

Duval County Public Schools

# Jean Ribault High School



## 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# 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

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: C (49%) 2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (44%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## 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)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 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	96%

### School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	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

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.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bostic, Gregory	Principal	
Hunter, Austin	Assistant Principal	
McNair, Michael	Assistant Principal	
Hamilton, Sabrina	Assistant Principal	
Houston, Jerrell	Instructional Coach	
Nolen, Victoria	Instructional Coach	
Griffin, Williams	Dean	
Simmons, Sherrilla	Dean	
Greene, Kevin	Dean	

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Gregory Bostic

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

1

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

11

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

75

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

1,517

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.

12

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

12

### Demographic Data

### Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's 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	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	369	386	357	220	1332	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	122	177	182	106	587	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129	73	45	19	266	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	66	36	12	122	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	63	52	28	159	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162	161	114	1	438	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134	107	135	75	451	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	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 who have 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	135	150	147	72	504

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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	14	65	48	2	129	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	45	54	29	146	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/6/2022

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	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	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	
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	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**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	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	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	0	0	0	0	
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 Review**

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	29%	45%	51%				29%	47%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	43%						42%	48%	51%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%						37%	42%	42%
Math Achievement	27%	37%	38%				46%	51%	51%
Math Learning Gains	38%						45%	52%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%						33%	47%	45%
Science Achievement	43%	43%	40%				46%	65%	68%
Social Studies Achievement	38%	53%	48%				38%	70%	73%

**Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments**

**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

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
2022					

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	42%	67%	-25%	67%	-25%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	39%	68%	-29%	70%	-31%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	32%	57%	-25%	61%	-29%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	52%	61%	-9%	57%	-5%

### Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	30	30	33	44	59	56	41	36		89	47
ELL											
BLK	28	43	49	26	36	49	41	36		94	76
HSP	44	56		36	70						
WHT	30	21		50							
FRL	26	40	49	25	35	46	40	35		68	69
2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	29	36	36	37	36	44	34	35		98	40
BLK	24	34	33	21	25	41	29	32		93	76
HSP	50	55		46							
WHT	26	33		31							
FRL	23	34	34	22	29	43	28	30		91	74

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

### ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	30
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	515
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	47
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	30
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	48
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	52
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	34
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	43
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Data Analysis**

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

**What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?**

Reading deficits and math deficits contribute to low performing proficiency, but gains show improvement in these areas.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?**

The lowest performing components were ELA and Math achievement. While ELA achievement rose 4 percentage points from 2021 to 22 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. The only overall data point to show a decline was mathematics achievement; in addition, when you break down math achievement, Geometry fell steeply and Algebra I's gains balanced it out. Geometry 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. 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.

**What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?**

Contributing factors to these needs for improvement were: lack of teacher experience and/or knowledge, student mathematical skills deficits, student reading deficits, and lack of targeted, aligned core instruction. We need to implement greater professional development and more targeted student instruction.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?**

Biology EOC proficiency increased 12 points, overall math learning gains increased 12 points, and ELA LPQ gains increased 12 points.

**What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?**

ELA and math 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. Biology focused on standards aligned instruction and also utilized small group pull outs.

**What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?**

Implement differentiated instruction through technology platforms. Small group instruction with certified teachers during class and through pull outs, and PD to ensure aligned instruction.

**Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.**

Professional development will focus on aligned instruction and how to differentiate to address learning gaps.

**Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.**

Small group pull outs to address learning gaps will occur weekly for target students. Teachers will engage in PD through PLC biweekly to focus on aligned instruction.

### **Areas of Focus**

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**  
**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

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. This is especially important as we implement new standards and benchmarks in math and ELA. Based on Standards Walk-through data from 2021-2022, less than 70% 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:**  
**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective 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.

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

Administrators will conduct weekly walks in the classroom to monitor. Administrator ratings will be compared to progress monitoring data via PMAs

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Gregory Bostic (bosticg@duvalschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Using new state standards resources and other district 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:**  
**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this 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**

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.



Administrators and interventionists will facilitate professional development with teachers through PLC on standards breakdown via the learning arc and planning protocols. Use Title I funds to give stipends for PD (Planning and Effective Learning Strategies) to improve teacher performance and student achievement.

**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** Austin Hunter (huntera@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 interventionists (math and Reading purchased through Title I), and lead teachers will facilitate common planning with teachers to produce standards aligned instructional plans. Use Title I to fund two fulltime instructional interventionists (one reading and one math) to help facilitate.

**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 interventionists and then to teachers.

**Person Responsible** Gregory Bostic (bosticg@duvalschools.org)

Increase targeted academic support for students in identified areas of need through increasing standards aligned classrooms.

Use title I to fund a full time social studies position in order to support student success in US History by adding additional classes in the social studies progression.

Use title I to fund two full time science positions in order to support student success in Biology by adding additional classes in the science progression.

Use title I to fund a full time reading teacher position in order to target student literacy deficits in class and support ELA achievement.

Use title I to fund a full time math teacher position in order to target student math deficits in class and support math achievement.

Use Title I to fund part time math tutors to address student deficits in math and increase achievement.

Use Title I to fund a secondary paraprofessional to ensure adequate support for students to meet achievement goals.

**Person Responsible** Gregory Bostic (bosticg@duvalschools.org)

Improve instruction and student achievement by ensuring all materials are standards aligned. Use Title I to fund curriculum associates (BEST material). Also Use Title I to fund general supplies such as toner, laminating film, and earbuds to support standards aligned instruction. Use Title I to fund 10 Emtec laptop Carts to ensure all students have access to aligned and rigorous platforms. Use title I to fund laptops to integrate standards aligned technology such as MathXI and Commonlit in class to increase student achievement.

**Person  
Responsible**

Gregory Bostic (bosticg@duvalschools.org)

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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**  
**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Implement 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. We will fund two full time Dean of Students Positions to lead the work of developing a consistent PBIS plan to ensure students are successful.

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

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

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

Principal and leadership team will meet biweekly to monitor the referral data to ensure decrease in occurrences.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Williams Griffin (griffinw1@duvalschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

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. We will fund two full time Dean of Students Positions to lead the work of developing a consistent PBIS plan to ensure students are successful.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this 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

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.

Expand the school PBIS team to meet biweekly and include more stakeholders. We will fund a Parent involvement liaison through Title I to support this work.

**Person Responsible** Williams Griffin (griffinw1@duvalschools.org)

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

**Person Responsible** Kevin Greene (greenek2@duvalschools.org)

Train teachers on PBIS plan via common planning departments

**Person Responsible** Williams Griffin (griffinw1@duvalschools.org)

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

**Person Responsible** Sherrilla Simmons (simmomss3@duvalschools.org)

## RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

### 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

N/A

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

N/A

### 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 new 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: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

N/A

**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 take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

N/A

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

**Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

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. Â§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?

N/A

**Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific 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 practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

N/A

**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**

N/A

**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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

**Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.**

Through surveys of parents, students and staff, we have created a multi-tiered plan to address building a positive school culture. We will be expanding our PBIS program, focusing on our school expectations (Timely, Respectful, Organized, judicious, astute, noble, and successful), and bringing back programs for stakeholders that are in person (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.

**Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive school culture and environment.**

Our Deans of Students (Griffin, Greene and Simmons) will lead this work. Other stakeholders include teachers from various departments, students, parents, and community members. The Deans will ensure all group are represented on the PBIS committee. The committee will be in charge of expanding our PBIS programs, monitoring their effectiveness, and suggesting changes to the leadership team.