Duval County Public Schools

Mandarin Oaks Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Mandarin Oaks Elementary School

10600 HORNETS NEST RD, Jacksonville, FL 32257

http://www.duvalschools.org/moe

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.

Mandarin Oaks will provide students with engaging and challenging instruction in every classroom, for every student, every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Mandarin Oaks will inspire and prepare every student for success through active engagement in quality educational opportunities.

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
Butterfield, Leigh	Principal	School-based administrators serve as the primary leaders of the school for which they are responsible. They offer guidance and support to our instructional and support staff and create a positive learning environment which is centered around student success. School-based administrator positions include: Principals, associate principals, assistant principals, directors of student services, and dean of students.
Harrison, Brooke	Assistant Principal	School-based administrators serve as the primary leaders of the school for which they are responsible. They offer guidance and support to our instructional and support staff and create a positive learning environment which is centered around student success. School-based administrator positions include: Principals, associate principals, assistant principals, directors of student services, and dean of 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.

The school has a Shared Decision Making Team (SDMT) comprised of staff members from each employee work group (teachers, administrators, paraprofessionals) who meet to discuss potential areas for improvement as well as strategies related to the SIP development process. The school also meets with parents and community memebers through PTA board meetings and the School Advisory Council to get feedback conerning potential areas for improvement. The results and implications from The 5 Essentials Survey are shared with parents and feedback is welcomed.

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))

Regular monitoring will occur through scheduled classroom walkthroughs, teacher formal and informal observations, and teacher data chats. The leadership team will meet with teachers weekly during content-specific professional learning communities (PLC) to monitor teacher implementation of strategies and student progress related to the SIP goals. The School Advisory Council will meet regularly and consists of teachers, parents, and community leaders- feedback and information regarding SIP progress will be shared and discussed.

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	49%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	54%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
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	6	54	64	56	50	54	0	0	0	284
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	1	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	9	21	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	21	0	0	0	28
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	21	57	78	99	96	0	0	0	351

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	12	108	106	100	103	106	0	0	0	535

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	2	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	3

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	39	44	38	31	45	0	0	0	197
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	4	6	1	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	26	28	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	26	26	0	0	0	52
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	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	3	7	4	4	24	0	0	0	42

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	6	12	9	12	0	0	0	41
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	3	2	0	0	0	6

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	39	44	38	31	45	0	0	0	197
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	4	6	1	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	8	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	26	28	0	0	0	54
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	26	26	0	0	0	52
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	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	3	7	4	4	24	0	0	0	42

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	6	12	9	12	0	0	0	41
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	3	2	0	0	0	6

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*	59	48	53	65	50	56	65		
ELA Learning Gains				71			72		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				59			53		
Math Achievement*	66	58	59	71	48	50	73		
Math Learning Gains				70			74		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				57			65		
Science Achievement*	62	52	54	55	59	59	62		
Social Studies Achievement*					63	64			
Middle School Acceleration					53	52			
Graduation Rate					46	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	41	54	59	84			58		

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	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	289
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	532
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98
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	39	Yes	1	
ELL	39	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	74			
BLK	51			
HSP	51			
MUL	53			
PAC				
WHT	62			
FRL	42			

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	45			
ELL	60			
AMI				
ASN	86			
BLK	55			
HSP	63			
MUL	69			
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	61			

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	59			66			62					41
SWD	34			44			41				4	
ELL	43			53			18				5	41
AMI												
ASN	69			87			65				3	
BLK	50			50			38				4	
HSP	51			61			58				5	26
MUL	60			50			40				4	
PAC												
WHT	61			71			72				5	50
FRL	43			47			56				5	25

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	65	71	59	71	70	57	55					84
SWD	35	59	55	42	54	44	28					
ELL	39	74	62	45	70	64	40					84
AMI												
ASN	80	92		88	88		80					
BLK	52	72	72	58	62	33	37					
HSP	59	76	54	60	59	64	53					79
MUL	68	63		69	74							
PAC												
WHT	67	69	52	73	72	59	56					
FRL	55	71	66	58	61	49	54					73

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	65	72	53	73	74	65	62					58
SWD	36	52	36	43	50		39					
ELL	36	73	70	50	80		17					58
AMI												
ASN	85	67		90	91		87					
BLK	50	64		49	50		23					
HSP	57	57		60	62		45					44
MUL	59	69		69	92		69					
PAC												
WHT	69	79	67	79	78	68	74					73
FRL	54	57	39	59	58	48	49					62

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	52%	47%	5%	54%	-2%
04	2023 - Spring	68%	50%	18%	58%	10%
03	2023 - Spring	56%	46%	10%	50%	6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	61%	59%	2%	59%	2%
04	2023 - Spring	78%	58%	20%	61%	17%
05	2023 - Spring	63%	52%	11%	55%	8%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	58%	48%	10%	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.

Reading proficiency in grade 3 and grade 5 showed the lowest performance. Some of the factors that contributed to student performance include inconsistent implementation of differentiated small groups. Additionally, many students were identified as having a substantial reading deficiency and did not receive enough systematic and intentional instruction in basic reading skills. Students needing intensive interventions did not receive them with fidelity.

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

The greatest decline from last year was reading achievement. Students who needed remediation in basic reading skills did not receive differentiated instruction with fidelity and intentionality. Targeted progress monitoring was not used efficiently to postively impact student achievement.

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 greatest gap comes from our science achievement. Some of the factors that contributed to this are a lack of consistent science instruction and differentiation. Additionally, there was not enough progress

monitoring to accurately meet student needs and improve performance in science. Access to professional development and collaboration at the school level was limited.

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

The greatest improvement was in math achievement. Teachers incorporated consistent differentiation through small group instruction, tutoring, and consistent progress monitoring. Additionally, teachers collaborated to address common math misconceptions and strategies for improving student performance.

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

Our greatest areas of concern are a high number of students who are missing a lareg amount of instruction due to absences as well as a large increase in students who have substantial reading deficiencies.

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

1. Address the need for intensive reading remediation and instruction for an increasing number of students who have a substantial reading deficiency.

2. Support teachers with implementing research-based intentional reading programs that help students to develop basic reading skills and enhanced comprehension skills.

3. Ensure that all teachers have access to adequate professional development opportunities in both reading and science that include data chats, vertical articulation, and lesson study cycles

4. Increase teacher implementation of small group differentiated reading centers and interventions

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.

Reading proficiency in 3rd and 5th grade has decreased significantly. Only 56% of 3rd graders were proficient in reading last year and only 52% of 5th graders were proficient in reading.

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

Increase reading proficiency in 3rd grade from 56% to 60%. Increase reading proficiency in 5th grade from 52% to 56%.

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

Teachers will participate in weekly professional learning communities (PLC) that focuses on small group instruction and explicit teaching of metacognitive strategies. Teachers will participate in data chats with school leadership focused on individual students and data-based goal setting. Teachers will participate in regular data chats regarding testing data and differentiated instruction results.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Leigh Butterfield (butterfieldl@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.)

High impact teachers from 4th grade ELA were moved to 5th Grade ELA. Two 3rd grade teachers were moved to 4th grade, and staff changes were made to 2nd grade to strengthen preparation for 3rd grade. A former VE teacher and 5th grade teacher were moved to 2nd grade to increase literacy leadership on the grade level. Teachers will particiapte in lesson study cycles and attend training for an evidence-based reading program called UFLI. Teacher schedules will provide teachers with two, 30-minute center rotations in addition to 30 minutes of reading intervention daily. Teachers will implement metacognitive strategies during reading instruction.

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

Providing consistent center rotations and an evidence-based reading program for interventions will allow teachers to meet the needs of students. Through a stronger focus on differentiated instruction and metacognitive strategies, teachers will be able to build students' reading skills and their ability to transfer those reading skills across content areas. Regular collaboration with colleagues and data based decision making will ensure that students are receiving appropriate instruction that is tailored to their academic needs and progress.

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.

Conduct data chats with teachers after each new data set is received. Facilitiate professional learning communites (PLC) that allow teachers to discuss data, participate in lesson study cycles, and set goals based on student performance. Create schedules that provide time for teachers to provide small group interventions and center rotations consistently. Ensure that all teachers have access to training regarding UFLI (research based reading curriculum and intervention).

Person Responsible: Leigh Butterfield (butterfieldl@duvalschools.org)

By When: 09/21/2023

#2. 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.

Science proficiency in 5th grade is at 62% and still has room for improvement. A review of data shows that while proficieny has increased from the previous school year, there is still a good number of students lacking in science proficiency.

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

Science proficiency in 5th grade will increase from 62% to 65%.

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

Data tracking and progress with aligned investigations will be monitored. Teacher use of assessment data and student led centers will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs. School leadership will analyze and review data with each teacher following all benchmark science assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Leigh Butterfield (butterfieldl@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.)

Science teachers will use Daily Science Digs to support student mastery. Teachers will ensure that students use guided noted with aligned investigations, SSA style questions, demos/experiments that include tasks to assess understanding, and reading-focused activities. High effect teacher was moved from 4th grade to 5th grade and will serve as the science lead for the grade level.

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

Teachers will be able to effectively idenitfy student needs and monitor their progress through a variety of science instruction strategies. Teachers will encourage metacognition through the use of SSA style and QCAM tasks. Teachers will design instruction using exit ticket data and student understanding will be stronger due to the incorporation of hands on activities. A strong science lead teacher will provide a model and support for the 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.

Provide teachers with access to district resources like Deep Dive and note taking guides to ensure that students have the proper tools for success in science. Provide support for teachers with implementing science based centers that include vocabulary, fluency, Study Island, and SSA style questions. Provide

opportunities for teacher to collaborate and share strategies for experiments, demos, and hands on experiences for students in science.

Person Responsible: Leigh Butterfield (butterfieldl@duvalschools.org)

By When: 09/15/2023

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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.

Math achievement has decreased this year. Our data shows that students math proficiency in grade 3 and grade 5 are both in need of improvement.

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

Math proficiency in 3rd grade will improve from 61% to 65%. Math proficiency in 5th grade will increase from 36% to 67%.

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

Teachers will participate in data chats with the leadership team to discuss small group instruction and data. Teachers will meet with school leadership for planning chats to review baseline data and to set instructional goals for students. School administration will conduct regular classroom walkthroughs to assess the efficacy of math instruction and the quality of small group instructional materials and strategies.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Leigh Butterfield (butterfieldl@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.)

Two strong 4th grade teachers were moved to 5th grade and one will serve as grade level chair. One 5th grade teacher was moved to 4th grade to teach a self-contained class. Teachers will participate in professional development and data chats with administration. Teachers will meet with the lead math teacher to discuss strategies for spiral reviews based on math benchmarks. Teachers will implement math centers with fidelity and intentionality. Teachers will participate in weekly PLC sessions focused on small group instruction and student data/progress in math.

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

A strong math lead teacher will serve as a support and a resource for the grade level to implement high quality instruction. Data chats will ensure that teachers are able to identify student needs in math so that they can plan appropriate instruction and interventions. The use of spirals will support students' development of math strategies and number sense. Teachers will be accountable for their instructional decisions and can receive timely instructional support through regular meetings with administration during data chats and PLC sessions.

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.

Ensure that teachers have access to math professional development resources. Facilitate weekly PLC sessions with teachers that focus on small group instruction and the explicit teaching of math strategies and number sense. Conduct planning and data chats with teachers to support the use of differentiated instruction and evidence-based practices. Ensure that teachers are analyzing student performance and that they have the opportunity to discuss student data with each other and the administration team.

Person Responsible: Leigh Butterfield (butterfieldl@duvalschools.org)

By When: 10/01/2023

#4. 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.

Our data shows that there is a large number of students who frequently absent from school in excess of 20 days.

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

Reduce the number of students with chronic absenteeism from 22% to 18%.

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

School counselors and district social workers will monitor students needing attendance interventions. They will also check-in with students concerning attendance. School counselors will hold monthly attendance meetings with leadership and district social workers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Leigh Butterfield (butterfieldl@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 school will utilize a mental health and attendance resource table for parents at Open House. Attendance information will be provided to parents at Open House and posted on the school Bloomz site. Students with attendance issues will be paired with a mentor. Our school will have a new truancy officer, Kaleb Brannon who will assist as well. There will be monthly attendance meetings with school leadership, social worker and school counselors to determine student attendance needs and plan interventions. Utilize Attendance Works program for students.

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

Ensuring that parents are informed about the importance of attendance and its correlation to academic performance will encourage them to bring their children to school each day. Providing resources for parents regarding mental health and attendance will help parents to give their children the resources needed to increase attendance at school. Providing tiered interventions for chronically absent students will ensure that students and families have the proper support to address potential attendance concerns.

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.

Create a presentation regarding attendance expectations for all teachers to share at Open House. Ensure that teachers have Attendance Works materials to share with parents. Determine potential mentors for students with chronic absences. Determine the steps for Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 attendance

classifications. Facilitate monthly attendance meetings to assess student needs and interventions. Educate teachers on the attendance intervention process. Facilitate meetings with parents regarding attendance concerns and resources for attendance improvement.

Person Responsible: Leigh Butterfield (butterfieldl@duvalschools.org)

By When: 10/01/2023

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

n/a

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

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

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

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

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

n/a

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

n/a

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

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

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

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

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

n/a

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

n/a

Monitoring

Monitoring
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

n/a

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

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

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

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

n/a

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- ◦ Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

n/a

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring

n/a

Title I Requirements

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

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

n/a

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

n/a

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

n/a

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

n/a

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

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

n/a

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

n/a

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

n/a

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

n/a

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

n/a

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$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.

No