

Duval County Public Schools

Jean Ribault High School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

Jean Ribault High School

3701 WINTON DR, Jacksonville, FL 32208

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

Demographics

Principal: Gregory Bostic

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Jean Ribault High School

3701 WINTON DR, Jacksonville, FL 32208

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	97%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bostic, Gregory	Principal	The principal provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making and ensures adequate Professional Development to support instructional implementation. He also communicates with parents regarding school-based plans and activities. The principal serves as an instructional leader by providing regular feedback to teachers and working directly with teachers on instructional improvements. The administrative team, including the principal, also works with the broader team and teacher-led action teams to make school based decisions with regard to family and community engagement and school climate and culture.
Hunter, Austin	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal serves as an instructional leader by providing regular feedback to teachers and working directly with teachers on instructional improvements. The administrative team, including the assistant principal, also works with the broader team and teacher-led action teams to make school based decisions with regard to family and community engagement and school climate and culture.
Griffin, Williams	Dean	The Deans of Students (Griffin and Brown) educate all students on the District Code of Conduct and behavioral referral process, monitor, and implement strategies to reduce the number of discipline referrals while working with the teacher-led PBIS team. In addition, the Deans will work directly with all stakeholders to increase positive behaviors and attendance.
Harris, Mia	School Counselor	The lead School Counselor (Ms. M. Harris) will work with all members to ensure student needs are being met. In addition, she will serve with the Deans to help improve attendance and reduce behavior concerns, She will work with the administrator over seniors to ensure all seniors graduate and are college or career ready.
Gaspard, James	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal serves as an instructional leader by providing regular feedback to teachers and working directly with teachers on instructional improvements. The administrative team, including the assistant principal, also works with the broader team and teacher-led action teams to make school based decisions with regard to family and community engagement and school climate and culture.
Johnson, Samai	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach (Ms. S. Johnson) will develop, lead, and evaluate school core content standards/ programs, identify and analyze existing literature on scientifically based curriculum/ behavior assessment and intervention approaches, identify systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence-based

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		intervention strategies; assist with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk;" assist in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provide support for assessment and implementation monitoring.
Hamilton, Sabrina	Assistant Principal	
McNair, Michael	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Gregory Bostic

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

74

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners*

(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (44%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	594	455	313	272	1634
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	85	58	3	166
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	12	3	0	19

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/28/2020

Prior Year - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	368	407	306	242	1323	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119	119	90	139	467	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	91	58	30	274	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	116	25	8	207	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	276	288	179	184	927	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	199	166	114	49	528

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	114	34	11	183
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	368	407	306	242	1323
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119	119	90	139	467
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	95	91	58	30	274
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58	116	25	8	207
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	276	288	179	184	927

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	199	166	114	49	528

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	114	34	11	183
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	29%	47%	56%	25%	46%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	42%	48%	51%	29%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	42%	42%	19%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	46%	51%	51%	48%	59%	49%
Math Learning Gains	45%	52%	48%	44%	52%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	33%	47%	45%	36%	45%	39%
Science Achievement	46%	65%	68%	49%	64%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	38%	70%	73%	39%	64%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2019	24%	48%	-24%	55%	-31%
	2018	23%	48%	-25%	53%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2019	27%	48%	-21%	53%	-26%
	2018	20%	49%	-29%	53%	-33%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	42%	67%	-25%	67%	-25%
2018	43%	63%	-20%	65%	-22%
Compare		-1%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	39%	68%	-29%	70%	-31%
2018	36%	64%	-28%	68%	-32%
Compare		3%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	32%	57%	-25%	61%	-29%
2018	47%	61%	-14%	62%	-15%
Compare		-15%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	52%	61%	-9%	57%	-5%
2018	39%	57%	-18%	56%	-17%
Compare		13%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	38	46	33	49	34	47	50	29		84	42
BLK	28	41	36	45	43	31	45	37		88	70
MUL	43	57		67							
WHT	45	80		67							
FRL	26	40	37	43	41	29	42	34		82	65
2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	31	34	20	51	52		52	55		77	30
BLK	24	31	29	45	43	33	43	37		82	69
MUL	36	40									
WHT	69	54		73						67	
FRL	24	31	30	46	43	33	42	38		76	70
2017 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	12	30	21	32	36		27	38		38	50
BLK	25	29	19	47	45	37	47	38		78	71
WHT	35	38		46	40		75				
FRL	20	28	21	44	43	37	46	38		76	72

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	472

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	46
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	56
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	64
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	44
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant 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 performing component was ELA achievement. While ELA achievement rose 4 percentage points from 2018 to 19 overall, it was still well below our next component. ELA achievement continues to remain a priority, but comparisons of cohort data show that students come into high school performing below proficiency but do make gains.

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

The only overall data point to show a decline was social studies achievement; however, when you break down math achievement, Algebra 1 fell steeply and geometry's gains balanced it out. Algebra I fell due to several factors: lack of teacher experience and/or knowledge, student mathematical skills deficits, and lack of targeted, aligned core instruction. All of which will be addressed this year.

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

The data component with the greatest gap when compared to the state average is Social Studies Achievement. This directly relates to the ELA achievement gap as well as social

studies is a literacy based test. We also did not see as many gains in FSAA US History as we anticipated.

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

ELA learning gains went up 10 points, and this was our area of most improvement. ELA instruction shifted last year to include targeted differentiation in class and during in school pull outs to assist students. In addition, the school utilized Achieve3000 and CommonLit to address individual student needs.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Out two biggest areas of concern are attendance and retained students. Therefore, we have instituted new attendance tracking procedures and rewards for good (and improved) attendance. In addition, retained students will be enrolled in online courses to help them rectify the credit issues.

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

1. Overall instructional improvement
2. Algebra I Achievement
2. ELA Achievement (both 9th and 10th)
3. Science Achievement
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus	Our focus will be on professional development around standards based instruction in PLC and then implementing effective standards aligned planning protocols in common planning in order to mitigate the gaps identified below.
Description and Rationale:	Based on Standards Walk-through data from 2019-2020, less than 50% of core content classrooms show standards aligned instruction, tasks, and/or assessments based on observational data conducted with the Standards walk through Tool. Additionally, based on data from the 5 essentials survey, just over half of teachers believe that instruction is ambitious showing a gap in rigor.
Measurable Outcome:	Based upon the instructional alignment rubric, the vast majority of core content teachers will create standards-based instruction and assessments and implement those aligned plans and assessments as measured by the standards walk through tool.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Gregory Bostic (bosticg@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Using ALDs, learning Arcs, and other standards based planning tools, professional development around standards breakdown and alignment will occur in PLC, and then this will be used in high quality common planning in all core content areas to plan aligned lessons. Using the district created Standards Walkthrough tool, we can effectively measure classrooms that have aligned instruction, tasks, and assessments in core content areas.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Best instructional practices indicate that students need to receive instruction that is aligned to standards and that is grade appropriate in order to address the achievement gap and student needs. Standards aligned instruction also ensures that students can be successful as measured by state assessments and the progression of standards is met and students are prepared for the next grade level. The importance of alignment and grade appropriate work is echoed in The Opportunity Myth.

Action Steps to Implement

Administrators and coaches will facilitate professional development with teachers through PLC on standards breakdown and planning protocols.

Person Responsible Austin Hunter (huntera@duvalschools.org)

Administrators will conduct consistent observations in all core content area classes to evaluate instructional alignment of lessons.

Person Responsible Gregory Bostic (bosticg@duvalschools.org)

Review observational data through the Standard Walk through Dashboard to identify areas of Focus for standards alignment.

Person Responsible Gregory Bostic (bosticg@duvalschools.org)

Administrators, instructional coaches (math and Reading purchased through Title I), and lead teachers will facilitate common planning with teachers to produce standards aligned instructional plans.

Person Responsible Austin Hunter (huntera@duvalschools.org)

Administrators will differentiate support to planning groups as needed based on observational data.

Person Responsible Gregory Bostic (bosticg@duvalschools.org)

Using the gradual release process, administrators will release the planning process to coaches and then to teachers.

Person Responsible Gregory Bostic (bosticg@duvalschools.org)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Develop an effective and consistent system of positive behavior interventions and supports. Enact systems that support teachers in developing the whole child and ensuring student safety in order to support student learning and improve student outcomes in all core subjects. Based on the 5 essentials survey, crafting a supportive environment was weak (overall score of 28 out of 100). Part of developing our school culture will fall to our Dean of Students (position purchased through Title I).

Measurable Outcome: On the 5 essentials survey, supportive environment will be rated at least 40. Call 1 referrals will decrease by 50%, and attendance will improve from 87% daily average to 95%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Williams Griffin (griffinw1@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: A consistent school wide positive behavior system that focus on attendance and specific behaviors will result in more time in class on task and therefore greater student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The school wide PBIS system will support student behavior, attendance, and impact retained levels. When looking at our attendance and behavior data, recidivism and absenteeism have a major impact on student achievement. Therefore, we need to target students to adjust behavior and attendance.

Action Steps to Implement

Create a school PBIS team that meets biweekly.

Person Responsible Williams Griffin (griffinw1@duvalschools.org)

PBIS team will adjust PBIS plan better target attendance and identified behaviors.

Person Responsible Williams Griffin (griffinw1@duvalschools.org)

Train teachers on PBIS plan

Person Responsible Williams Griffin (griffinw1@duvalschools.org)

Review implementation of PBIS plan based on attendance, discipline, and observational data.

Person Responsible Williams Griffin (griffinw1@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Overall instructional improvement in classrooms led by standards-aligned practices will result in increases in all areas of student achievement in core content areas as students will receive consistently aligned instruction that gives them equivalent experiences to the state assessments.

Using Title I funds, instructional coaches for reading and math will assist in training teachers on standards and standards-aligned instruction in order to support student growth and achievement. In addition, a math and an English teacher will also be purchased through Title I to support instructional improvement and will participate in the professional development process centered around standards-based instruction.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Through surveys of parents, we have crafted programming (Why Cook Wednesday?) that provides engagement and educational information. We have also crafted a space for parents to utilize in our school with appropriate resources. Please see PFEP for more detailed information.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00