

Duval County Public Schools

Duval Charter School At Westside 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	17
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	17
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Duval Charter School At Westside

9238 103RD ST, Jacksonville, FL 32210

www.westsidecharter.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.

Building global awareness and appreciation for diversity.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Duval Charter School at Westside will provide a supportive environment that prepares our students to be the next generation of leaders.

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
Lane, Courtney	Principal	Overall operations of 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.

All stakeholders collaborate monthly to discuss current school needs, initiatives and action steps. Surveys are also used to determine if identified initiatives aligned with stakeholder perspectives. School Improvement Plan process is used for the following based on stakeholder feedback and academic achievement from the previous 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))

The School Improvement Plan is consistently monitored LEA deliverables and reporting. There are also :state of the school' presentations twice per year for parents and stakeholders to address academic progress and initiatives.

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-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	88%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	77%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
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: 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	0	39	20	34	12	17	11	8	21	162	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
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	35	47	50	45	29	2	208	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	28	41	52	47	33	3	204	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	13	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Absent 10% or more school days		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.		

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

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 school days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	15	0	0	0	0	0	15
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*	34	45	53	32	47	55	29		
ELA Learning Gains				46			40		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41			40		
Math Achievement*	36	46	55	29	40	42	24		
Math Learning Gains				45			35		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				43			40		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	24	45	52	17	45	54	11		
Social Studies Achievement*	49	62	68	71	50	59	55		
Middle School Acceleration	77	73	70	47	45	51	68		
Graduation Rate		72	74		41	50			
College and Career Acceleration		54	53		65	70			
ELP Progress	30	47	55	48	68	70	52		

* 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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	288
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	419
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97
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	14	Yes	4	4
ELL	27	Yes	3	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	39	Yes	2	
HSP	46			
MUL	52			
PAC				
WHT	43			
FRL	40	Yes	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	22	Yes	3	3
ELL	36	Yes	2	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	39	Yes	1	
HSP	39	Yes	1	
MUL	54			
PAC				
WHT	49			
FRL	41			

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	34			36			24	49	77			30
SWD	13			24			0	17			4	
ELL	22			30			18	20			6	30
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	31			30			14	47	75		6	
HSP	32			37			32	47	92		7	33
MUL	59			56			40				3	
PAC												
WHT	44			50			43	36			4	
FRL	31			33			23	43	73		7	38

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	32	46	41	29	45	43	17	71	47			48
SWD	13	33	30	11	33	32	4					
ELL	25	51	35	19	38	35	11	60				48
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	31	44	42	25	45	46	10	66				
HSP	29	41	32	24	41	43	21	79				44
MUL	46	60		52	56							
PAC												
WHT	39	53	45	42	51		42	71				
FRL	31	45	40	27	45	44	12	77				47

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	29	40	40	24	35	40	11	55	68			52
SWD	14	28	23	12	27	37	4	27				
ELL	20	27	31	18	22	27	7	27				52

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
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	22	36	37	18	29	37	6	45	60			
HSP	32	40	44	26	31	36	23	55				43
MUL	37	57		16	50							
PAC												
WHT	47	52		49	57		27	79				
FRL	27	36	37	21	34	40	9	49	50			77

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	25%	47%	-22%	54%	-29%
07	2023 - Spring	35%	40%	-5%	47%	-12%
08	2023 - Spring	44%	41%	3%	47%	-3%
04	2023 - Spring	34%	50%	-16%	58%	-24%
06	2023 - Spring	28%	38%	-10%	47%	-19%
03	2023 - Spring	34%	46%	-12%	50%	-16%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	32%	43%	-11%	54%	-22%
07	2023 - Spring	35%	40%	-5%	48%	-13%
03	2023 - Spring	31%	59%	-28%	59%	-28%
04	2023 - Spring	41%	58%	-17%	61%	-20%
08	2023 - Spring	75%	45%	30%	55%	20%
05	2023 - Spring	14%	52%	-38%	55%	-41%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	24%	35%	-11%	44%	-20%
05	2023 - Spring	12%	48%	-36%	51%	-39%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	88%	52%	36%	50%	38%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	94%	64%	30%	63%	31%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	50%	63%	-13%	66%	-16%

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.

Science achievement was lowest performing for 22-23 school year. This deficit is greatly impacted by a lack of vocabulary acquisition and ability to read text with stamina and comprehension.

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

Social studies achievement showed the greatest decline in comparison to the prior year. Obtaining highly qualified staff attributed to this drop in performance.

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.

Math achievement showed the largest gap compared to the state with an 18% deficit. This is primarily attributed to poor math foundations and number sense which manifests in tested grade levels.

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

Although still the lowest performance area, Science achievement was also the largest area of improvement. This was primarily due to a team of intervention/tutoring dedicated to both 5th and 8th support.

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

Chronic attendance

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

High quality Tier 1 instruction
Social skill development
Attendance/Parental Involvement

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

To ensure classrooms are conducive for learning, it is important that students understand and have the opportunity to positive interact with their peers and use appropriate communication skills. After the pandemic there was a noticeable gap in student social pragmatics.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Reduction of discipline referrals and any reactive measures to address behavior deficits.

Monitoring:

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

Teacher and student surveys will be conducted to measure effectiveness of interventions and programs implemented.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Courtney Lane (clane@westsidecharter.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.)

PBIS Implementation- Social skillbuilders and lessons

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

PBIS framework has proving effective for improving school culture among and student belonging especially in Title I schools with high academic and social needs

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**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.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Monitoring:

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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).

All school improvement funding allocations will be strategically planned to support student academic and social needs. This includes but not limited to resources, programming and personnel.

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.

https://westsidecharter.org/apps/pages/index.jsp?uREC_ID=573067&type=d

Communications (electronic and hardcopy) are distributed in language indicated as primarily spoken at home. Presentations are also available with speech to text translation feature.

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))

https://westsidecharter.org/apps/pages/index.jsp?uREC_ID=573067&type=d

Monthly parent nights are held to educate parents on grade level requirements, individual student data reports, and resources to support at home.

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)

Based on our 2022-23 winter NWEA data projections, Duval Charter School at Westside (DCSW) continues to need strategic emphasis in the core subjects of reading, math, and science. After meeting with our leadership team and members of the instructional staff, we believe the next step to move the needle for our students is to focus on differentiated and collaborative small group instructional learning model with a hands-on learning approach in reading, math, and science. For effective differentiation students, teachers, and parents will need to know the students' individual instructional levels. Then, with that knowledge, form well-structured small or collaborative groups to assist in the areas of need while pushing those who are excelling. To further support this initiative, Title I funds are needed for the Lexia program for implementation for all our students. Lexia is a research based structured literacy program that offers 3 components: Lexia Core 5, Lexia Power Up, and English Language Development. Lexia Core 5 Reading addresses the need of literacy acceleration for students in grade K-5. Lexia Powerup Literacy addresses the need of literacy acceleration for students in grade 6-12. Lexia English Language Development address the English Language Development for the emergent bilingual students in K-6. Through these three Lexia program components, DCSW is supporting each student's individual reading needs and providing differentiated support for all learners, including our ESOL population.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Weekly social skills groups based on deficit. Tier 2 counseling based on teacher/parent feedback and Tier 3 mental health sessions based on parent interview and support from Mental Health Liasion

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

PBIS initiative focused on student input and social skills topics based on discipline data

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Ongoing professional development on teaching best practices (high yield) and engagement.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

Annual Transition Kindergarten Day. Summer Kindergarten screenings and ramp up program