82%	48%	34%	51%	31%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

The data component that showed the lowest performance is ELA proficiency.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was ELA. Overall Hendricks dropped 3 points in proficiency. The factors that contributed to this decline include

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

All data components compared favorably with state averages.

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

Our science data showed the most important with a 4 point gain to 82% proficiency. This year we implemented science tutoring before school and within science centers.

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

One potential area of concern is in 3rd grade, where 14 students show 2 or more risk indicators. The most common indicators were attendance of less than 90% and reading level significantly below grade level.

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

Our highest priorities leading into the 23-24 school year include (1) 3rd grade ELA proficiency, which is a new cell in the school grade calculation for the 2023-24 school year and, as noted above, we have a cohort of students with significant number showing multiple risk indicators; (2) ELA Lowest Performing Quartile gains, which is a focus encompassing our 4th graders who scored a performance level of 1 in last year's FAST and were promoted good cause; (3) Teacher collaboration - supporting more ownership of instructional development and planning with the loss of an instructional coach; (4) Teacher-Principal trust, which declined by 7% in the 5 Essentials survey from 2022 to 2023.

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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

If we increase teacher efficacy as measured by Teacher/Principal trust and Teacher Influence, student achievement will increase as a function of collaboration and ownership of instruction.

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

In the next 5 Essentials Survey, Teacher-Principal trust will increase from 47% to 61% and Teacher Influence will increase from 43% to 50%.

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

Admin will monitor through teacher surveys and PMC discussions related to these items. Admin is empowering teachers to take ownership of their common planning/PLC teams this year with the loss of our instructional coach.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Darrell Edmunds (edmundsd@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.)

Inquiry-based protocols for identifying problems of practice and producing concrete, actionable solutions.

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

We need a framework for collaborating wit a focus on small group differentiated instruction.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Intervention

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

Based on 2022-23 achievement data, our rising 5th grade students (4th last year) had a proficiency rate of only 67% scoring at a performance level 3 or above. ELA: 3rd grade proficiency and 4th/5th grade LPQ gains are an area of focus this year because 14 of our 98 students show two or more risk indicators. 4th grade saw a significant number of students promoted with good cause from 3rd grade the year prior. In addition, we saw a decrease in math proficiency for 4th and 5th grade.

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

If differentiated instruction (small groups, aligned tasks and targeted interventions) are implemented with fidelity to address student needs reflected in formative assessment, students will demonstrate growth as evidenced by the FAST (Florida Assessment of Student Thinking) Progress Monitoring results.

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

The area of focus will be monitored through FAST Progress Monitoring, unit formative assessments and UFLI progress as well as DCPS District Monitoring Assessments; small-group progress monitoring through our 4-step plan.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jessica Daniel (atkinsonj1@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.)

UFLI: Add 30 minutes per day of WIN *What I Need) time to master schedules to provide students with targeted intervention based on individual reading deficiencies.

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

This is an evidence-based program with initial success in pilot schools.

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 Collaborative Planning

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

Based on 2022-23 achievement data, proficiency in 4th and 5th grade math as well as 4th grade ELA decreased. We also know that we will have significant numbers of students performing below grade level entering 4th grade, and that we will not have an instructional coach/interventionist to assist with intervention.

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

On the Spring 2024 FAST assessment, We will achieve ELA LPQ Gains of at least 65% and Increase 4th and 5th math proficiency from 79% and 78%, respectively, to 84% each.

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

We will be monitoring center-based differentiated small group instruction for aligned tasks and accountability, tiered for student needs based on formative data. Achievement of target students will be monitored using a four-step plan.

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.)

Small group intervention (including UFLI) is evidence-based along with our emphasis on teacher collaboration to increase efficacy, which presents a large effect size (Hattie).

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

Using intentional, prescriptive interventions based on data will address specific skills needs by our lowst-performing quartile.

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).

N/A

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- ◦ The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- ◦ The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- ◦ Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A (not a RAISE School)

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

N/A (not a RAISE School)

Measurable Outcomes
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- ◦ Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;

- ◦ Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and

- ◦ Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

N/A (not a RAISE School)

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

N/A (not a RAISE School)

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.

N/A (not a RAISE School)

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

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?

N/A (not a RAISE School)

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?

N/A (not a RAISE School)

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

N/A (not a RAISE School)

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.

N/A

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))

N/A

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))

N/A

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

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

N/A

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

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

N/A

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

N/A

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

N/A

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: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Intervention	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

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

Yes