

Duval County Public Schools

Parkwood Heights Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	19
VI. Title I Requirements	22
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	24

Parkwood Heights Elementary School

1709 LANSDOWNE DR, Jacksonville, FL 32211

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

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.

In collaboration with family and community, the mission of Parkwood Heights Elementary is to provide an academically rigorous learning experience in a safe environment for all learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Parkwood Heights Elementary is to do what is best for children as we develop competent independent learners who are eager to explore the possibilities of what they can become.

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
Price, Ashton	Principal	Responsible for all aspects of school operation.
Simpson, Delayna	Assistant Principal	Testing coordinator, assists in instructional planning, data analysis, and Title 1 compliance.
Clark, Amy	Reading Coach	Assists with instructional planning in Reading. Conducts reading intervention groups.
Sapp, Demetrice	School Counselor	Responsible for MTSS process and staffing of students. Assists with PBIS requirements.

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.

Stakeholders are invited to participate in all SAC and Title 1 meetings. This information is sent out in hard copy to students in multiple languages and in email and robocall forms. Community leaders are invited with separate invitations. Social media is also used to communicate with stakeholders. Input is derived from anecdotal notes during meetings as well as survey data.

SIP Monitoring

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

The SIP will be monitored by the leadership team after each FAST PM and again after each DMA. When data is analyzed, the SIP will be analyzed along with it to ensure that student achievement is moving in the right direction. If there are adjustments that need to be made with the implementation, then the SIP will be revised.

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	83%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	3	22	22	17	19	18	0	0	0	101
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	5
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	21	26	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	13	20	0	0	0	33
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	25	26	23	0	0	0	0	0	75

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	12	10	17	21	0	0	0	73

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	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

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	14	19	12	9	13	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	2	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	21	16	13	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	11	5	16	0	0	0	32
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	11	20	33	21	16	0	0	0	101

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	8	8	20	19	15	0	0	0	70

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	14	19	12	9	13	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	2	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	21	16	13	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	11	5	16	0	0	0	32
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	11	20	33	21	16	0	0	0	101

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	8	8	20	19	15	0	0	0	70

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	37	48	53	42	50	56	34		
ELA Learning Gains				58			38		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				61			29		
Math Achievement*	52	58	59	55	48	50	50		
Math Learning Gains				75			47		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				65			38		
Science Achievement*	44	52	54	40	59	59	37		
Social Studies Achievement*					63	64			
Middle School Acceleration					53	52			
Graduation Rate					46	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	62	54	59	63			63		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	232
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57

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	459
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	26	Yes	4	1
ELL	51			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	49			
HSP	35	Yes	1	
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	50			
FRL	43			

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	36	Yes	3	
ELL	59			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	57			
HSP	50			

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	75			
FRL	58			

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	37			52			44					62
SWD	19			33							2	
ELL	30			60							3	62
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	40			49			48				5	70
HSP	15			46							3	45
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	40			60							2	
FRL	33			50			37				5	60

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	42	58	61	55	75	65	40					63
SWD	15	42		35	50							
ELL	38	61		50	83							63
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	35	60	71	49	81	75	35					53
HSP	31			50								70
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	72			78								
FRL	36	59	60	53	75	65	42					70

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	34	38	29	50	47	38	37					63
SWD	21	30		35	42		36					
ELL	25	30		35								63
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	28	37	30	42	38	31	30					67
HSP	36			50								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	54	33		76	91		67					
FRL	31	37		49	47	31	34					61

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	48%	47%	1%	54%	-6%
04	2023 - Spring	40%	50%	-10%	58%	-18%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	40%	46%	-6%	50%	-10%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	42%	59%	-17%	59%	-17%
04	2023 - Spring	53%	58%	-5%	61%	-8%
05	2023 - Spring	60%	52%	8%	55%	5%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	40%	48%	-8%	51%	-11%

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.

Science showed the lowest performance with 41% proficiency. One contributing factor would be the lack of science instruction in the lower grades. Also, there was a change in teachers to a teacher who had not taught science before. Although ELA proficiency showed growth from 42% to 49%, it still runs below Math proficiency by 9 points. It has historically run lower than math. The factors that led to this continue to be the aftereffects of Covid and students entering Kindergarten with little to no pre-k or daycare experience. We also continue to have an influx of ELL students that do not speak English.

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

No data component showed a decline at all. All subjects showed some type of increase. Individual class data was different, 4th-grade ELA proficiency went down 3%, and 3rd-grade math went down 16%. The math decline can be attributed to having the class start the year with one teacher, then a long-term substitute, and then to finish the year, there was a novice teacher. The ELA decline in 4th is harder to explain as there is a veteran teacher in that class. We believe part of the issue is a lack of release to independence by that teacher to her students.

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 with the greatest gap was Science. It is 11.7 % behind the state according to 21-22 scores, as there are no state scores yet for 22-23. Science proficiency is affected by low reading levels. In addition, the teacher who taught science was new to that subject area. Also, there is not enough science instruction in the younger grades.

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

ELA proficiency showed the greatest improvement, with a 7% increase from the previous year. Our school continued to do after-school tutoring. One new action we took was to synchronize small group schedules to maximize the amount of time students were being seen in small groups. We also implemented additional tutoring during resource after December to allow for more time to remediate with students.

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

Our areas of concern are Science and ELA proficiency.

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

ELA proficiency will continue to be our top priority because we will be gaining growth and LPQ growth back into our scores, we will need improvement in this area to increase overall student achievement. Our second area of concern is Science proficiency.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Chronic absenteeism is one early warning area of focus. The Hispanic population makes up 12.6% of our school population but represents 17.2% of our chronic absences. Students with disabilities make up 15.9% of our population and are absent 18.7% of the time.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The goal is to reduce absences among Hispanic students from 17.2% to 10%. The goal is to reduce absences among students with disabilities from 18.7 to 15%.

Monitoring:

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

The school counselor will pull attendance monthly and meet with students and parents to identify obstacles to their attendance and ways to get them to school.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Demetrice Sapp (sappd2@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 counselor will track attendance with students in monthly meetings where they update their attendance folders. The counselor will conduct quarterly meetings with parents to discuss attendance and solutions. We will also use our Spanish-speaking staff to assist with meetings and barriers within this community.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our ELL students represent a growing part of our school population. These students cannot reach proficiency in ELA and Math if they are not attending school.

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 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 is a crucial area of focus due to our 11.7% lag behind the state data.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our current Science proficiency is 41%, and our goal will be to increase 5% to 46%. This will begin to close the gap.

Monitoring:

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

It will be monitored using a county-created baseline test that will be compared to subsequent progress-monitoring assessments.

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.)

The evidence-based strategy will be to use all of the county curriculum available in science, including county-created PowerPoints and benchmark quizzes. In addition, teachers will use the county-provided textbook and workbook to supplement student understanding and practice. Our students with disabilities subgroup will be pulled in small groups for additional remediation.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The county-created materials are an excellent source of visual review material. The county-provided benchmark quizzes are great for small-group practice. The Houghton-Mifflin textbook and workbook materials offer added rigor and more in-depth visual information on the content.

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. 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.

Although ELA proficiency has grown over the last 2 years, it is still 4.2% behind the state average.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Currently, ELA proficiency is 49%, our goal is to increase by 5 points to 54%.

Monitoring:

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

Students' proficiency will be monitored with the new state FAST test and district-level progress monitoring assessments. To determine the next steps, common planning will be used to analyze data and target students below projected proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Delayna Simpson (payned@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.)

Our interventionists will use the LLI program in small group pullouts. Teachers will use materials from the Benchmark Advance curriculum in small classroom groups. We will continue to use after-school tutoring and use additional staff to increase small-group interventions further. Students with disabilities will be included in this group.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The materials we are using are research-based and have been helping us increase over the last 2 years. We will continue these strategies, but expand them into more classrooms, more often using additional staff.

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).

Parkwood has been identified as ATSI school based on the students with disabilities subgroup.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

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

The instructional practice we will use to increase reading proficiency in K-2 will be daily small group reading instruction in class and pull-out. We will use our reading interventionist, VE teachers, and paraprofessionals to work with students on sight words, phonics, and fluency. In addition, after-school tutoring will be available with Title 1 funds.

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

The instructional practice we will use to increase reading proficiency in 3-5 will be daily small group reading instruction in class and pull-out. We will use our reading interventionist, VE teachers, and paraprofessionals to work with students on Benchmark Advance and LLI. In addition, after-school tutoring will be available with Title 1 funds.

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

Kindergarten is currently at 57% proficiency, according to district STAR data, our goal will be to reach 60%. First grade is our main area of concern at 37% and second grade is 46% proficient. The goal will be to reach 50% in both grades.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

According to FAST PM 3 from 22-23, our 3rd and 4th grade students are at 40% proficiency, and 5th grade is at 48%. Our goal will be to reach 50% in all grade levels.

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.

This area of focus will be monitored with an analysis of all FAST PM tests and district progress monitoring test data. This will occur after each test with changes made to small groups as needed. We will also monitor I-Ready and STAR data after each diagnostic. Data chats with teachers will take place monthly during common planning. Teachers will conduct data chats with students monthly.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Price, Ashton, pricea@duvalschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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

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

The use of Benchmark Advance small group materials, along with LLI, all meet the county and state requirements of evidence-based programs. The use of small group instruction is an evidence-based instructional practice. In addition, students in K-2 are using prescriptive blended learning programs such as Waterford and I-Ready. Select students will use Seeing Stars and Heggerty as interventions.

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?

LLI and Benchmark Advance are programs designed to improve comprehension. The county has purchased Heggerty and Seeing Stars as a phonics intervention program. I-Ready and Waterford or prescriptive online programs that work on phonics, sight words, vocabulary, and comprehension. The school population needs all of these practices to reach grade-level proficiency.

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
<p>Data analysis and establishment of small groups for intervention. In collaboration with the Reading Interventionist, the assistant principal will establish groups of students who need intensive small-group reading instruction. We will use progress monitoring data to assess group progress. Training will be provided to paraprofessionals on Benchmark Advance small group materials. The reading interventionist will concentrate on using LLI materials.</p>	<p>Simpson, Delayna, payned@duvalschools.org</p>
<p>Daily small group instruction from teachers, interventionists, and paraprofessionals. The assistant principal will create block scheduling to allow the pull out of students needing reading interventions in small groups. This will be monitored with walk-throughs and observations. Professional learning on conducting groups will take place during common planning. Assessment of effectiveness will be measured with I-Ready, STAR, and state and district progress monitoring assessments.</p>	<p>Simpson, Delayna, payned@duvalschools.org</p>

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.

A link to the SIP will be included on our school website. In addition, we will have a copy in the main office and a copy in the Parent Resource Room. We will also have translated copies of this plan available in the same locations. Finally, we have put a link to our SIP out to our community partners via email.

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))

All parents have the opportunity to participate in all meetings to give input into the process throughout the school year through a variety of channels, including; PTA meetings and School Advisory Council meetings. We also have various Title One parent in-services that are offered throughout the year, teaching them how to support their child's education. The SAC is responsible for developing, implementing, and evaluating the various school-level plans, including the SIP and PFEP.

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)

The school will maximize quality learning time through master scheduling of all small groups. We will strengthen academic programs by utilizing all support staff to work with students in small groups and

after-school tutoring. We will build on the current curriculum materials with additional materials and software programs purchased with Title One funds.

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))

Our School Improvement Plan will include programs presented to parents through Title One and using Title One materials to increase integration at home.

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))

The school utilizes the school counselor as needed for referrals of students needing extra mental health and behavior support. All staff utilize full-service counseling programs for students who need more support than what is offered at the school.

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))

Not applicable

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).

The school currently follows a PBIS model for the school. This includes Guidelines for Success, classroom rules, consequences and rewards. Students are taught the expectations in the morning holding area as well as in the classroom with their teacher. Students who need additional interventions are given Tier 2 and Tier 3 support.

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))

Teachers are given professional development by the county at early dismissal and in preplanning. Teachers are also given professional learning during common planning and PLCs, along with presentations by admin.

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))

Not applicable

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

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

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes