

Duval County Public Schools

Hospital And Homebound 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	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	20
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	22

Hospital And Homebound

1128 BARBER ST, Jacksonville, FL 32209

<http://www.duvalschools.org>

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 a compassionate individualized educational approach dedicated to student success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student is inspired and prepared to overcome their challenges and succeed in college, work, 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
Ertel, Mark	Principal	School Principal level leadership of school.
Macy, Matthew	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal leadership of the School.

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.

Hospital Homebound has a lead team of faculty that reviews all data and collaborates on setting goals. Leadership then reviews our goals with faculty and staff prior to finalizing the SIP.

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))

Data is compiled and reviewed each month by the lead team to monitor progress of our goals. The progress or concerns are shared with all at bi-weekly faculty meetings. Input by all faculty is imperative on how to support the progress and then make updates to the SIP goals.

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)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	50%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	24%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI
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)* White Students (WHT)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: MAINTAINING 2018-19: MAINTAINING 2017-18: I 2016-17: MAINTAINING
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	1	2	2	0	0	1	6	5	7	24
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	1	1	1	0	0	0	2	2	3	10
Course failure in Math	1	1	1	0	0	0	2	1	3	9
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	5	5	15
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	0	1	3	4	4	13
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	1	1	0	1	3	5	5	17

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	1	1	1	0	1	2	4	4	14

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total				
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8					
Absent 10% or more days				1	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	4	30	
One or more suspensions				0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA				0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	11
Course failure in Math				0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment				0	2	0	1	3	2	1	3	4	22	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment				0	1	0	1	4	2	1	3	3	18	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.				0	2	0	1	5	0	0	3	5	26	
				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	2	0	1	4	2	1	3	5	32

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	11

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	0	2	0	0	0	1	2	4	10
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	7
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	2	0	1	3	2	1	3	4	16
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	1	0	1	4	2	1	3	3	15
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	2	0	1	5	0	0	3	5	16
	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	2	0	1	4	2	1	3	5	18

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

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*	19	45	53	10	47	55			
ELA Learning Gains									
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*	7	46	55	12	40	42			
Math Learning Gains									

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*	33	45	52	8	45	54			
Social Studies Achievement*		62	68		50	59			
Middle School Acceleration		73	70		45	51			
Graduation Rate		72	74		41	50			
College and Career Acceleration		54	53		65	70			
ELP Progress		47	55		68	70			

* 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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	20
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	59
Total Components for the Federal Index	3
Percent Tested	89
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	10
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	30
Total Components for the Federal Index	3
Percent Tested	79

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
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	19	Yes	4	2
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	18	Yes	2	2
FRL				

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	17	Yes	3	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	15	Yes	1	1
FRL				

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	19			7			33					
SWD	19			4			33				3	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	27			8							2	
FRL												

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	10			12			8					
SWD	15			19								
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	8			21								
FRL												

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												
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

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.

Grade	Year	ELA				
		School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	36%	44%	-8%	50%	-14%
05	2023 - Spring	*	47%	*	54%	*
07	2023 - Spring	20%	40%	-20%	47%	-27%
08	2023 - Spring	18%	41%	-23%	47%	-29%
09	2023 - Spring	38%	42%	-4%	48%	-10%
04	2023 - Spring	*	50%	*	58%	*
06	2023 - Spring	*	38%	*	47%	*
03	2023 - Spring	*	46%	*	50%	*

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	*	43%	*	54%	*
07	2023 - Spring	10%	40%	-30%	48%	-38%
03	2023 - Spring	*	59%	*	59%	*
04	2023 - Spring	*	58%	*	61%	*
08	2023 - Spring	*	45%	*	55%	*
05	2023 - Spring	*	52%	*	55%	*

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	*	35%	*	44%	*
05	2023 - Spring	*	48%	*	51%	*

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	52%	*	50%	*

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	27%	52%	-25%	48%	-21%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	75%	64%	11%	63%	12%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	63%	*	66%	*

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	27%	60%	-33%	63%	-36%

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.

Statewide Science achievement scores showed the lowest performance. Factors that contributed: an increase in enrollment at a residential facility whose control of student time and access is a limitation.

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

ELA achievement showed the greatest decline. Contributing factors include the fluidity of the migrant nature of admission to the program.

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.

ELA Achievement had the greatest gap and also showed the greatest decline from the prior year. More students meeting eligibility requirements and enrolling in the program were level 1 students and were very sick.

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

Social Studies showed the most improvement. We moved one teacher to a residential facility that houses around 25 of our students at anytime. This teacher facilitated good study habits and also held small group instruction for the students in Social Studies.

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

Attendance has been the highest area of concern. Hospital Homebound serves students who have an acute, catastrophic or chronic illness that keeps them out of school for a minimum of 15 days. Attendance will always be an issue with our population but we continue to strive to reach these students the best we can.

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

1. Attendance
2. Participation in virtual learning and online tutoring.
3. Using PMs and PMAs to identify students/standards with the need for improvement.
4. Differentiate instruction during small group instruction.
5. Mental Health Awareness (while working with students at the SIPP facility).

Area of Focus

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

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Attendance. Students in Hospital Homebound are suffering from an acute, catastrophic, or chronic illness. Most of these students are located a very restricted environment (home, facility, hospital). Due to the nature of the program, we know our students will exhibit absences; however, we want to keep up with the family to ensure that our teachers are aware of the reasons for the absences and are able to provide the utmost support to the children when they are unable to access our services.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We are going to try to reduce all absence by 10%. The Early Warning indicators suggest that the number of students missing 10% or more days increased by 140% from the previous year.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers and school leadership the online curriculum along with FOCUS attendance and implement interventions in hopes to reduce absenteeism of students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Matthew Macy (macym@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.)

Teachers will reach out to parents and discuss the reasoning for the absences. If needed, program representatives will reach out to the physicians who provided the referral for Hospital Homebound to speak to them about the absences to inquire if excessive absences are a result of the student's illness. Our student population is ESE and the team will hold Lack of Adequate progress meetings and input attendance goals.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Attendance is critical to the students success in the program. One of the eligibility criteria for Hospital Homebound is that the student will benefit from instruction while enrolled in the program. HH has an abbreviated time of instruction compared to a brick and mortar school, but attending and completing coursework is just as important to the child's academic success.

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.

Teachers monitor FOCUS attendance and identify any student who has been absent two consecutive school days. Teachers will report students who have two consecutive absences in one week to administration after they have scheduled a parent/teacher conference to discuss attendance

Person Responsible: Matthew Macy (macym@duvalschools.org)

By When: By the end of each week.

Upon the fourth time of two consecutive absences, Teachers will include Program Representatives in parent/teacher conferences along with information provided by the physician to discuss health of the child and the benefit of instruction the program provides. These meetings will also include administration.

Person Responsible: Matthew Macy (macym@duvalschools.org)

By When: The fourth time a student has two consecutive absences.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

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.

Differentiated instruction was identified as a need through looking at PM and PMA data from last school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

An increase by 50% from PM1 to PM3 from ELA grades 3-8.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers and administration will monitor PM data throughout the school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Matthew Macy (macym@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.)

Teachers and administration will hold Data chats during early release to go over PM results and scores related directly to standards for each student.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Drilling down to the accuracy for specific standards will allow the team to identify students and standards that need to be addressed through differentiation and whole class review. The team will group students with like results for small group instruction and provide 1:1 support for students struggling in certain areas.

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.

Data chats to drill down to identify standards that need to be reviewed by groups or individuals.

Person Responsible: Matthew Macy (macym@duvalschools.org)

By When: Early Release dates after PM testing has occurred.

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).

School admin will work with district staff to facilitate the implementation of appropriate resources and the related funding.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

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

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

Many Hospital Homebound students will need to be referred to the ESE office for evaluations. Our typical students coming into K-2 will need an Academic/Adaptive evaluation to ensure the most appropriate curriculum is in place for these students. Our general education teachers will go over Waterford, iReady results to determine the needs of the individual during a diagnostic test. The teachers will then differentiate their instruction when working 1:1 with students.

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

This year the teachers are becoming proficient in tests/gathering results from the new State FAST Progress Monitoring Assessments. They will use these results to identify individual needs. We have also increased instructional time for our students 3-5 by having small group instruction virtually four days a week.

Measurable Outcomes

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

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

N/A due to the nature of fluidity in the program. Our students are being enrolled/dismissed on a daily basis.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

N/A due to the nature of fluidity in the program. Our students are being enrolled/dismissed on a daily basis.

Monitoring

Monitoring

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

We will be looking at the subgroup of students that is with us for the whole year to determine growth in the Area of FOCUS category. For other students, we will monitor through formative assessments the growth during enrollment at our school. Supports and Follow through regarding attendance will be essential for the success of the each student on our program.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Macy, Matthew , macym@duvalschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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

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

Yes, our practices do align and meet the definition of evidence-based practices.

Assess, Analyze, and Change Instructional practices to best achieve outcomes.

Rationale:

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

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

The evidence-based practices will address the identified need. We will use the results of the assessments and determine the change to instruction to best fit each individual child.

Data analysis and instruction implementation is proven.

Action Steps to Implement

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
The administration conducts a deep dive into prior test scores and analytics. The Administration becomes proficient in analyzing data of new progress monitoring assessments.	Macy, Matthew , macym@duvalschools.org

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

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