

Duval County Public Schools

Lone Star 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	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	21
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Lone Star Elementary School

10400 LONE STAR RD, Jacksonville, FL 32225

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

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.

It is the mission of Lone Star Elementary School to inspire, motivate, and challenge students to attain annual learning gains.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Encourage students to think, reflect, and possess the courage to go for Greatness!

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
Quarles Gaston, Cheryl	Principal	Empower leaders to venture forward, explore new frontiers, and ensure students demonstrate annual growth.
Link, Rebekkah	Assistant Principal	Assess students, review data, and monitor to ensure teachers are providing adequate instruction
Cavin, Sue	Teacher, K-12	Provides Science Instruction & serves as Science Lead
Tate, Debra	Teacher, ESE	Provides ESE services to students with IEP's
Thies, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12	Intermediate Reading Teacher Rep (3 - 5)
Shifkey, Jacqueline	Teacher, K-12	Primary Reading Teacher (K - 2)
Wood, Stephen	Teacher, K-12	Provides Math Instruction (grade 5) & Math Lead
Manabat, Stephanie	Administrative Support	Executive Director (region 1)
Simon, Marianne	Administrative Support	Region 1 Superintendent

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 SAC Committee meets annually in June to discuss the SIP, review student data, and to assess "what worked" throughout the school year. The SAC Committee provides recommendations to the School Leadership Team to improve and solidify the SIP. Strategies are discussed to improve the SIP. The SIP is monitored monthly during the SAC meetings, the mid-year stakeholder's meeting, and district IR visits & LEAD Data Meetings. In addition, parent recommendations are solicited via a (title 1 parent survey).

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))

Strategies in the SIP is monitored during weekly Instructional Common Planning Time with Teachers. Teachers participate in Instructional grade-level meetings with Administration in which student data, curriculum, instructional practices, and benchmark walk-throughs are addressed. Also, the SIP is monitored monthly during the SAC meetings. Updates are provided to SAC members regarding how the school is progressing. In addition to monthly SAC meetings, the Mid-year Stakeholder's Meeting is held to address & publicly discuss mid-year data & student progression. SIP strategies are monitored & discussed during district Instructional Review or IR visits with district administrators. Lastly, LEAD Data Meetings attended by district supervisors & colleagues to discuss school progress and to generate ideas to ensure SIP strategies are met.

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	64%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	93%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
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) 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: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 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	0	18	30	21	20	25	0	0	0	114	
One or more suspensions	0	1	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	7	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	4	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	16	14	0	0	0	31	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	10	15	0	0	0	26	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	18	26	21	0	0	0	0	0	66	

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	0	10	17	10	12	14	0	0	0	63

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	4	1	2	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	
Students retained two or more times	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	
Students retained two or more times	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*	62	48	53	60	50	56	52		
ELA Learning Gains				61			51		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54			36		
Math Achievement*	65	58	59	53	48	50	59		
Math Learning Gains				36					
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				38					
Science Achievement*	60	52	54	40	59	59	63		
Social Studies Achievement*					63	64			
Middle School Acceleration					53	52			
Graduation Rate					46	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	54	54	59	36			84		

** 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	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	301
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	378
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	41			
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN	73			
BLK	39	Yes	1	
HSP	60			
MUL				
PAC				

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%
WHT	79			
FRL	53			

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	29	Yes	1	1
ELL	48			
AMI				
ASN	67			
BLK	48			
HSP	58			
MUL	50			
PAC				
WHT	51			
FRL	39	Yes	1	

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	62			65			60					54
SWD	35			46							2	
ELL	43			29							3	54
AMI												
ASN	64			82							2	
BLK	48			54			38				4	
HSP	62			62							3	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	77			72			76				4	
FRL	56			58			38				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	60	61	54	53	36	38	40					36
SWD	24	42		26	33		21					
ELL	58	69		32	46							36
AMI												
ASN	75			58								
BLK	49	63	57	48	35	45	40					
HSP	62	82		50	55		40					
MUL	64			36								
PAC												
WHT	68	54		57	30		45					
FRL	47	52	52	40	27	30	28					

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	52	51	36	59			63					84
SWD	7			37								
ELL	44			40								84
AMI												
ASN	50											
BLK	34	39		42			44					
HSP	61			57								
MUL	55											
PAC												
WHT	65	52		76			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
FRL	38	38		48			58					73

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	54%	47%	7%	54%	0%
04	2023 - Spring	66%	50%	16%	58%	8%
03	2023 - Spring	54%	46%	8%	50%	4%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	72%	59%	13%	59%	13%
04	2023 - Spring	63%	58%	5%	61%	2%
05	2023 - Spring	58%	52%	6%	55%	3%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	53%	48%	5%	51%	2%

III. Planning for Improvement**Data Analysis/Reflection**

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

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

Based on 2022 data, the component with the lowest performance was LPQ Math. Science proficiency declined as well. We used our ESSR funding for push-in support for Reading to close the learning gap from the pandemic. However, we did not have sufficient funding to provide push-in support for Math. The district cut the funding for our Science Lab Teacher & the online platform PENDA Program. Therefore, students were unable to receive the same level of Science support as in past years. For 2023 3rd grade reading demonstrated growth; however, 3rd grade's reading proficiency data component at 54% remains lower than 4th & 5th grade. Title 1 funding for a Reading Interventionist and ESSR funding for after-school tutoring increased 3rd grade's proficiency. Therefore, 3rd grade showed growth, but is in need of additional monetary support to significantly close the learning gap from the pandemic at a greater pace.

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

Based on 2022, gains for Students with Disabilities and Economically Disadvantaged was below the 50% (percentile) for 5th grade Math & 3rd grade Reading. In addition, both 5th grade Science & Math declined significantly. Fortunately, for 2023 there was no decline. All 3 academic components (reading, math, & science) demonstrated significant growth for 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.

Based on 2023 FAST data, there was no decline or gap when compared to the state average. In fact, the school data surpassed both the district and state average. All 3 academic components (reading, math, & science) demonstrated significant growth for proficiency!

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

The data component showing the most improvement is 5th grade Math Proficiency at 62% thus contributing to our overall Math Proficiency of 68%. The following are actions implemented to show growth: Provided Title 1 funding for a Math Interventionist and ESSR funding for Push-In support for intensive remediation & after-school tutoring. Provided District support so that teachers could remediate or alter instruction to students in a timely manner. We utilized our ESSR funding allocated to close the learning gap in Math. We hired additional push-in support to provide daily remediation to students in need. In addition, we appropriated funds to provide after-school tutoring to targeted students by their classroom teacher throughout the school year. We utilized human capital in order to support students impacted by the Pandemic. Also, weekly common planning with teachers for data chats. weekly prof. development for teachers to assess understanding of the new math curriculum. Professional Development for teachers to assess their understanding of the new State Benchmarks & Standards. Specific Math PD from Specialists for teachers. Specific Training from Acaletics Reps for instruction.

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

Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment (4th grade: 16) (5th grade: 14)
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment (4th grade: 10) (5th grade: 15)

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

The highest priorities for school improvement in the upcoming school year are as follows:

- * 3RD GRADE READING PROFICIENCY
- *ELA GAINS
- *ELA LPQ
- *MATH GAINS
- *MATH LPQ

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 Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on the 2023 5Essentials Survey, students scored the school as "Very Weak" for Supportive Environment:

In schools with a Supportive Environment, the school is safe, demanding, and supportive. In such schools,

- *students feel safe in and around the school,
- *they find teachers trust-worthy and responsive to their academic needs,
- *all students value hard work, and
- *teachers push all students toward high academic performance.

A Supportive Environment directly impacts student academic performance. Therefore these measures must be addressed to positively increase the academic performance of Economically Disadvantaged & Students with Disabilities. The needs of the 2 low performing subgroups must be addressed in order to reduce the the number of 4th & 5th grades scoring a Level 1 on the statewide ELA & Math assessment.

*Economically Disadvantaged - Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment (4th grade: 16) (5th grade: 14)

Level 1 on statewide Math assessment (4th grade: 10) (5th grade: 15)

*Students with Disabilities - Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment (4th grade: 16) (5th grade: 14)

Level 1 on statewide Math assessment (4th grade: 10) (5th grade: 15)

Measurable Outcome:

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

Reduce the number of 4th & 5th grade students with disabilities & economically disadvantaged students scoring Level 1 on the statewide ELA & Math assessment by 10%

Monitoring:

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

- *Student Teacher Trust
- *Academic Personalism
- *Safety
- *Peer Support for Academic Work

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rebekkah Link (linkr@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.)

UChicago Impact Study Resources:

- *Avoiding Power Struggles
- *Morning Meeting
- *Student Led Meetings: Empowering Student Voices
- *Group Work Rubric
- *Scholar Partner Evaluation

Book Study

- *"Better Thank Carrots or Sticks" - Restorative Practices for Positive Classroom Management
- *Dr. Ben Springer "Happy Kids Don't Punch You in the Face"

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In schools with a Supportive Environment, the school is safe, demanding, and supportive. In such schools,
*students feel safe in and around the school,
*they find teachers trust-worthy and responsive to their academic needs,
*all students value hard work, and
*teachers push all students toward high academic performance.

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.

During Pre-Planning (8/7/2023) teachers will receive professional development training on the Interventions being implemented to provide a supportive environment to students. The Interventions will be implemented daily and/or as needed to ensure the following:

- *students feel safe in and around the school,
- *they find teachers trust-worthy and responsive to their academic needs,
- *all students value hard work, and
- *teachers push all students toward high academic performance.

Person Responsible: Rebekkah Link (linkr@duvalschools.org)

By When: The Interventions will be implemented beginning Day 1 for students on (8/14/2023) and will continue throughout the remainder of the academic school year which ends on (5/31/2024).

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**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.

Description of Area of Focus: Instructional practice specifically relating to benchmark-aligned instruction will focus on supporting teachers with research based practices that follow state adopted standards within the specific content area.

Rationale for Area of Focus: Benchmark data (FAST, Common Assessments, PMA's, Walk-Through etc.) collected from the 2022-2023 school year showed students performing at grade level in ELA, Math, and Science with inconsistencies in assessments aligned to grade appropriate benchmarks. Students are not provided with consistent opportunities to be successful with benchmark aligned assessments while adhering to the district curriculum guide, and teachers have limited effective teaching methods to support learning assessments. Walk-Through data collected from the 2022-2023 school year showed that less than 50% of teachers were providing grade appropriate benchmark-aligned assessments.

* By October 2023 - at least 55% of teachers will provide opportunities for students to engage in benchmark-aligned assessments based on Walk-Through data. By December 2023, 80% of teachers will provide opportunities for students to engage in benchmark-aligned assessments.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We need to focus on proficiency AND gains in order to reach the 2024 district goal of Total Points 467/ Grade B:

*ELA proficiency: increase by 1 percentage point; *3rd grade proficiency increase by 1 percentage point; ELA gains (62); ELA LPQ (55)

*Math proficiency: increase by 1 percentage points; Math gains (50); Math LPQ (50)

*Science: increase by 1 percentage points

Monitoring:

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

Administrators will observe instruction to ensure benchmarks are aligned with the tasks and desired outcomes for students. The Data from District & State aligned assessments will be monitored for progress. Classroom data (supplemental resources) will be monitored monthly for progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cheryl Quarles Gaston (quarlesc@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.)

Professional Learning Communities (PLC):

Professional Learning Communities will be focused on benchmark planning, student work, project-based learning, analysis protocol, development of common assessments, and analyzing data. The work of the PLC will be centered around the research of Richard Dufour's PLC questions

and will be utilized throughout the following Instructional format:

1. MTSS - improving the effectiveness of meeting the needs of all students.
2. 4 Phase Instruction for ELA - a) extended level instruction; b) instructional level instruction; c) on grade-level instruction d) 30 min (WIN)
3. 3 Phase Instruction for Math - a) on grade-level instruction; b) instructional groups and basic facts automaticity c) 30 min (WIN)
4. Infuse science into all academic courses.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We are embracing the District's priorities and utilizing information attained from the Monthly Principal & AP meetings to address them at the school level for our students.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. ELA-School-wide explicit vocabulary instruction, Waterford for K; UFLI Phonics Program for K-2; LLI intervention for 3-5; I-Ready 1-2; Freckles 3-5; Achieve 3-5; Benchmark Advance K-5; Houghton Mifflin & Penda for Science; District provided curriculum for Social Studies; Benchmark-based instruction daily; Project-based learning (K-5); Push-in classroom support with paras and tutors.
2. Reveal Math (K-5); Reflex Math (2-5), I-Ready 1-2; Freckles (3-5); Refrax Math (3 - 4); Push-in support (4-5)
3. Interdisciplinary-constructivist teaching approach; emphasis on science, inquiry, & project-based learning (student-selected projects)
4. Region Reading Specialist-analyze reading achievement progress; provide professional development as needed; facilitate coaching cycles; and provide coaching for teachers.
5. Science Lab teacher-design and monitor science achievement progress and provide instruction for students and coaching for teachers; Utilize PENDA for 5th grade computer-based curriculum support
6. Reading & Math interventionist-provide tier-2 and tier-3 intervention to struggling readers & math students; Implement 30 minutes of WIN
7. District Math, & Science, Coach-analyze data, provide professional development & coaching for teachers.
8. After school tutoring (K-5) for targeted students
9. Imagine Learning for ELL students

Person Responsible: Cheryl Quarles Gaston (quarlesc@duvalschools.org)

By When: Implementation begins on Day 1 of instruction (8/14/23) and ends on Day 180 (5/31/2024)

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)).

Funding is based off of FAST student data & district PM data. Priority is based on areas identified as needing improvement. Student performance on FAST impacts the level of importance placed on Areas of Focus. Funding is allocated on Identified Areas of Focus.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

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

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The SIP goals will be disseminated to stakeholders & reviewed during monthly Faculty and SAC meetings. Goals & strategies will be reviewed during weekly common planning with teachers & staff, and during data chats with students. Goals will be discussed during parent events (PTA, Parent Nights, FAST mtgs, Awards Programs, etc...) held at the school. Information will be shared via power-points, hand-outs, infused in the Title 1 parent involvement plan, social media, and through verbal discourse. In addition, goals will be addressed with district leaders during LEAD & IR meetings as needed.

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))

Based on data provided from the 5 Essentials Survey, we will continue to keep stakeholders engaged and involved during monthly Faculty and SAC meetings. Also, during data chats with students & their parents. Keep parents informed during Parent events (PTA, Parent Nights, FAST mtgs, Awards Programs, etc...) held at the school. Information will be shared via power-points, hand-outs, infused in the Title 1 parent involvement plan, social media, and through verbal discourse.

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)

Goal 1: Increase Reading proficiency in 3rd & 5th grade:

? Measurable Outcome: Increase 3rd grade Reading Proficiency percentage from 60% to 65% and increase 5th grade Reading Proficiency from 59% to 64% on the 2024 FAST PM3 ELA Assessment

Goal 2: Increase Math Learning Gains & LPQ Gains:

? Measurable Outcome: Increase Math Learning gains from (36%/2022) 50% to 55% and increase LPQ gains from (38%/2022) 50% to 55% on the 2024 FAST PM3 MATH Assessment

Goal 3: Increase Science proficiency in 5th grade:

? Measurable Outcome: Increase 5th grade Science Proficiency from 60% to 65% on the 2024 NGSSS Assessment

Strategies To Attain Goals 1, 2, & 3:

- Implement ELA-School-wide explicit vocabulary instruction utilizing, Waterford for K; UFLI Phonics Program for K-2; LLI intervention for 3-5; I-Ready 1-2; Freckles 3-5; Achieve 3-5; Benchmark Advance K-5; Push-in classroom support with paras and part-time reading tutors
- Reveal Math (K-5); Reflex Math (2-5), I-Ready 1-2; Freckles (3-5); Frax Math (3 - 4); Push-in support (4-5)
- Facilitate Benchmark-based instruction daily; Project-based learning (K-5)
- Implement Houghton Mifflin & Penda for Science; Interdisciplinary-constructivist teaching approach; emphasis on science, inquiry, & project-based learning (student-selected projects)
- Science Lab teacher-design and monitor science achievement progress and provide instruction for students and coaching for teachers; Utilize PENDA for 5th grade computer-based curriculum support
- District provided curriculum for Social Studies
- Region Reading Specialist-analyze reading achievement progress; provide professional development as needed
- District Math, & Science, Coach-analyze data, provide professional development & coaching for teachers
- Administration facilitates coaching cycles; and provide coaching for teachers.
- Reading & Math interventionist-provide tier-2 and tier-3 intervention to struggling readers & math students; Implement 30 minutes of WIN
- Utilize Resource Teachers (push-in support/WIN) in grades K – 5 (assigned times/classrooms)
- Utilize Volunteers to provide (push-in support/WIN in grades K - 5
- After school tutoring (K-5) for targeted students
- Imagine Learning, UFLI, & RMSE for ELL students – ESOL Para
- Data from District & State aligned assessments will be monitored for progress during scheduled Data Chats. Classroom data (supplemental resources) will be monitored monthly for progress

? Weekly Professional Learning Communities (PLC):

? Professional Learning Communities will be focused on bench-mark planning/walk-throughs, student work, project-based learning, analysis protocol, development of common assessments, and analyzing data

? The work of the PLC will be centered around the research of Richard Dufour's PLC questions and will be utilized throughout the following Instructional format:

? MTSS - improving the effectiveness of meeting the needs of all students.

? 4 Phase Instruction for ELA - a) extended level instruction; b) instructional level instruction; c) on grade-level instruction d) 30 min (WIN)

? 3 Phase Instruction for Math - a) on grade-level instruction; b) instructional groups and basic facts automaticity c) 30 min (WIN)

? Infuse science into all academic courses.

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))

Utilize wrap-around services provided by the district to Title 1 schools.

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).

Utilize wrap-around services provided by the district to Title 1 schools as needed.

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))

DCPS Human Resources determines how to recruit potential candidates. DCPS Curriculum and Instruction determines the level of Professional Development provided to teachers, paras, and staff.

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))

During the summer, the school implements a Panther Cub Camp for PreK students to transition to Elementary School. Teachers volunteer to host a 3 hour orientation to PreK students. Teachers are not paid and volunteer during their time off over the summer.