Greenland Pines Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Greenland Pines Elementary School

5050 GREENLAND RD, Jacksonville, FL 32258

http://www.duvalschools.org/greenlandpines

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.

Greenland Pines Elementary School's mission is to provide educational excellence at our school, in every classroom, for every student, every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Greenland Pines Elementary School's vision is a community working together to inspire and prepare all students for success in college or a career and in life.

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
Hinkley, Michelle	Principal	Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensure that the teachers are implementing the curriculum with fidelity, manages school schedules to use support staff effectively, ensures that the shared decision making process is used effectively, communicates with parents in order to gain a partnership between school and home.
O'Quinn, Christi	Assistant Principal	Provide a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensures that the teachers are implementing the curriculum with fidelity, manages school schedules to use support staff effectively, ensures that the shared decision making process is used effectively, communicates with parents in order to gain a partnership between school and home.
Altom, Katherine	Teacher, ESE	Liaison for implementation of MTSS at the school level which includes feedback to the Leadership Team, presentations to the faculty, work with school-based coaches, and work with small collaborative groups of teachers, and provide direct intervention services and support to students identified as needing Tier II or Tier III intervention services. Leads MRT meetings at the school level. Assists to oversee and ensure compliance with the IEP process, FBA process and other ESE related services at the school level.
Wright, Dishon	Assistant Principal	Provide a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensures that the teachers are implementing the curriculum with fidelity, manages school schedules to use support staff effectively, ensures that the shared decision making process is used effectively, communicates with parents in order to gain a partnership between school and home.
Weber, Amy	School Counselor	

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 Advisory Council meets monthly and reviews the SIP multiple times during the year. In addition to progress monitoring data throughout the year, this committee discusses strategies and implementation of resources to improve our school. In addition to this team, the SIP is presented to faculty at the beginning of the year and we utilize time to discuss implementation, review and brainstorm strategies and then review and progress monitor throughout the year.

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))

We will have data meetings throughout the year with individual teachers and grade levels to discuss data points and make changes as needed to support the best implementation of our plan. If students are not making progress, plans will be reviewed for fidelity of implementation and tweaks will be made as necessary to support student growth. The SAC will also review data during our mid-year stakeholder's meeting.

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	42%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	58%
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	2	35	23	25	20	22	0	0	0	127
One or more suspensions	1	7	1	5	2	1	0	0	0	17
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	18	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	10	20	0	0	0	32
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	46	33	36	0	0	0	0	0	118

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	2	23	17	16	11	18	0	0	0	87

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	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) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	1	18	27	19	16	17	0	0	0	98
One or more suspensions	0	4	2	2	0	1	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	2	2	5	1	1	1	1	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	1	3	3	1	0	2	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	9	12	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	10	10	0	0	0	25
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	14	26	36	0	0	0	0	0	79

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	0	2	5	1	1	0	0	0	11
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	1	18	27	19	16	17	0	0	0	98
One or more suspensions	0	4	2	2	0	1	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	2	2	5	1	1	1	1	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	1	3	3	1	0	2	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	9	12	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	10	10	0	0	0	25
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	14	26	36	0	0	0	0	0	79

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	0	2	5	1	1	0	0	0	11
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*	64	48	53	67	50	56	58		
ELA Learning Gains				61			58		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45			38		
Math Achievement*	68	58	59	70	48	50	64		
Math Learning Gains				69			64		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				60			52		
Science Achievement*	70	52	54	61	59	59	68		
Social Studies Achievement*					63	64			
Middle School Acceleration					53	52			
Graduation Rate					46	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	50	54	59				80		

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	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	320
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	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	433
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
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	37	Yes	1	
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN	83			
BLK	49			
HSP	70			
MUL	74			
PAC				
WHT	69			
FRL	63			

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%
2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
SWD	49			
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN	70			
BLK	64			
HSP	45			
MUL	68			
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	57			

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)

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
2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
All Students	64			68			70					50
SWD	33			38			41				4	
ELL	40			47							3	50
AMI												
ASN	75			90							2	
BLK	46			49			53				3	
HSP	73			72			67				4	
MUL	74			67							3	
PAC												
WHT	63			70			71				4	
FRL	57			61			71				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	67	61	45	70	69	60	61					
SWD	43	50	40	42	65	61	40					
ELL	44	50		35	54							
AMI												
ASN	74	64		79	64							
BLK	60	53		62	78		67					
HSP	53	50		48	63	45	10					
MUL	83	67		72	50							
PAC												
WHT	70	64	57	76	69	65	66					
FRL	66	56	45	64	63	50	55					

| 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	58	58	38	64	64	52	68					80
SWD	26	27	10	29	33	38	36					
ELL	26			42								80
AMI												
ASN	74			78								
BLK	51	69		60	50		43					
HSP	41	25		38	46		46					
MUL	58			58								
PAC												
WHT	62	67		71	76		83					
FRL	49	61		51	54		50					

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	66%	47%	19%	54%	12%
04	2023 - Spring	63%	50%	13%	58%	5%
03	2023 - Spring	68%	46%	22%	50%	18%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	80%	59%	21%	59%	21%
04	2023 - Spring	64%	58%	6%	61%	3%
05	2023 - Spring	68%	52%	16%	55%	13%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	67%	48%	19%	51%	16%

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.

For the 2022-2023 school year Greenland Pines Elementary saw a slight decrease (+-2 points) in proficiency in ELA, math and science. Our 4th grade cohort declined in math compared to the high gains from the previous year. Overall, the performance was very similar to the previous year.

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

Based off the current data, our greatest need for improvement is ELA proficiency. As students rise to 3rd grade, we are seeing that they are not as prepared as in year's past, partially because of learning loss experienced by COVID.

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.

Greenland Pines scored above the state and district average in all grades and content areas.

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

All areas showed the same amount of growth. We show that we are making steady progress and maintaining in all areas.

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

We will continue the corrective reading program with our 3rd grade students who come in below grade level. In addition, we will continue school data chats and progress monitoring to identify students not making adequate progress throughout the year. We will offer both after school and in-school tutoring to help with closing learning gaps.

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

The highest priorities this year will be for ELA proficiency, science proficiency and learning gains across all subjects. We all also continue to focus on collaborative practices and collective responsibility across our school to improve the culture.

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.

From the 5 Essentials survey, collective responsibility was the lowest measure in the collaborative teachers domain. Collective responsibility scored at 17 and increased 4 from the previous year.

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

If collaboration and collective responsibility increases in the building then the Collaborative Teachers domain (specifically the collaborative teachers measure) will increase on the 2023 survey.

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

Classroom walkthroughs, common planning attendance and effectiveness, informal observation and school culture will be monitored to determine movement toward the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@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.)

Schools with higher culture and climate ratings tend to work efficiently to solve problems that may arise in the school including how to best serve students and families and how to support each other professionally through modeling of excellent instruction.

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

If the school is able to have a solid teacher to teacher trust and climate where teacher collaboration is the expectation, we will more consistently be able to support each other and students.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

Develop a plan for team building activities throughout the year to encourage teacher relationships, build trust and increase collaboration.

Person Responsible: Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@duvalschools.org)

By When: September 2023

Provide opportunities for teachers to collaborate with one another in non-threatening environments. Implement Teaching Tuesday (led by teachers) to allow teachers opportunities to share ideas and resources that are having a positive impact on standards based instruction and student growth within their classrooms.

Person Responsible: Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@duvalschools.org)

By When: Monthly opportunities ongoing throughout the year.

Provide opportunities for relationship building and professional discourse regularly within the school (common planning.)

Person Responsible: Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@duvalschools.org)

By When: Weekly opportunities ongoing throughout the year.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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

Teachers will need time to learn. practice and align classroom instruction and student assessment to the new benchmarks (BEST.) Through this focus, teachers will work together with school and district leadership to receive training and collaborate on elements of effective teaching methods to achieve student success. Teachers will work collaboratively to align instructional materials and student tasks to BEST benchmarks thus increasing student achievement in ELA.

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

100% of GPE K-5 teachers will engage in successful standards-based instruction, development and implementation of BEST Benchmarks during administrative led common planning ensuring student tasks are aligned to the full rigor and depth of the standard. Through this work, the student task alignment on the SWT dashboard should be at least 85% and student ELA proficiency will increase to 70%.

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

Professional development will be done with teachers focused on implementation of BEST standards into their instruction and student assessment. Weekly common planning will take place with all ELA and math teachers in K-5 to provide necessary PD, plan for aligned instruction, and learning tasks. Frequent classroom walkthroughs will be used to assess the alignment, quality and fidelity of implementation.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@duvalschools.org)

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

We will use the Standards Walkthrough Tool in addition to informal class observations, student work samples and classroom and district assessments to measure classroom instruction, student task alignment and assessment alignment in core classes.

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

Use of the SWT will provide us with specific data points in order to assess which grade levels need additional support in implementation of the new 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.

Utilize resources and reports from standards walk-through tool dashboard. Calibrate with APs and continue to use and share data frequently to ensure staff understanding and readiness. APs and principal

will meet weekly and engage in conversation focused on evidence from the SWT and classroom observations to continue calibration throughout the year and discuss next steps.

Person Responsible: Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@duvalschools.org)

By When: Weekly, ongoing until May 2023.

Frequent classroom walk-throughs by principal and AP using SWT to assess the alignment, quality and fidelity of implementation.

Person Responsible: Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@duvalschools.org)

By When: Weekly, ongoing until May 2023.

Engagement of all K-5 teachers in professional development based around BEST standards-based instruction, implementation of aligned curriculum and creation of aligned materials.

Person Responsible: Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@duvalschools.org)

By When: Monthly, ongoing until May 2023.

Leadership will engage in weekly common planning with all K-5 teachers in the areas of ELA and/or math to create materials aligned to current standards, create aligned student tasks and assessments and plan for instructional delivery in all classrooms. Some teachers will engage in monthly or bi-monthly common planning with other schools to continue alignment work around new benchmarks and curriculum.

Person Responsible: Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@duvalschools.org)

By When: Monthly, ongoing until May 2023.

#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.

In order to ensure all students make gains, we will have an intentional focus on small group instruction in order to monitor student progress on specific benchmarks and provide intensive remediation and support as needed.

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

In past years, our learning gains were 60% in both ELA and math. Our goal this year will be 60% learning gains in ELA.

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

This area will be monitored using classroom and district data (DMAs) throughout the year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@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.)

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

By progress monitoring the most current data, we can ensure students are making progress throughout the year and brainstorm new interventions as needed.

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.

Teachers will participate in quarterly data chats with administration to progress monitor individual students and groups of students and to plan for future instruction.

Person Responsible: Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@duvalschools.org)

By When: Ongoing, quarterly until May 2023

Classroom walkthroughs and feedback from admin during small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@duvalschools.org)

By When: Ongoing, quarterly until May 2023

#4. 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.

Our LPQ learning gains were 38% in 2020-2021. Through differentiation and intervention, the goal is to increase this to 50%.

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

Through differentiation and intervention, the goal is to increase this to 50%.

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

We will progress monitor student learning gains for our lowest performing quartile throughout each district and state assessment. We will also monitor their progress specific to the intervention they will receive in ELA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@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.)

Students in 2nd grade will receive Phonics for Reading if they show a deficiency in the area of phonics. Students in 3rd grade will receive Corrective Reading or Seeing Stars if they show a deficiency in the area of phonics.

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

Students who have trouble in the area of phonics struggle to comprehend text.

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.

Progress monitor intervention groups.

Person Responsible: Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@duvalschools.org)

By When: May 2023

Progress monitor intervention groups.

Person Responsible: Michelle Hinkley (simrellm@duvalschools.org)

By When: May 2023