Crown Point Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Crown Point Elementary School

3800 CROWN POINT RD, Jacksonville, FL 32257

http://www.duvalschools.org/crownpoint

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 live to learn and love to lead. We are CPE!

Provide the school's vision statement.

We are a community of rising leaders who foster learning through an engaging, safe, and nurturing environment.

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
Hartley, Brett	Principal	Principal Brett Hartley leads instruction, school improvement, school safety, and provides management of all school functions. He leads observations, evaluations, professional development and instructional data reviews. Mr. Hartley also mentors aspiring and first-year principals in the leadership and planning. Mr. Hartley works with PTA, SAC, Shared Decision Making, and the Lighthouse Leadership Team. Mr. Hartley oversees the math leadership team and leads common planning for 3-5 mathematics, K-2 ELA, and K-5 Science.
Carr, Elisha	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal Elisha Carr coordinates testing, oversees technology programs, textbooks and complies data from Performance Matters. She co-leads discipline and supports the MTSS parent relations process. Mrs. Carr oversees faith-based and business partnerships and leads the SAC committee. She conducts focus walks and observations, leads ELA professional development, and assists the reading interventionist and reading tutors in supporting teachers. She co-leads common planning for ELA K-5.
Moore, Dawn	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal Dawn Moore oversees Title 1, supports instructional materials, and supports VE teachers with instructional decisions. Mrs. Moore also complies data from Performance Matters. She leads discipline and supports the MTSS parent relations process. Mrs. Carr oversees parental involvement, leads the MTSS and the PBIS team to implement school-wide discipline and behavior strategies. She conducts focus walks and observations, leads ELA professional development, and assists the reading interventionist in supporting teachers. She co-leads common planning for ELA K-5.
Repper, Amanda	Reading Coach	Mrs. Amanda Repper provides targeted support for teachers and students in all five areas of reading. Mrs. Repper supports small group ELA instruction by working with students weekly. Co-leads common planning for 3rd-5th ELA instruction and serves as PDF coordinator for staff. Mrs. Repper also co-leads the Lighthouse Leadership Team K-5.
Driver, Dana	Math Coach	Mrs. Driver provides targeted support for teachers and students in the area of math and science. Coordinator of technology and leads common planning for math K-5.
	Science Coach	Pam Adams provides targeted support in Science for grade 5. She plans and works closely with teachers and students.

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.

To ensure stakeholders are included in the SIP development process, during the previous year 2022-2023 feedback from the School Advisory Council is collected and reviewed for the new SIP. Crown Point's leadership team met during July 2023 to review data and Title 1 Budget to set goals and discuss strategies for ELA, Math and Science. The leadership team is made up of teachers, coaches and administration. Faith-Based partners are also informed during July 2023 of school-wide data, systems for the upcoming school year and collect feedback. These processes allow for all stakeholder to be included during the SIP development process.

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 monitored monthly by the school's leadership team and teacher's with monthly data chats. The SIP progress will also be shared each month at the School Advisory Committee meetings. Goals, strategies and results will be shared along with next steps and feedback from the committee members.

Demographic Data	
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	66%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	80%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP)* 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: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 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	91	88	105	103	70	68	0	0	0	525
One or more suspensions	4	7	5	2	6	4	0	0	0	28
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	58	39	40	0	0	0	137
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	28	26	41	0	0	0	95
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	48	72	50	58	39	40	0	0	0	307

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	103	104	116	115	96	91	0	0	0	625

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	4
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	2	51	43	42	31	34	0	0	0	203
One or more suspensions	1	4	4	3	3	5	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA	3	3	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	1	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	28	43	0	0	0	81
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	18	42	0	0	0	69
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	18	45	84	0	0	0	0	0	150

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	3	21	41	73	16	38	0	0	0	192

The number of students identified retained:

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

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	2	51	43	42	31	34	0	0	0	203
One or more suspensions	1	4	4	3	3	5	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA	3	3	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	1	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	28	43	0	0	0	81
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	18	42	0	0	0	69
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	18	45	84	0	0	0	0	0	150

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	3	21	41	73	16	38	0	0	0	192

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	47			45	50	56	48		
ELA Learning Gains				51	58	61	53		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38	51	52	40		
Math Achievement*	65			55	59	60	54		
Math Learning Gains				55	63	64	60		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				32	57	55	56		
Science Achievement*	51			39	47	51	44		
Social Studies Achievement*					0	50			
Middle School Acceleration									
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress	58			52			61		

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	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	276
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	367
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	23	Yes	4	1
ELL	39	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	42			
HSP	50			
MUL	63			
PAC				
WHT	65			

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%
FRL	51			

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	32	Yes	3	
ELL	32	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	41			
HSP	39	Yes	1	
MUL	72			
PAC				
WHT	57			
FRL	43			

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	47			65			51					58
SWD	12			31			31				4	
ELL	27			55			21				5	58
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	39			52			38				4	
HSP	42			63			42				5	53
MUL	56			64			70				3	

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
PAC												
WHT	53			73			63				5	77
FRL	41			58			45				5	61

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	45	51	38	55	55	32	39					52
SWD	12	37	38	29	45	31	29					
ELL	23	40	33	26	35	29	20					52
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	36	42	37	49	58	38	29					
HSP	35	46	32	47	47	26	30					49
MUL	65	81		73	67							
PAC												
WHT	56	54		62	59		53					
FRL	40	50	38	50	51	30	32					54

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	48	53	40	54	60	56	44					61
SWD	26	33		45	40		21					
ELL	30	48	42	51	78	69	26					61
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	33	39		38	35		28					
HSP	41	49	38	51	68	75	22					58
MUL	62			69								
PAC												
WHT	60	55		63	66		66					50
FRL	41	45	38	47	47	50	32					58

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	39%	47%	-8%	54%	-15%
04	2023 - Spring	48%	50%	-2%	58%	-10%
03	2023 - Spring	44%	46%	-2%	50%	-6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	69%	59%	10%	59%	10%
04	2023 - Spring	60%	58%	2%	61%	-1%
05	2023 - Spring	46%	52%	-6%	55%	-9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	44%	48%	-4%	51%	-7%

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

1. Students with disabilities has a Federal Index below of 41%
2. Reading Proficiency with Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners K-5
3. 5th Grade Math Proficiency

Standard-based small group instruction was evident but it inconsistently addressed critical reading learning gaps in ELA with students with disabilities and ELL students. The focus was more on bubble students since the goal was proficiency. To address these needs for improvements ELL students were scheduled into sheltered classes K-5, small group reading instruction has been prioritized K-5 including a

reading intervention block for 3rd-5th, and small group math instruction will be put into place in grades 3-5.

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

5th grade math proficiency showed the greatest decline from 50% to 49%. All three 5th grade math teachers were new to the grade level and learning the Florida BEST Standards.

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

ELA proficiency had the greatest gap compared to state average. The state average is 53% and Crown Point was 50%. This was the first year of the assessing the Florida BEST Standards completely online and previous years was paper-based. Our focus was on proficiency and supporting bubble students within small group. More interventions are needed with the Lower Performing Quartile.

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

3rd Grade Math proficiency showed the greatest improvement with a 17 point increase to 79% proficient. The greatest contributing factor was 3rd grade math teachers had more time to implement small group center instruction along with Acaletics math intervention program.

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

One area of Concern is the 3 year decline of students with disabilities lack of proficiency in reading. These students are often in the lower performing quartile and have frequent absences.

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

1. 3rd-5th Reading Proficiency to 55%
2. 3rd Grade Reading Proficiency to 55%
3. Science Proficiency to 60%
4. SWD and ELL students increasing in Learning Gains

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 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.

Crown Point will continue to participate in the school-wide Leader in Me Program. We will continue to build students leadership skills that will apply to life at home and at school. Parental involvement events will be planned and implemented to engage and inform families in their students' learning. Parents will receive support in partnering with their child using the new state B.E.S.T. Benchmarks and how to achieve success.
With the Leader in Me framework, we have 6 action teams in which all faculty and staff are members.
Those teams are;
1. Student Learning and 4DX
2. Shared Leadership and Community Service
3. Leadership Environment
4. Leadership Events
5. PBIS
6. Public Relations and Marketing
Using the work and ideas from each of these teams, we are able to positively impact the school culture in various ways. We will analyze data from surveys such as the 5 Essentials to make decisions that are data driven.
To aid in creating a safe and inviting space for students to learn and lead, we will continue to use Positive Office referrals to encourage students to display the 7 habits of Leader in Me around the school.

Partnerships with both faith-based and business partners will continue to be built and utilized monthly. Currently four faith-based partners have been established and their efforts are being coordinated with admin and teachers at Crown Point. Business partnerships will continue to grown in order to meet the needs and to build community awareness of services to support families.

Crown Point has a SAC and PTA committees that meet once a month with the support of staff from each grade level and the administration. These groups volunteer to support instructional initiative, teachers and staff and enriching students' lives.

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

1. 50% of students in grades 3rd-5th to show an increase quarterly on the STAR Assessment
2. Decrease in referrals to less than 15 per month for students with disabilities.

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

1. Monthly meetings with the PBIS team analyzing discipline data for Students with Disabilities.
2. Monthly Leadership meetings including school counselors, academic coaches, admin and teachers to review

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dawn Moore (moored@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.)

1. Literacy Leadership to support small group reading instruction
2. Literacy Coaching of K-5 ELA teachers and tutors
3. Reading Intervention Block-WIN Time

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

Small Group Reading instruction aligned to Florida B.E.S.T. standards and differentiated small group instruction using the science of reading.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

1. Crown Point uses Title 1 funds to purchase an additional school counselor that will work with students to provide classroom Social and
Emotional Lessons.
2. PBIS Team will utilize behavior tickets for students to earn "Panther Bucks" to spend at the school PBIS store.

Person Responsible: Dawn Moore (moored@duvalschools.org)

By When: End of Year Spring Assessment of STAR

#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.

Increase reading proficiency in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade.

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

Measurable Outcome: Increase 3-5 Reading Proficiency from 51% to 55%.
- 3rd grade from 53% to 58%
- 4th grade from 54% to 59%
- 5th grade from 44% to 49%

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

This area of Focus will be monitored by the school's leadership team monthly with data chats. Teachers will have monthly classroom data chats with a member of administration and interventionist for support and next steps. FAST data for PM1 and PM2 will be used track.

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.)

1. Continue to use the 4 Disciplines of Execution within the Leader in Me program in which students know their goals, act on their lead measures, track their progress on a scoreboard, and hold each other accountable.

2. Add 30 minutes per day of WIN time to master schedules to provide students with targeted intervention based on individual reading needs.

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

Administration will conduct data chats with teachers once a month during PLCs. Teachers will utilize the principles from the science of reading when assessing the progress of small group reading 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.

1. Title 1 Funds will be utilized to purchase supplemental positions to support differentiated academic interventions such as a paraprofessional, general paraprofessional, two reading tutors for ELL students in grades 2nd-3rd and 4th-5th. A interventionist for math small groups and reading interventionist to support small group reading instruction in

WIN Time. These positions will have a positive impact on student achievement by allowing students to receive targeted small group
instruction on their level.

2. Weekly common planning focusing on small group instruction for ELA and Math.

3.City Year Partnership- Each 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade ELA team will have a full time AmeriCorps member. This member will be assigned to one teacher but will lead small group instruction in each non-sheltered ESOL class with their assigned bubble students.

4. 5th grade teachers are looping up with the students they had in 4th grade.

Person Responsible: Elisha Carr (carre1@duvalschools.org)

By When: Monthly Data Chats per Quarter

Title 1 funds will also be used to purchase additional curriculum for sheltered ESOL classes to support newcomer reading instruction.

Person Responsible: Brett Hartley (hartleyb@duvalschools.org)

By When: Materials will be in place by the end of the first quarter.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

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

Increase Science Proficiency in 5th grade.

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

Increase Science Proficiency from 51% to 60%. Science proficiency in 21-22 was 39%

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

The Leadership team and District Specialists will review District Progress Monitoring data quarterly in 5th grade.

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.)

Planning lessons with Science Coach that are differentiated to meet both student needs.
Science Coach will support student achievement with additional small group instruction.

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

https://www.cpalms.org/PreviewCourse/Preview/55

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

1. Title 1 funds will also purchase Study Island for science engagement and instruction to support the growth in the area of science. Title 1 funds also used to purchase science coach.
2. Data chats based on DMA's.

Person Responsible: Brett Hartley (hartleyb@duvalschools.org)

By When: Quarterly

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

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

Increase Lowest Performing Quartile Gains in ELA for ELL students.

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

Lowest Performing Quartile Gaines will be 50%

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

ELL students will be monitored monthly using the Language for Learning passed lessons and 70 minutes of weekly instruction. ELL students will also be monitored using the winter DMA.

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.)

Send all 3rd, 4th, 5th grade ELA teachers to UFLI Training to use for phonics instruction during WIN time for those who need it.

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

https://ufli.education.ufl.edu/foundations/

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

1. Hire 2 ESOL tutors with Title 1 funds to work with specific students. One tutor will be assigned to 4th and 5th grade, while the other will work with 2nd and 3rd grade students.
2. Purchase ELL newcomer curriculum

Person Responsible: Elisha Carr (carre1@duvalschools.org)

By When: Quarterly

1. Hire 2 ESOL tutors with Title 1 funds to work with specific students. One tutor will be assigned to 4th and 5th grade, while the other will work with 2nd and 3rd grade students.
2. Purchase ELL newcomer curriculum

Person Responsible: Elisha Carr (carre1@duvalschools.org)

By When: Quarterly

#5. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

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.

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

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

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.)

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

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).

Duval County Public Schools has a tiered system of support to align interventions for CSI, TSI and ATSI schools. The first tier of support begins with the Superintendent's cabinet of executive leaders who represent all district departments (Human Resources, Academic Services, Division of Schools, Operations, Finance, Technology, etc.). At a minimum, this team meets on a weekly basis to develop, monitor, and implement the district's strategic plan initiatives. The next level of the tier branches out with the Chief of Schools who oversees the district's Division of Schools. Schools are divided by region (Elementary, Middle, High, and Turnaround/Fragile (ISI Region). Each region has a Regional Superintendent, Executive Directors, and Content Area Specialists who work to ensure that the support is aligned and implemented.

Ensuring adequate funding, resources, and support is available to CSI, TSI and ATSI schools is a driver for

district-wide collaboration. To accomplish this, the Division of Schools works with multiple district departments to further tier support for CSI, TSI and ATSI schools. This support includes but is not limited to the following:

1. Academic Services provides curriculum support and additional content specialists for schools. Academic Services also oversees our district professional development department and coordinates professional development for instructional and non-instructional personnel.
2. Title I – Coordinates the use of funds to best support the barriers that research has shown negatively impacts disadvantaged students. In addition, Title I provides professional development to teachers to improve their pedagogy.
3. The Division of Schools conducts school visits that include instructional reviews and instructional walks. These visits occur on a weekly basis and serve as an opportunity to observe instructional delivery, student learning, and provide feedback to school staff.
4. Finance – Finance provides the funds to provide resources and the personnel needed to address individual school needs.
5. Human Resources – Human Resources works to recruit quality personnel for our most needy schools. This includes a dedicated staffing team to our Turnaround School Region (ISI), priority hiring, and monitoring teacher VAM rating percentage by school. They also work with unions to collective bargain memorandums of understanding that provide for incentives, professional development, and additional strategies to address school needs.

Though the above examples are not comprehensive of all support provided to School Improvement schools, they do provide a snapshot of the layers of support that are available and used to improve student outcomes. Through this layered approach, the district's team along with each school's academic leadership team, teachers, staff, parents, and other stakeholders collaborate on methods of improvement and monitor implementation on a continuous basis.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

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

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

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

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

The area of focus for K-2 at Crown Point Elementary is Small Group Reading Instruction. Small Group reading instruction allows for tailored student differentiated instruction to improve reading and reading comprehension. This instructional component will be used for Tier 2 and Tier 3 reading interventions to ensure students are matched with their needs. Although our data shows that 62% of Kindergarten, 45%

of 1st grade and 65% of second grade are at the 40% for 2023 STAR State Assessment, we are striving for our students to meet the 50% in STAR in 2024.

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

The area of focus for 3-5 at Crown Point Elementary is Small Group Reading Instruction. Small Group reading instruction allows for tailored student differentiated instruction to improve reading and reading comprehension. This instructional component will be used for Tier 2 and Tier 3 reading interventions to ensure students are matched with their needs. Although our data shows that 51% of our students are meeting a Level 3 or higher on the 2023 statewide FAST ELA assessment. We are striving to meet at least 55% reading proficiency and 50 in ELA Learning Gains.

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

Each grade K-2 will have 55% of students meeting the 50% percentile in 2024 statewide STAR Reading Assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Each grade 3-5 will have 55% of students meeting a Level 3 or higher and Learning gains on the 2024 statewide FAST ELA Assessment.

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.

Teachers will complete monthly data chats with the administration and coaches. All teachers K-5 will bring data used to determine small group reading instruction and blended learning data points. Teachers will meet with Reading Coach to plan and implement Tier 2 small group instruction.

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

Carr, Elisha, carre1@duvalschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

The evidence-based practice within small group reading instruction will focus on the five components of reading- phonics, phonemic awareness, vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension and UFLI. The five components of reading are part of the Florida Reading Endorsement course which aligns to the science of Reading. K-5 teachers will UFLI phonics based on the work of University of Florida in literacy. Teachers will use UFLI for students that meet the qualifications during the Reading Intervention Block and Benchmark Advanced Leveled Readers to support individualized reading groups.

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?

The programs were chosen based on a needs to fill in foundational phonics and comprehension skills while providing intensive support with targeted comprehension skills.

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
Administration will create a small group instruction schedule for all K-5 teachers to follow.	Hartley, Brett, hartleyb@duvalschools.org
Monthly Data chats to monitor student progress	Carr, Elisha, carre1@duvalschools.org

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The SIP will be disseminated during the monthly School Advisory Committee meetings. Each month the SAC will discuss an area of focus, school wide data, and/or Title 1 support to stakeholders and get feedback. The SIP will also be reviewed during Title 1 Parental Involvement Events and PTA General Meetings if applicable.

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))

Using Title 1 Funds to sponsor a Literacy Night, Math Night, Mad Scientist Day and a Cultural Arts Night to involve students and parents in the academic process. These events will also feature parent resources to take home to support students academically beyond the classroom.

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))

1. City Year Partnership- Each 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade ELA team will have a full time AmeriCorps member. This Corp member will be assigned to one teacher but will lead a small group instruction group in each non-sheltered ESOL class with their assigned bubble students.
2. Assign City Year Corp Members to bubble students so that teachers can focus on LPQ students during WIN time and small group instruction.
3. 2 Reading Tutors (purchased with Title 1 Funds) assigned to specifically work with 2nd-3rd grade and 4th and 5th grades ESOL students.
4. Title 1 funds will also be used to purchase Scholastic Storyworks Magazines which are aligned to the BEST standards and used during small group reading instruction.

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))

The SIP also includes elements of the Parental Involvement Plan with the Title 1 department. Additionally, the SIP strategies are also based on the goals of the PBIS plan and implementation.

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: Early Warning System	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners	$0.00
5	III.B.	Area of Focus: -- Select below --:	$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