Pickett Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Pickett Elementary School

6305 OLD KINGS RD, Jacksonville, FL 32254

http://www.duvalschools.org/pickett

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.

Mission Statement:
To build strong leaders, academically and socially, by implementing standards-based instruction daily in a safe, positive, and supportive environment which will positively impact students, families, and the community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision:
Every student is motivated, inspired, and developed academically and socially to become strong leaders, proficient learners, responsible citizens, and productive community members.

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
Stovall, Violet	Principal	The principal is the instructional leader, supervises, and administers all programs, policies, and activities of the school to include: • Monitors and assess effectiveness of instructional practices, ensures effective implementation of district curriculum, and instructional and support personnel. • Participates in the school performance review process to determine causes of low performance and implements appropriate strategies for school improvement, • Works to ensure the highest academic standards are implemented daily, while monitoring the success of all students in the learning environment to promote effective student performance. • Leads the school in data analysis, instructional improvements and works as a support system to all faculty, staff, and students. • Ensures the school is a safe and secure learning environment for all students and staff through the implementation of Positive Behavior Intervention Supports and other appropriate preventive strategies. • Develops and encourages positive school/community relations with internal and external stakeholders, and serves as liaison between the school, staff, and the community • Performs all other duties as assigned or needed.
Administrative Support		The Administrative Support serves as a leader of the learning community and all activities of the school to include: • Instructional leader to monitor and assess instruction. • Monitors the success of all students in the learning environment, aligns the curriculum, instruction, and assessment processes to promote effective student performance, and uses feedback measures to ensure accountability for all participants engaged in the learning process. • Ensures a safe and secure learning environment through the implementation of Positive Behavior

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 process for involving stakeholders in the development of the School Improvement began with the summer planning team reviewing last year's State Assessment data to identify deficient areas. Plans were made to identify strategies an action plan to improve student Achievement. The draft of the plan will be presented to the SAC Team to provide input for modifications and additions.

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

The School Improvement Plan will be monitored by the Leadership Team, faculty and SAC for effective implementation of action steps and for progress monitoring of student performance. Student data will be analyzed regularly to determine if interventions in place are working. The school will make modifications as needed to ensure continuous improvement.

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	61%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* Black/African American Students (BLK) 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: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
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	1	20	18	16	10	10	0	0	0	75
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	2	4	4	0	0	0	12
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	13	7	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	4	7	0	0	0	12
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	19	16	17	0	0	0	0	0	53

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	1	12	13	11	8	9	0	0	0	54

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	1	6	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2

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	22	10	13	9	9	0	0	0	64
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	3	3	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	1	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	9	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	6	6	0	0	0	16
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	13	17	14	5	5	0	0	0	55

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	1	13	17	14	5	5	0	0	0	55

The number of students identified retained:

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

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	22	10	13	9	9	0	0	0	64
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	3	3	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	1	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	9	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	6	6	0	0	0	16
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	13	17	14	5	5	0	0	0	55

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	1	13	17	14	5	5	0	0	0	55

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	28	48	53	41	50	56	39		
ELA Learning Gains				61			44		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				55					
Math Achievement*	49	58	59	62	48	50	58		
Math Learning Gains				55			54		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				45					
Science Achievement*	38	52	54	48	59	59	28		
Social Studies Achievement*					63	64			
Middle School Acceleration					53	52			
Graduation Rate					46	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		54	59						

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	36
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	142
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	367
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	23	Yes	3	3
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	30	Yes	1	1
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	36	Yes	1	
FRL	33	Yes	1	

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	27	Yes	2	2
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	49			
HSP				

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	52			

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	28			49			38					
SWD	12			33							2	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	24			42			31				4	
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	29			52							3	
FRL	26			43			41				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	41	61	55	62	55	45	48					
SWD	12			41								
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
BLK	39	56		54	48		46					
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	39	61		71	61							
FRL	41	60	55	59	55	50	45					

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	39	44		58	54		28					
SWD	17			18								
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	41	50		52								
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	35	40		60	53		29					
FRL	36	35		52	45		24					

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	41%	47%	-6%	54%	-13%
04	2023 - Spring	27%	50%	-23%	58%	-31%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	28%	46%	-18%	50%	-22%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	69%	59%	10%	59%	10%
04	2023 - Spring	42%	58%	-16%	61%	-19%
05	2023 - Spring	33%	52%	-19%	55%	-22%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	35%	48%	-13%	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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance for Pickett was Reading proficiency. One contributing factor for the low performance was teacher's ineffective execution of the new Benchmark Curriculum and the alignment of instruction with grade level BEST Benchmarks in grades 3 & 4. Another factor was the lack

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

Based on the 2023 FAST, the data component showing the greatest decline from the prior year was fifth (5th) grade Math. A contributing was the lack of teacher experience and knowledge with teaching the fifth grade BEST Benchmarks at the complexity level required to increase proficiency.

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.

The data component showing the greatest gap when compared to the state average was fifth grade Science. The factor contributing to the gap was the teacher knowledge and experience with executing the Science instruction.

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

The data component showing the most improvement was from PM1 to PM 3 third grade Math. The action taken last year was to place the Math Interventionist in the third grade classroom after the first quarter. Focused
small group instruction and student remediation groups improved assessment data and instruction.

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

An area of concern on the EWS data from Part 1 is the number of students with 10% or more absences and the students with 2 or more EWS indicators.

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

Reading Proficiency and Reading Gains
Science Proficiency
Math Proficiency

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 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 the FAST 2023 data, Pickett's overall Reading proficiency was 35%.

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

If effective instructional practices and Tier 2 interventions are effectively implemented and student performance is monitored, student's reading proficiency will increase from 35% to 45%.

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

Weekly classroom observations will occur using the district's Benchmark Walkthrough Tool to determine alignment of instruction, student tasks and assessments. Feedback will be provided to teachers based on observations using the tool.
Student assessment data will be monitored to determined additional interventions needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Violet Stovall (stovallv@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.)

Small group Tier 2 instruction will be provided daily with teachers and push-in support from paras.
After school tutoring with prescribed instruction for specific students.

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

Prescribed interventions must be facilitated daily based on student needs. Student performance must be monitored to determine next steps.

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.

Weekly common vertical planning sessions will focus on data analysis and instruction based on grade level Benchmarks. Teachers will participate in district-provided trainings during early dismissal trainings.

Person Responsible: Violet Stovall (stovallv@duvalschools.org)

By When:

#2. -- 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

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

The data from the 5E's indicates less than 50% of the respondents feel Pickett is does not have a supportive environment..

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

If a positive school culture and environment was maintained at Pickett, teacher retention will increase from the previous year by 10%.

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

Teachers new to the profession of teaching will have weekly check-in meetings with admin and the peer teacher to determine their understanding of school systems, instructional best practices.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Violet Stovall (stovallv@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.)

Weekly common planning sessions with new teachers will be provided to plan student tasks, assessments, Tier 2 interventions and benchmark-based instruction.

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

New teachers receiving instructional support from admin and their peers will be able to consistently share their areas of expertise and weaknesses. The support systems will keep a gauge on levels of comfort in the classroom.

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.

New teachers will be assigned a peer teacher to provide support as needed by meeting consistently throughout the school year.

Person Responsible: Violet Stovall (stovallv@duvalschools.org)

By When: May 2024

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

If a positive school culture and environment was maintained at Pickett, teacher retention will increase from the previous year by 10%.

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:
>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.
>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.
>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.
>Finance – Finance provides the funds to provide resources and the personnel needed to address individual school needs.
>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

Based on grades K -2, 2022 - 2023 data using Waterford and i-Ready, there is a reading deficit and concern that the current students are not on track to score at a proficiency level of 3 or above on the ELA

Florida Assessment Test. The student's data indicated the reading proficiency was below 50%: grade K - 43%; grade 1 - 33%; grade 2 - 39%

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

Based on grades 3 -5, 2022 - 2023 FAST data, there is a deficiency in Reading proficiency. The student's data indicated the reading proficiency was below 50% in grade 3 - 28% - grade 4 27% and grade 5 - 41%

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

50 % or higher of grades K-2 students will leave the primary grades reading on grade level.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

55% or higher of grades 3-5 grade students will be proficient on state progress monitoring assessments.

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.

Ongoing monitoring of the implementation of Benchmark Based Instructional practices.
Monitoring of Tier 2 interventions and plans to ensure students are making progress.
Progress monitoring of student data using: Unit Assessments, district assessments, PM's, Waterford, I-Ready FAST, and STAR assessments.
Data will be consistently analyzed to determine student's progress toward proficiency.

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

Stovall, Violet, stovallv@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?

Benchmark Advance
Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI)
Waterford Blended Learning
I-Ready Blended Learning
Freckle
UFLI

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?

All reading programs are adopted and supported by DCPS Academic Services.

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
*Implementation of benchmark-based instruction *UFLI-Foundations program in grades K - 5. *Monitoring of Blended learning programs: I-Ready, Waterford & Freckle	Stovall, Violet, stovallv@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 school will use various methods of dissemination of the School Improvement Plan to stakeholders. The parent monthly newsletter will provide updates on the school's progress toward our academic goals. Monthly parent Involvement meeting will include our school goals and action plan and resources used daily.

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))

Pickett Elementary will build a positive school culture and environment by:
• Providing activities to engage parents, family members and the community in learning that will promote student academic and social growth.
• Teachers will facilitate daily Social Emotion Learning lessons for students to acquire and effectively apply
the knowledge, attitudes, and skills necessary to understand and manage emotions, set and achieve positive goals, feel, and show empathy for others, establish and maintain positive relationships and make
responsible decisions.
• Discipline assemblies will take place quarterly to include bus safety and safety procedures commuting to
and from school to ensure students feel safe.
• The PBIS team will meet monthly to develop plans for a supportive and fulfilling school environment with
conditions that are conducive to learning and meet the needs of all students and staff.
• The school will partner with surrounding businesses, volunteers, non-profits, and stakeholders to bring positive, measurable change to the school. The school will solicit funding to provide monthly incentives for
the school's instructional staff to enhance staff morale.
• The core Leadership Team will meet weekly to develop plans to improve and integrate data, systems, and
practices to positively affect student academic outcomes.

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))

Weekly common planning sessions will focus on data analysis and instruction based on grade level Benchmarks. A great emphasis will be placed on Tier 2 instruction to close the achievement gap and focus on deficient foundational skills in Reading and Math. Paraprofessionals will be used (Title 1

funding) to provide prescriptive small group instruction daily with students in Reading, Science and Math. Students will also receive additional Science instructional support from the Media Specialist (Title 1 funding .5) and Reading Interventionist (Title 1 funding). Implementing effective Reading strategies with Science will be a focus for Science proficiency. Fifth grade students will also participate in a trip to Kennedy Space Center (Title 1 funding)to increase proficiency with Space standards.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A