

Duval County Public Schools

# Bartram Springs Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

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

## Bartram Springs Elementary

14799 BARTRAM SPRINGS PKWY, Jacksonville, FL 32258

<http://www.duvalschools.org/bartramsprings>

### 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.**

Bartram Springs Eagles, families, and community working together will SOAR to attain educational excellence by:  
 providing a Safe, Inclusive, and Nurturing Environment,  
 providing Opportunities for academic, social, and emotional growth,  
 providing Academic success through focused, data driven instruction and  
 by continuously Reviewing student progress, to match instruction to meet the needs of an ever evolving community of learners.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Engage students in data-driven instruction that inspires them to take ownership of learning and excel academically while promoting leadership and collaboration that supports and encourages life-long learning.

### 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
Wright, Kimberley	Principal	
Bartley, Cynthia	Assistant Principal	
Weaks, Caroline	Teacher, K-12	
Spears, Racheal	Teacher, K-12	
Clements, Vicki	Teacher, K-12	
Antzaklis, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	
Armstrong, Steven	Teacher, K-12	
Ray , Cindy	Teacher, K-12	

**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 Improvement Plan is developed after the School Leadership Team has met to review the previous year's data. The team analyzes the data and identifies priority goals and strategies for the school year. Once the goals and strategies are established, the School Improvement Plan is presented to the School Advisory Council for feedback. The School Improvement Plan can be revised based on their input.

**SIP Monitoring**

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP is monitored throughout the school year after each progress monitoring assessment. Student achievement is formally shared with the School Advisory Council during the Mid-Year Stakeholder’s meeting.

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

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	No
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	54%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	40%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

**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	52	46	31	34	27	0	0	0	192
One or more suspensions	0	3	7	3	1	2	0	0	0	16
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	34	12	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	25	12	0	0	0	38
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	3	65	68	38	0	0	0	0	0	174

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	20	25	14	25	11	0	0	0	97

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	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	0	50	25	34	21	20	0	0	0	150
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	3	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	4	20	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	8	22	0	0	0	31
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	18	26	42	0	0	0	0	0	86
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	18	20	34	3	18	0	0	0	93

**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	2	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	0	50	25	34	21	20	0	0	0	150
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	0	0	2	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	3	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	3	4	1	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	4	20	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	8	22	0	0	0	31
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	18	26	42	0	0	0	0	0	86
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**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	18	20	34	3	18	0	0	0	93

**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	2	0	0	0	0	0	4
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*	66	48	53	73	50	56	71		
ELA Learning Gains				62			65		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43			48		
Math Achievement*	76	58	59	79	48	50	73		
Math Learning Gains				70			58		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				47			30		
Science Achievement*	67	52	54	67	59	59	66		
Social Studies Achievement*					63	64			
Middle School Acceleration					53	52			
Graduation Rate					46	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	39	54	59	63			75		

*\* 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	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	310
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	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	504
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	45			
ELL	52			
AMI				
ASN	75			
BLK	55			
HSP	57			
MUL	61			
PAC				
WHT	74			
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	60			
AMI				
ASN	78			
BLK	57			
HSP	53			
MUL	67			
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	55			

**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	66			76			67					39
SWD	46			56			48				4	
ELL	59			63			67				5	39
AMI												
ASN	77			85			80				4	
BLK	60			55			50				4	
HSP	54			74			59				5	38
MUL	61			61							3	
PAC												
WHT	71			84			72				4	
FRL	50			62			53				5	45

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	73	62	43	79	70	47	67					63
SWD	59	53	53	59	58	48	38					
ELL	58	65	40	66	70							63
AMI												
ASN	78	68		84	76		83					
BLK	67	64	47	63	64	39	52					
HSP	66	58	33	70	55	31	57					
MUL	70	38		77	86		62					
PAC												
WHT	76	65	52	86	74	41	75					
FRL	60	57	36	66	60	42	61					

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	71	65	48	73	58	30	66					75
SWD	44	28		48	40	17	33					
ELL	53			71								75
AMI												
ASN	77			83			73					
BLK	58	53	31	53	50	18	46					
HSP	63	47		70	53		57					64
MUL	67			73								
PAC												
WHT	80	77	73	81	63	50	79					90
FRL	61	62	50	63	44	25	43					

**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	62%	47%	15%	54%	8%
04	2023 - Spring	78%	50%	28%	58%	20%
03	2023 - Spring	59%	46%	13%	50%	9%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	76%	59%	17%	59%	17%
04	2023 - Spring	82%	58%	24%	61%	21%
05	2023 - Spring	66%	52%	14%	55%	11%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	64%	48%	16%	51%	13%

### 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.**

Based on the new 2023 FAST, our 3rd grade students demonstrated a 59% proficiency rate in Reading. In 2022, our 3rd grade students were at 76% proficiency on the FSA. FAST was a new assessment for all 3rd - 5th grade students. Compared to the previous year, we had more students that needed intensive intervention in Reading.

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

3rd grade Reading, 5th grade Reading, 3rd grade Math and 5th grade Math showed the greatest declines from the previous year. FAST was a new assessment for all 3rd - 5th grade students. We also had a new Reading and Math curriculum for 3rd - 5th grade.

**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.**

Despite having a decrease in Reading and Math for grades 3 and 5, our overall percentages were above the state average.

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

4th grade Reading and Math showed the most improvement. Reading increased from 66% to 78%. Math increased from 67% to 82%. Our 4th grade team worked diligently to create Focus Calendars to remediate skills with students.

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

Reflecting on our EWS data, the number of students with a substantial reading deficiency is an area of concern.

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

1. Increasing Science proficiency in 5th grade.
2. Increasing Reading proficiency in 3rd and 5th grade.
3. Increasing Math proficiency in 3rd and 5th grade.
4. Demonstrate learning gains in Reading and Math.

**Area of Focus**

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

## #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to 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.

Our Science data did not increase from the previous year. Our Science proficiency remained at 67%.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

If teachers provide targeted, data-driven instruction along with providing engaging aligned science investigations, our students will increase from 67% to 68% in Science proficiency.

### Monitoring:

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

Administration will review student data from progress monitoring assessments administered from the beginning to the end of the school year. Data chats will be conducted with teachers.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kimberley Wright (wrightk@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.)

Teachers will provide instruction using district resources, aligned investigations and Science centers.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Hands-on learning can enhance student achievement.

### 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 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.

Based on our 2023 FAST data, 3rd grade decreased from 76% to 59%; 5th grade decreased from 63% to 62%. Overall reading proficiency decreased from 73% to 69%.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

If teachers provide targeted, data-driven instruction, along with the appropriate Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions, we will increase our overall ELA proficiency from 69% to 74% and increase proficiency in 3rd grade from 59% to 70%.

**Monitoring:**

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

Administration will review student data from progress monitoring assessments administered from the beginning to the end of the school year. Data chats will be conducted with teachers.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Kimberley Wright (wrightk@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 will be implemented in K -2 and for identified students in 3 - 5.  
Small group instruction based on student data with benchmark aligned resources.  
Freckle, blending learning for grades 3 - 5 for targeted remediation.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The above-mentioned interventions will be used to bridge the gap of foundational reading skills for students so that they can be closer to reading and comprehending on grade level.

**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. 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.

Based on the results from the 2022-23 5 Essentials Survey, areas of improvement include Effective Leaders, Collaborative Teachers and Supportive Environment. Results show that we were rated as "Neutral" in all 3 categories.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Our goal on the 5 Essentials Survey is to increase from "Neutral" to "Strong" in the areas of Effective Leaders, Collaborative Teachers and Supportive Environment.

**Monitoring:**

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

Admin will use PLCs and Early Dismissal days to monitor and track teacher participation and solicit feedback. School-wide goals to increase teacher collaboration will also be reflected on each teacher's Individual Professional Development Plan.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Kimberley Wright (wrightk@duvalschools.org)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**

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

The 5 Essentials Survey is an evidence-based survey to measure the culture and climate of the school.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The identified areas continue to be a concern since the implementation of the 5 Essentials Survey. Supportive Environment decreased from Strong to Neutral from the previous year.

**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***