

Clay County Schools

Grove Park 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	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	24
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Grove Park Elementary School

1643 MILLER ST, Orange Park, FL 32073

<http://gpe.oneclay.net>

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Clay County School Board on 10/5/2023.

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.

The mission of Grove Park Elementary is to prepare students to become successful and productive global thinkers in an ever-changing world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Grove Park Elementary, in development of Collective Commitments, will recognize the potential of ALL students through the power of belief, perseverance, and holding ourselves and our students accountable with high expectations.

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
Jones , Justin	Principal	Coordinate School Advisory Council Activities, monitor implementation of curriculum, monitor, build and promote teacher efficacy, maintain standards of appropriate student conduct and school atmosphere, implement programs designed to meet the unique needs of special student populations and sub-groups.
Smith, Shadrecka	Assistant Principal	Assist in coordinating School Advisory Council Activities, monitoring implementation of curriculum, monitor, build and promote teacher efficacy, maintain standards of appropriate student conduct and school atmosphere, implement programs designed to meet the unique needs of special student populations and sub-groups.

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.

During the summer, GPE leadership hosted a community involvement event to gather input from community stakeholders. Additionally, we hosted a preliminary meeting with members from the School Advisory Council to review student needs based on student achievement. Finally, at the beginning of the school year, GPE leadership hosted a staff meeting to include all staff members. During that meeting we reviewed student performance data from the previous year. We then used guiding questions to drive a staff-wide discussion around where we needed to grow and how we could best impact our students in the upcoming year.

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))

Our School Advisory Council will meet quarterly to review student performance data. In addition, our Student Success Team will meet monthly to monitor student progress. Our Leadership Team will meet monthly with District Title One to ensure compliance with our Title One Plan.

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-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	75%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	9	5	14	9	9	11	9	0	0	66	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in English Language Arts (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	10	8	19	21	0	0	58	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	13	33	30	0	0	82	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	9	6	0	0	0	0	15	

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	0	0	6	5	20	20	0	0	51

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	6	3	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	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	23	18	17	22	23	16	18	0	0	137	
One or more suspensions	2	5	4	4	12	6	7	0	0	40	
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	21	32	16	14	0	0	83	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	32	29	26	11	0	0	98	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	17	7	21	32	16	14	0	0	108	

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	1	2	10	18	9	0	0	40

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	8	4	0	10	1	1	0	0	0	24
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	23	18	17	22	23	16	18	0	0	137	
One or more suspensions	2	5	4	4	12	6	7	0	0	40	
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	21	32	16	14	0	0	83	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	32	29	26	11	0	0	98	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	17	7	21	32	16	14	0	0	108	

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	1	2	10	18	9	0	0	40

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	8	4	0	10	1	1	0	0	0	24
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*	32	59	53	37	63	56	40		
ELA Learning Gains				50			58		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53			52		
Math Achievement*	29	64	59	31	51	50	35		
Math Learning Gains				53			52		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				47			54		
Science Achievement*	33	65	54	39	69	59	33		
Social Studies Achievement*					70	64			
Middle School Acceleration					61	52			
Graduation Rate					64	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	53	55	59	32			47		

* 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	37
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	184
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	43

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	342
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	16	Yes	4	1
ELL	28	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	28	Yes	3	1
HSP	37	Yes	1	
MUL	40	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	44			
FRL	29	Yes	3	1

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	32	Yes	3	
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	37	Yes	2	
HSP	41			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	56			
FRL	39	Yes	2	

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	32			29			33					53
SWD	13			16			17				4	
ELL	10			20							3	53
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	30			27			20				4	
HSP	23			25							4	45
MUL	50			30							2	
PAC												
WHT	44			33			71				4	
FRL	30			24			27				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	37	50	53	31	53	47	39					32
SWD	10	37	64	12	47	38	15					
ELL	24	65	64	19	65							32
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	29	45	48	27	52	48	10					
HSP	37	50		34	54		45					27
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	51	59		36	56		77					
FRL	33	49	52	27	47	41	39					25

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	40	58	52	35	52	54	33					47
SWD	23	53	45	26	47	36						
ELL	24			35								47
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32	43	38	20	40	44	29					
HSP	33	56		52	61							46
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	57	82		46	59		55					
FRL	43	55	36	35	50	33	36					40

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	29%	55%	-26%	54%	-25%
04	2023 - Spring	30%	61%	-31%	58%	-28%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	38%	61%	-23%	47%	-9%
03	2023 - Spring	31%	59%	-28%	50%	-19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	38%	75%	-37%	54%	-16%
03	2023 - Spring	31%	62%	-31%	59%	-28%
04	2023 - Spring	13%	67%	-54%	61%	-48%
05	2023 - Spring	29%	59%	-30%	55%	-26%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	29%	63%	-34%	51%	-22%

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 lowest performance indicator was Math proficiency at 28%. Inconsistency among staff was a concern from the previous year as all instructional positions were not filled at the beginning of the year. Additionally, Tier one Math instruction and consistent corrective instruction was a contributing factor.

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

ELA Achievement declined from 37% to 33%. Contributing factors were inconsistent Tier one instruction, staffing related issues, and challenges managing the classroom environment.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The greatest gap was observed between the State's average in Math when compared to GPE's overall Math proficiency - A difference of 29 percentage points. Contributing factors were inconsistent Tier one instruction, staffing related issues, and challenges managing the classroom environment.

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

AT this time, there is no significant data point that has been identified to show growth from last year.

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

Two significant areas of concern are the number of students experience chronic absenteeism and the number of students with a substantial reading deficiency.

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

Our highest priorities are the following: Math proficiency, Reading proficiency, Attendance (reduction of chronic absenteeism and increase in average daily attendance) and an increase in students' positive outlook on school.

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

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

Based on FAST data, our area of focus will be Math.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase MATH proficiency from 28% to 60%.

Monitoring:

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

We will access and review FAST Progress Monitoring data, Local Assessment data, and program assessment data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

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.)

Progress Monitoring, Individual and Small group instruction, visual representations, active classroom engagement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Progress monitoring will be critical for understanding how students are performing and responding to instruction. Monitoring will allow for us to better understand the corrective instruction needs and which students and/or sub-groups where we need to focus the greatest support.

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.

All Math teachers will administer baseline student assessments i.e. PM1, PM2, etc.

Person Responsible: Shadreka Smith (shadreka.smith@myoneclay.net)

By When: FAST baseline assessment will be complete in September and at each FAT progress monitoring interval for the 2023-2024 school year.

Collect and analyze data from school and District based assessments at a minimum of five (5) times per annum to inform instructional practices.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: By the end of the year.

All students will track data using grade-level developed common methods.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Quarterly

All faculty and classroom assistants will participate in professional development and collaborative planning for small-group instructional best practices.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Beginning of year

An instructional coach will support professional learning communities, and direct coaching to instructional staff regarding lesson structure, and implementation, remediation, etc.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

Provide hands-on materials (i.e. markers, manipulatives, white boards, etc.) for teachers to use during small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Beginning of the year and ongoing

Title I funded additional classroom teacher and classroom assistants to reduce overall classroom size.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Beginning of year

All mathematics classrooms will display accurate images, graphics, symbols, contextual or other renderings of mathematical quantities and relationships.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: End of first quarter

Developing classroom engagement kits for active participation.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Beginning of year and ongoing

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Based on the ESSA subgroup data summary, we will focus (an increase on math proficiency, reading proficiency and outlook on school) on students with disabilities, students who are black, students who qualify for free or reduced lunch, students who are Hispanic, English Language Learners and students who are multi-racial. All six of the subgroups mentioned above fall below the threshold of 41% performance.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal is to increase each subgroup by the amount necessary to remove them from a position below the 41% threshold. This will require an increase of 10 points for SWD, 5 points for students who are black, 3 points for students who qualify for free or reduced lunch, 17 points for students who are Hispanic, 26 points for English Language Learners and 1 point for students who are multi-racial.

Monitoring:

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

We will access and review FAST Progress Monitoring data, Local Assessment data, and program assessment data for Math and Reading. We will monitor outlook on school through the use of monthly student survey data, climate surveys, and parent surveys.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

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.)

For Math and Reading we will engage in Progress Monitoring, Individual and Small group instruction, visual representations, active classroom engagement. In order to increase student outlook on school we will develop predictable routines, define and teach positive expectations, engage students in relevant learning, design a safe school environment, and promote high positivity within the classroom environment.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Progress monitoring will be critical for understanding how students are performing and responding to instruction. Monitoring will allow for us to better understand the corrective instruction needs and which students and/or sub-groups where we need to focus the greatest support.

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.

All students will track data using grade-level developed common methods.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Quarterly

Subgroup students will engage in data chats with teachers on a grade appropriate level to gain understanding of their performance and set goals.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: After PM1 and PM2

All faculty and classroom assistants will participate in professional development and collaborative planning for small-group instructional best practices.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

Provide hands-on materials (i.e. markers, manipulatives, white boards, etc.) for teachers to use during small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Beginning of year and ongoing

Title I funded additional classroom teacher and classroom assistants to reduce overall classroom size.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Beginning of year

All teachers and staff will establish a campus and classroom culture of inclusion and respect that welcomes all students.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Beginning of year

Teachers, staff, and school counselor will explicitly link desired character traits and values to academic progress and success.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

Training, teaching and support for teachers working with ELL students on the use of the "Can Do Descriptors" provided through the Ellevation platform.

Person Responsible: Shadreka Smith (shadreka.smith@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

Trained and coached teachers and support staff on strategies for students that are at risk for not reaching proficiency.

Person Responsible: Shadreka Smith (shadreka.smith@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

#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.

Based on FAST data, our area of focus will be ELA/Reading.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase Reading proficiency from 33% to 50%.

Monitoring:

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

We will access and review FAST Progress Monitoring data, Local Assessment data, and program assessment data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Our evidenced based interventions include the following: Progress Monitoring, Individual and Small group instruction, visual representations, active classroom engagement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Progress monitoring will be critical for understanding how students are performing and responding to instruction. Monitoring will allow for us to better understand the corrective instruction needs and which students and/or sub-groups where we need to focus the greatest support.

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.

All reading teachers will administer baseline student assessments i.e. PM1, PM2, etc. using chromebooks and headphones.

Person Responsible: Shadreka Smith (shadreka.smith@myoneclay.net)

By When: By the end of September and January.

Collect and analyze data from school and District based assessments at a minimum of five (5) times per annum to inform instructional practices.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: By the end of the year.

All students will track data using grade-level developed common methods.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Quarterly

All faculty and classroom assistants will participate in professional development and collaborative planning for small-group instructional best practices.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Beginning of the year

An instructional coach will support professional learning communities, and direct coaching to instructional staff regarding lesson structure, and implementation, remediation, etc.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

Title 1 funded additional classroom assistants to increase coverage and engagement within small groups.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Beginning of year and ongoing

All ELA/Reading teachers will use pictures, sketches, webs, maps images, graphics, symbols, contextual or other renderings to help readers make their thinking visible.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

All ELA/Reading teachers will show how reading, English, and language arts content domains progress.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

All ELA/Reading teachers will use anchor charts to communicate reading, English, or language arts ideas in a variety of concepts.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

Developing classroom engagement kits for active participation.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

Students will use active modalities to demonstrate mastery.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

#4. 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.

During the 2022/2023 school year only 51% of students identified that they liked coming to school everyday. We believe that outlook directly contributed to the high rates of chronic absenteeism and low rates of daily attendance.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By using the strategies and action plan described below, we will increase the percentage of students that like coming to school everyday from 51% to 80%.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor this through the use of monthly student survey data, climate surveys, and parent surveys.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

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.)

In order to increase student outlook we will develop predictable routines, define and teach positive expectations, engage students in relevant learning, design a safe school environment, and promote high positivity within the classroom environment.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We believe that a positive outlook toward school will increase students' active participation in the classroom and promote stronger attendance school-wide. We believe that we will also see a decline in the actions that result in the reduction of instructional participation due to misbehavior and off task behavior among all sub-groups.

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.

All classroom teacher conducts predictable and welcoming morning routines.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Daily

Create, print, and publish visual artifacts to reinforce predictable routines.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: End of September

Full-time preventionist to lead key campus initiatives to include after-hour planning and implementation for day-one instruction.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Beginning of the year

The PBIS team will define and publish campus-wide behaviors that promote academic progress.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: End of September

Coordinator of Title 1 & Student Success, School Counselor, and assistants will promote cooperation, perspective-taking, peer mediation, conflict management and resolution, restorative practices, and compliance.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

Teachers, staff, and school counselor will explicitly link desired character traits and values to academic progress and success.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Ongoing

All teachers and staff will establish a campus and classroom culture of inclusion and respect that welcomes all students.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: Beginning of year

The PBIS team will recognize and reward faculty, staff, students, and parents/guardians when they show progress toward, meet, exceed, or role model expectations.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: End of September

All teachers will make positive student and or parent contacts using postcards and phone calls, and document in Synergy.

Person Responsible: Justin Jones (justin.jones@myoneclay.net)

By When: End of September

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).

At the beginning of our planning process our leadership team reviewed the previous use of funds and how resources have previously been allocated. Additionally, we reviewed student performance on state assessments, both overall and by subgroup. We then connected with stakeholders to gather information and input. Based on our review, we believed it best to allocate the largest portion of our funds through Title 1 to additional staff. We have included an additional third grade teacher and a student success coordinator. Additionally, we have increased the student contact time for current support staff and instructional assistants. Additional funding has been allocated to support the purchase of resources that align to our current reading

and math curriculum, and support our schoolwide PBIS plan. Additionally, we have allocated funds to support tutoring and after school academic preparation. Finally, we have allocated funds to support the purchase of additional technology for classroom use by students to support instruction.

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

Fewer than 50% of students in Kindergarten through 2nd grade have not met level 3 proficiency on the STAR Measures ELA assessment. The ELA scores from the 22/23 STAR are as follows: KG - 51% fell below benchmark, 1st - 61% fell below benchmark, 2nd - 51% fell below benchmark.

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

Fewer than 50% of students in grades 3 through 5 have have not met level 3 proficiency on the PM3 Reading assessment. The scores from the 22/23 PM3 are as follows: 3rd - 69% scored 1 or 2, 4th - 70% scored 1 or 2, 5th - 71% scored 1 or 2.

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

Please note our grade specific goals below for the 23/24 school year:

KG - From 51% to fewer than 37%, 1st - From 61% to fewer than 37%, 2nd - From 51% to fewer than 37% falling below benchmark.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Please note our grade specific goals below for the 23/24 school year:

3rd - From 69% scoring 1/2 to fewer than 50%, 4th - From 70% scoring 1/2 to fewer than 50%, 5th - From 71% scoring 1/2 to fewer than 50%.

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 access and review FAST Progress Monitoring data, STAR data, Local Assessment data, and program assessment data. We will continue to monitor formative student performance and how that performance impacts corrective instruction. We will utilize our District support in the form of curriculum specialists, reading coaches and new teacher coaches to continue to build teacher capacity and efficacy as we monitor instructional practice.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Jones , Justin, justin.jones@myoneclay.net

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?

Our evidenced based interventions include the following for all grade levels Kindergarten through 6th grade: Progress Monitoring, Individual and Small group instruction, visual representations, active classroom engagement.

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?

Progress monitoring will be critical for understanding how students are performing and responding to instruction. Monitoring will allow for us to better understand the corrective instruction needs and which

students and/or sub-groups where we need to focus the greatest support. Individual and small group instruction ensures that students can receive the specific support and corrective instruction they need. Additionally, research indicates that active classroom engagement will encourage a greater connection from the learner and support the retention of standards based instruction.

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
We will utilize Literacy Leadership Team comprised of our MTSS Coordinator, Administration, Student Success Coordinator, Media Specialist, an ELA lead teacher and an ESE Support Facilitator to ensure that we are frequently reviewing and monitoring student performance, and how we are responding to literacy achievement gaps.	Jones , Justin, justin.jones@myoneclay.net
We are providing an additional focus for our staff on Professional Learning by creating opportunities for targeted ELA teachers to participate in Corrective Reading Training and Spelling through Morphographs training. Both of these programs are designed to provide a greater intensity of support to students with deficiencies in reading. Additionally, our instructional support staff are working toward micro-credentialing through the Lastinger Center which will allow them to provide additional academic intervention through the use of targeted small groups.	Jones , Justin, justin.jones@myoneclay.net