Duval County Public Schools

San Pablo Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

San Pablo Elementary School

801 18TH AVE N, Jacksonville Beach, FL 32250

http://www.duvalschools.org/sanpablo

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.

Through rigorous, standards-based instruction and curriculum, as well as an engaging Science, Health and Fitness magnet program. San Pablo ensures student performance and the success of each learner.

Provide the school's vision statement.

San Pablo Elementary School is dedicated to providing a healthy, productive learning environment that nurtures the academic, physical,and social growth of all students.

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
Brown, Jennifer	Principal	
Grause, Nikki	Assistant Principal	
Seybert, Jillian	Other	Professional Development and Coaching, Teaches Science Resource.

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 leadership team and select teachers review the data. We have discussion regarding why we think the data is what it is. We identify areas of growth and identify what we can implement to attain those goals. The leadership team finalizes the plan and attempts to secure the resources needed. The goals and strategies are shared with teachers through PLC's.

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))

We will monitor monthly during leadership meetings.

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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	28%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	45%
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: 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	7	4	10	9	3	10	0	0	0	43
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	1	6	1	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	6	9	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	7	9	0	0	0	22
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	

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	1	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	7

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	2	1	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	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	

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	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	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	

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*	69	48	53	69	50	56	70		
ELA Learning Gains				62			68		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51			53		
Math Achievement*	81	58	59	80	48	50	80		
Math Learning Gains				68			66		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				62			50		
Science Achievement*	68	52	54	80	59	59	71		
Social Studies Achievement*					63	64			
Middle School Acceleration					53	52			
Graduation Rate					46	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		54	59	82			41		

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	74
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	294
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69

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	554
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	43			
ELL	60			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	46			
HSP	55			
MUL	76			
PAC				
WHT	79			
FRL	57			

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	48			
ELL	50			
AMI				
ASN	100			
BLK	37	Yes	1	
HSP	49			

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	73			
PAC				
WHT	73			
FRL	53			

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	69			81			68					
SWD	39			48			33				4	
ELL	60			60							2	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	47			44							2	
HSP	52			57							2	
MUL	63			89							2	
PAC												
WHT	73			86			76				4	
FRL	54			65			55				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	69	62	51	80	68	62	80					82
SWD	23	42	56	48	59	58	53					
ELL	29	55		47	36							82
AMI												
ASN	100			100								

							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	25	30		38	55							
HSP	32	42		52	47	45	45					82
MUL	73											
PAC												
WHT	75	67	50	86	69	75	88					
FRL	39	37	47	60	51	48	58					80

							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	70	68	53	80	66	50	71					41
SWD	35			58			50					
ELL	33			53								41
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	38			31								
HSP	44			52								38
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	77	75	69	88	71		76					
FRL	50	57		59	60		56					36

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	64%	47%	17%	54%	10%
04	2023 - Spring	81%	50%	31%	58%	23%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	72%	46%	26%	50%	22%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	84%	59%	25%	59%	25%
04	2023 - Spring	85%	58%	27%	61%	24%
05	2023 - Spring	70%	52%	18%	55%	15%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	66%	48%	18%	51%	15%

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

The data component that showed the lowest performance was 5th grade Language Arts.
This same group of students showed the lowest performance in 4th grade, but increased 5 percentage points from 4th grade to 5th grade.

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

5th grade math showed the greatest decline from last year.

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.

We performed above the state average.

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

4th grade Language Arts showed the most improvement. Placing a novice Language Arts teacher with a veteran to allow for collaboration. Focused PLC work that worked on the needs of this grade level. Focused small group instruction with a research based program.

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

Absences continue to be higher than desired.

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

Increase Science Proficiency.
Increase Reading Proficiency in Grades 3 and 5.
Increase Language Arts Learning Gains and LPQ Gains in Grades 3, 4 and 5.

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.

Decreasing the number of students with absences of more than 20%.

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

We will decrease the percentage of students with 20 or more absences to 12%.

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

Administration will monitor absences weekly.
School Counselor will track this information.

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.)

Contacting students and families to determine what are the barriers their students face when attempting to attend school.

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

If we know what the barrier is, we may be able to help them address it.

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.

Increase Science Proficiency in grade 5.

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

Fifth Grade Science Proficiency will improve to 74%,

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

This will be monitored with weekly walkthroughs.
Computer based assessments with data analysis.
Teacher observation.
District Assessments.
Exit Tickets.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Brown (ossij1@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.)

Deepening Science Instruction at all grade levels to support 5th grade Science Instruction long term.

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

Deepening Science Instruction in all grade levels through focused Professional Development will assist all students to have a deeper understanding of Science Content which will support 5th grade Science scores for years to come.

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.

Shifted 5th grade Science to a 3 way split to allow for more time for Science Instruction.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Brown (ossij1@duvalschools.org)

By When: completed

Devoted Science Coach to provide prescriptive Professional Development.

Person Responsible: Jillian Seybert (seybertj@duvalschools.org)

By When: Continuous

Implementing Scientist of the Month.

Person Responsible: Jillian Seybert (seybertj@duvalschools.org)

By When: August 31, 2023

Implementing Science word of the Day.

Person Responsible: Jillian Seybert (seybertj@duvalschools.org)

By When: September 5, 2023

Science Resource every other week.

Person Responsible: Jillian Seybert (seybertj@duvalschools.org)

By When: August 21, 2023

#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.

Increase Reading Proficiency in Grades 3 and 5.

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

Increase Grade 3 Reading Proficiency from 72% to 76%, Increase Grade 5 Reading Proficiency from 64% to 73%.

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

Weekly Walkthroughs
District Assessments.
PM State Assessments
Regular Data Chats
Consistent monitoring of student data by leadership team.

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.)

Whole group explicit instruction.
Small group teacher led instruction.
Research Based Interventions that are prescriptive to student need.
Differentiation in Tier 1.
Continue to delve deeply into the benchmarks to ensure alignment.
Instructional Notebooks for all teachers that they will bring to all PLC's and Common Planning.
Professional Development with a focus on being quality consumers of our resources.
Professional Development that focuses on Data Analysis and student work analysis for differentiation and prescriptive instruction.

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

Many of these best practices are already imbedded in our daily practice and have been proven to be effective. Some of these are areas that we need to revisit to ensure that we are prescriptive in meeting the needs of students.
We have been given many new resources in recent years and as we deepen our understanding of the new Benchmarks we need to know which resources are truly aligned and are the most effective for instruction.

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.

PLC's and Common Planning

Person Responsible: Jennifer Brown (ossij1@duvalschools.org)

By When: Continuously

Weekly Walkthroughs

Person Responsible: Jennifer Brown (ossij1@duvalschools.org)

By When: Continuously

Data chats after each round of data.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Brown (ossij1@duvalschools.org)

By When: Continuously

#4. 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.

Increase Learning Gains in Language Arts

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

Increase Learning Gains in Language Arts from 68 % in 21-22 to 70%, increase LPQ gains in Language Arts from 51% in 21-22 to 54%.

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

Weekly Walkthroughs
District Assessments.
PM State Assessments
Regular Data Chats
Consistent monitoring of student data by leadership team.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Brown (ossij1@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.)

Whole group explicit instruction.
Small group teacher led instruction.
Research Based Interventions that are prescriptive to student need.
Differentiation in Tier 1.
Continue to delve deeply into the benchmarks to ensure alignment.
Instructional Notebooks for all teachers that they will bring to all PLC's and Common Planning.
Professional Development with a focus on being quality consumers of our resources.
Professional Development that focuses on Data Analysis and student work analysis for differentiation and prescriptive instruction.

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

Many of these best practices are already imbedded in our daily practice and have been proven to be effective. Some of these are areas that we need to revisit to ensure that we are prescriptive in meeting the needs of students.
We have been given many new resources in recent years and as we deepen our understanding of the new Benchmarks we need to know which resources are truly aligned and are the most effective for instruction.

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.

Walkthroughs

Person Responsible: Jennifer Brown (ossij1@duvalschools.org)

By When: Continuously

PLC's and Common Planning

Person Responsible: Jennifer Brown (ossij1@duvalschools.org)

By When: Continuously

Consistent monitoring of student data to ensure that students are receiving the appropriate interventions.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Brown (ossij1@duvalschools.org)

By When: Continuous

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).

uval County Public Schools has a tiered system of support to align interventions for CSI, TSI and ATSI schools. The first tier of support begins with the Superintendent's cabinet of executive leaders who represent all district departments (Human Resources, Academic Services, Division of Schools, Operations, Finance, Technology, etc.). At a minimum, this team meets on a weekly basis to develop, monitor, and implement the district's strategic plan initiatives. The next level of the tier branches out with the Chief of Schools who oversees the district's Division of Schools. Schools are divided by region (Elementary, Middle, High, and Turnaround/Fragile (ISI Region). Each region has a Regional Superintendent, Executive Directors, and Content Area Specialists who work to ensure that the support is aligned and implemented.

Ensuring adequate funding, resources, and support is available to CSI, TSI and ATSI schools is a driver for district-wide collaboration. To accomplish this, the Division of Schools works with multiple district departments to further tier support for CSI, TSI and ATSI schools.

This support includes but is not limited to the following:
>Academic Services provides curriculum support and additional content specialists for schools. Academic Services also oversees our district professional development department and coordinates professional development for instructional and non-instructional personnel.
>Title I – Coordinates the use of funds to best support the barriers that research has shown negatively impacts disadvantaged students. In addition, Title I provides professional development to teachers to improve their pedagogy.
>The Division of Schools conducts school visits that include instructional reviews and instructional walks. These visits occur on a weekly basis and serve as an opportunity to observe instructional delivery, student learning, and provide feedback to school staff.
>Finance – Finance provides the funds to provide resources and the personnel needed to address individual school needs.
>Human Resources – Human Resources works to recruit quality personnel for our most needy schools. This includes a dedicated staffing team to our Turnaround School Region (ISI), priority hiring, and monitoring teacher VAM rating percentage by school. They also work with unions to collective bargain memorandums of understanding that provide for incentives, professional development, and additional strategies to address

school needs.

Though the above examples are not comprehensive of all support provided to School Improvement schools, they do provide a snapshot of the layers of support that are available and used to improve student outcomes. Through this layered approach, the district's team along with each school's academic leadership team, teachers, staff, parents, and other stakeholders collaborate on methods of improvement and monitor implementation on a continuous basis.