

Duval County Public Schools

Oceanway 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	0
VI. Title I Requirements	19
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	20

Oceanway Elementary School

12555 GILLESPIE AVE, Jacksonville, FL 32218

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

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.

To provide educational excellence in every school, in every classroom, for every student, every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every student is inspired and prepared for success in college or a career, and life.

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
Gray, Jennifer	Principal	Instructional Leader and Building Management
Troy, Ronrica	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader and Building Management
Pipkin, Barbara	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coaching and ELA Support
Johnson, Keith	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coaching and Math Support

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.

Monthly Shared-Decision Making, Parent-Teacher Association, School Advisory Council, and Title I Parent Input & Engagement meetings are held to continually review data points, progress towards goals, and the review of strategies and resource implementation to provide on-going input and feedback regarding what is going well, as well as areas for improvement and focus. Meeting agendas and minutes capture on-going discussions and responses to be used for SIP and school improvement overall.

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))

As indicated above, monthly meetings with various stakeholder groups allow and require monthly conversations regarding our progress and implementation of programs. As noted in monthly agendas and meeting minutes, progress monitoring is discussed throughout the year, including specific demographic subgroup data points to insure we are serving our greatest needs proactively, rather than reactively.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	54%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	82%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) 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: B 2018-19: B 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	0	40	39	45	40	32	0	0	0	196	
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	5	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	5	1	0	0	0	0	8	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	30	36	0	0	0	70	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	17	26	0	0	0	46	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	43	33	49	0	0	0	0	0	126	

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	24	22	28	19	27	0	0	0	120

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	0	2	6	1	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	1	23	28	38	30	38	0	0	0	158	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	6	
Course failure in ELA	2	5	3	4	5	1	0	0	0	20	
Course failure in Math	2	3	2	2	3	1	0	0	0	13	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	21	19	0	0	0	48	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	16	14	0	0	0	36	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	5	33	59	0	0	0	0	0	98	

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	2	9	27	49	14	13	0	0	0	114

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	3	8	5	1	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	1	23	28	38	30	38	0	0	0	158	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	2	1	0	0	0	6	
Course failure in ELA	2	5	3	4	5	1	0	0	0	20	
Course failure in Math	2	3	2	2	3	1	0	0	0	13	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	21	19	0	0	0	48	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	16	14	0	0	0	36	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	5	33	59	0	0	0	0	0	98	

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	2	9	27	49	14	13	0	0	0	114

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	3	8	5	1	0	0	0	20	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	

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*	50	48	53	52	50	56	47		
ELA Learning Gains				64			45		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				64			35		
Math Achievement*	67	58	59	70	48	50	58		
Math Learning Gains				79			48		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				74			16		
Science Achievement*	55	52	54	57	59	59	52		
Social Studies Achievement*					63	64			
Middle School Acceleration					53	52			
Graduation Rate					46	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	45	54	59	90			73		

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	269
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
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	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	550
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	27	Yes	1	1
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	43			
HSP	55			
MUL	77			
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	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%
SWD	46			
ELL	90			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	75			
HSP	70			

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	54			
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	63			

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	50			67			55					45
SWD	23			35			21				4	
ELL											1	45
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	38			57			38				4	
HSP	54			73			42				4	
MUL	82			71							2	
PAC												
WHT	52			70			61				4	
FRL	45			59			45				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	52	64	64	70	79	74	57					90
SWD	14	44	44	34	73	75	40					
ELL												90
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	54	73	82	72	88	92	65					
HSP	66	65		74	74		70					
MUL	43			64								
PAC												
WHT	45	59	64	66	73	67	53					
FRL	45	65	66	61	78	72	53					

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	47	45	35	58	48	16	52					73
SWD	22	24		33	33		29					
ELL												73
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	46	53		58	40		48					
HSP	56			65			45					
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	44	41	33	57	50	14	56					
FRL	42	35	36	51	33	0	37					

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	60%	47%	13%	54%	6%
04	2023 - Spring	44%	50%	-6%	58%	-14%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	49%	46%	3%	50%	-1%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	73%	59%	14%	59%	14%
04	2023 - Spring	64%	58%	6%	61%	3%
05	2023 - Spring	66%	52%	14%	55%	11%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	54%	48%	6%	51%	3%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

Reading proficiency in grades 3 and 4 in the previously learning cycle demonstrates the greatest need for improvement. While continuing to score above the state, looking at historical data, this continues to be an area of focus, even low declines were not noted in this current cycle that only accounted for proficiency rates across all grade levels.

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

Science in 5th grade showed the greatest decline from the prior year with a 2 percentage point drop. Following our analysis, we noted positive trend data throughout the year with district progress monitoring data points. All indicators projected our trend upward and were anticipated an increase in this area. However, when a decline was noted, on top of reviewing individual data results, as there was no change in assessment, our concern was ultimately stamina for our 5th grade students who took the Science assessment at the very end of the 23-24 state accountability cycle.

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.

Reading Proficiency in 4th grade continues to show the greatest gap when compared to the state average. We are noting a drop each year in 4th grade, but especially related to this cohort of students. A

continued focus on 4th grade ELA core content and pacing must continue to be an area of focus for this grade level to address the needs of our students.

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

Our math proficiency data continues to show great improvement. Through the continued focus on pacing and core content instruction, we have maintained our proficiency goals.

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

1. Providing critical core ELA instruction for all students aligned with state benchmark standards and in a effective pace.
2. Utilizing research based interventions and enrichment supports through the use of WIN folders to insure every student is getting what he/she needs daily related to ELA instruction.

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

1. Reading proficiency in grades 3 and 4.
2. Science proficiency in grade 5.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Proficiency data in 3rd and 4th grade ELA continues to be an area of focus as data indicates students struggling to articulate their understanding of the standards as it relates to what they are learning, the tasks are not consistently aligned to the rigor or depth of the identified standard, and do not consistently require students to display mastery of the identified standard. This is negatively impacting our student's learning and mastery of grade level standards.

As the BEST standards continue to be implemented, we must review our current level of progress and focus on not only our proficiency, but also targeted students in need for growth and gains.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Across all grade levels in the ELA content area, 85% of completed benchmark-based instruction and assessment walk-through tool will result in a final rating of 1.5 or higher when rating if students are demonstrating mastery of the standard through appropriate activities/tasks that are equivalent to state assessments.

Monitoring:

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

The administrative team will conduct weekly benchmark walkthroughs to monitor progress and provide specific weekly review to classroom teachers via weekly PLC meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Gray (grayj1@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 will be utilized to provide professional development and ultimately empower our teachers to unpack standards to develop lessons and tasks that utilize a variety of cognitive learning strategies to reach all students where they are and provide them with an instructional path to display mastery of the identified standard or an appropriate grade level component in daily lessons.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

When a school functions as a true professional learning community, educators within that school embrace high levels of learning for ALL students as both the REASON the organization exists, as well as the fundamental responsibility of all who work within it. (DuFour, DuFour, Eaker, Many & Mattos, Learning by Doing, 2016) In addition, data pulled from the 22-23 school year Standards Walk dashboard demonstrated a school-wide strength of using aligned materials and implementing aligned instruction. This data indicates a need to focus on student application at the level of mastery aligned to state assessments.

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.

Utilize a Reading interventionists to provide job-embedded professional development related to standards and monitoring of levels of understanding through available data points at consistent intervals (i.e. benchmark testing and progress monitoring)

Person Responsible: Jennifer Gray (grayj1@duvalschools.org)

By When: Weekly, as evidenced by administratively directed common planning agendas and minutes.

Utilize a Reading Interventionists to help monitor the instructional practices and implementation of identified strategies and best practices that are aligned to standards based instruction to support learning and understanding, providing coaching, as needed.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Gray (grayj1@duvalschools.org)

By When: Weekly, as evidenced by administratively directed common planning agendas and minutes.

Continue the scheduled blocks of weekly administratively directed common planning's to facilitate discussions, analyze student data points, and review student work in support of standards work and daily lesson alignment.

Person Responsible: Ronrica Troy (pinkneyr@duvalschools.org)

By When: Weekly, as evidenced by administratively directed common planning agendas and minutes.

#2. 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.

Per our 5Essentials data points, we must create an environment where people want to come to work and kids want to come to learn. By building collective responsibility and focusing on teacher to teacher support, our staff will identify ways in which our systems support our work and our focus, together.

Measurable Outcome:

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

On the 23-24 5Essentials data, our Teacher to Teacher Trust and Collective Responsibility will show positive growth and rate in the neutral or strong rating area as a result of our supporting systems implemented.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor our monthly collective responsibility and teacher to teacher support through pulse survey checks on something they have 'learned' from a peer.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Gray (grayj1@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.)

A variety of teacher to teacher evidence-based interventions will be used to support this goal. In monitoring the use of these resources and providing reinforcement for staff, continued growth and development will occur.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

When a school functions as a true professional learning community, educators within that school embrace high levels of learning for ALL students as both the REASON the organization exists, as well as the fundamental responsibility of all who work within it. (DuFour, DuFour, Eaker, Many & Mattos, Learning by Doing, 2016)

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.

Use of consistent Teaching Tuesday activities to use one another as resources to learn and grow related to pertinent topics.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Gray (grayj1@duvalschools.org)

By When: Monthly

Use of Pineapple classroom observation board for classroom sign-ups and opportunities for peer-to-peer observations, related to individual needs assessments.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Gray (grayj1@duvalschools.org)

By When: Monthly

Review of our purpose and vision through the focus on WHY, as a school community.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Gray (grayj1@duvalschools.org)

By When: quarterly

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

n/a

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

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

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

The School Improvement Plan is posted on our district website, as well as available in our Parent Resource Room. In addition, it has been linked on our bloomz communication page, while also being shared and discussed monthly during SAC, SDMT and PTA meetings to discussion current levels of progress.

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))

It is the goal of the school to promote helpfulness, inclusiveness, and responsibility. We will do this by providing opportunities for families to become involved in their child's education through monthly events such as our Parent-Student Conference Nights, Math and Literacy Nights, and Night of the Arts. Through monthly engagement events, our families participate in both academic and social events with their students and are provided with take-home strategies and supports to increase the school-to-home connection and positively impact student learning.

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)

Through the use of our varied communication and dismissal applications, our bell-to-bell instruction remains a top priority with no loss of instructional time. Through our interventionists support, the daily instruction received within the classroom is designed specifically for the individual needs of the students.

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))

Various school, district and state agencies support the work to serve our community. Through our PreK, VPK, and ESOL departments, we are able to serve our students and provide resources to assist with any need necessary. As a state shelter site, we also partner with local agencies to support the needs of our community outside the instructional day.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$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