

Duval County Public Schools

Julia Landon College Preparatory & Leadership



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Julia Landon College Preparatory & Leadership Development School

1819 THACKER AVE, Jacksonville, FL 32207

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

Demographics

Principal: Ryan Casey

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	30%
2021-22 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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (76%) 2018-19: A (81%) 2017-18: A (79%)
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	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Julia Landon College Preparatory & Leadership Development School

1819 THACKER AVE, Jacksonville, FL 32207

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

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)
Middle School 6-8	No	30%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	51%

School Grades History

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

n/a

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision at Julia Landon College Preparatory and Leadership Development School is to create college bound students with a deep commitment to public service and a true understanding of their leadership skills within the global community.

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
Casey, Ryan	Principal	Overseeing school operations and management
Oliver, Tracey	Assistant Principal	Principal Designee, Testing Coordinator, Teacher Evaluations, Student Services
Bell, Michelle	Assistant Principal	Principal of Curriculum and Instruction, Teacher Evaluations, Transportation, 7th & 8th Grade House
Bourgholtzer, MiChelle	Dean	Student Discipline and Director of Athletics

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2022, Ryan Casey

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.*

2

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

40

Total number of students enrolled at the school

854

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

5

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

7

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	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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 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	

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	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/27/2022

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	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	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		

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	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	81%	43%	50%				86%	43%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	61%						68%	49%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%						59%	45%	47%
Math Achievement	87%	35%	36%				91%	49%	58%
Math Learning Gains	72%						78%	50%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	69%						72%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	81%	48%	53%				88%	44%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	96%	53%	58%				97%	68%	72%

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
06	2022					
	2019	83%	47%	36%	54%	29%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	86%	44%	42%	52%	34%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				
08	2022					
	2019	88%	49%	39%	56%	32%
Cohort Comparison		-86%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	91%	51%	40%	55%	36%
Cohort Comparison						

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2022					
	2019	87%	47%	40%	54%	33%
Cohort Comparison		-91%				
08	2022					
	2019	0%	32%	-32%	46%	-46%
Cohort Comparison		-87%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	88%	40%	48%	48%	40%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	0%	67%	-67%	67%	-67%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	97%	69%	28%	71%	26%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	91%	57%	34%	61%	30%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	61%	39%	57%	43%

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	47	47	46	60	58	59	61	93	59		
ELL	56	64	53	81	80	70			80		
ASN	88	71	64	94	84	80	81	97	95		
BLK	65	58	50	68	65	58	64	93	69		
HSP	66	53	29	77	61	48	81	95	79		
MUL	80	66	56	88	73	65	75	100	90		
WHT	85	60	55	92	72	77	88	96	92		
FRL	61	55	51	66	66	59	67	86	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	56	44	32	66	56	56	50	82	74		
ELL	51	55	48	67	53	55		81	55		
ASN	86	81	60	93	73	78	97	95	97		
BLK	68	59	52	73	54	58	63	96	82		
HSP	77	55	40	82	61	50	78	84	79		
MUL	83	62	42	87	65	48	81	88	92		
WHT	86	66	57	92	64	71	91	98	95		
FRL	61	57	49	63	45	41	62	88	67		
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	44	38	27	69	71	66	42	95	71		
ELL	54	46	55	69	54						
ASN	93	74	58	97	84		100	97	98		
BLK	71	58	57	75	66	65	68	93	78		
HSP	71	56	44	86	77	70	90	91	96		
MUL	84	71	64	86	82	73		94	100		
WHT	90	70	64	96	80	76	91	100	94		
FRL	68	61	63	76	68	64	76	92	79		

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	75
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	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	747
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	59
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	68
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	84
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	66
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	65

Hispanic Students	
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	77
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	80
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	64
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?

We have always seen success in proficiency across contents, however ELA continues to be the lowest with 81%

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

ELA lowest quartile students are not making gains.

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

We need more differentiated instruction in the classroom for our lowest performing students.

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

Consistency in teachers, great PLC's and teachers using common assessments and differentiated instruction.

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

Mathematics and Civics showed the biggest growth.

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

Differentiated standards based instruction and small group 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.

MTSS Training for teachers, small group instruction training.

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

Pulled small groups of lowest performing students with support staff (admin, counselors, dean, issp)

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to School Safety

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

Approximately 34% of students who participate in the survey indicated that they feel very safe when in the hallways of the school. Last year approximately 62% of students who participated in the survey indicated they feel very safe when in teacher's classes. This was a decrease percentage from the previous year's survey results.

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

60% of our 2022-2023 student will feel they are very safe when they are in the hallways and in when they are in their teacher's class.

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

Principal Focus Lunches, quarterly surveys to students

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

MiChelle Bourgholtzer (werred@duvalschools.org)

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

To help students become more accountable for their actions, we need to establish routines, procedures and structures while simultaneously offering students opportunities to observe the presence of school staff members throughout the school (as well as in classrooms) monitoring and modeling appropriate behavior and good citizenship.

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

According to ASCD, research on safe schools. A school must be safe; creating this condition requires thoughtful and constant attention to the security and safety of the facilities; creation of clear policies and procedures for students and staff conduct; frequent and effective communication with school and community stakeholders; and attention to classroom management as well as specific and relevant professional development. The absenteeism of these conditions in place, hinder student intentional learning and achievement.

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.

Facilitate professional development on the Supportive Environment – Student survey results and reflection. (Pre-planning)

Person Responsible

MiChelle Bourgholtzer (werred@duvalschools.org)

Dissect previous year data related to ensuring a safe learning environment. School based professional development on student conduct expectations for common areas outside of the classroom (Pre-planning)

Person Responsible

MiChelle Bourgholtzer (werred@duvalschools.org)

Rounds with content grade level teams to discuss student expectations in classrooms. (Preplanning)

Person Responsible MiChelle Bourgholtzer (werred@duvalschools.org)

Student grade level assemblies (virtual if needed) to review code of conduct expectations.

Person Responsible MiChelle Bourgholtzer (werred@duvalschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

After teachers have completed the standards based planning process and implemented their lesson plans they will ensure that they have a common standards based assessment. When teachers are assessing students after teaching a concept, the findings show that students who were already performing at or above grade level for reading proficiency continue to show proficiency in mastery of concepts presented in the assessment; whereas students who were already categorized as achieving below grade level for reading proficiency show a lack of mastery and/or adequate growth.

Measurable Outcome:

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

100% of our 2020-2021 core course teachers will engage in the usage of and implementation of standards based common formative assessment. The PLC format will include using the Learning Arc Framework to ensure that lesson plans created on every standard are aligned and include an assessment to know which students are proficient on the standard and which students are not, so that reteaching and reassessments can take place. After common subject and grade level teachers engage in and implement instruction delivery rooted in standards, they are to collaborate on standards based common formative assessment, to provide their students. Teachers are to upload the assessment into Performance Matters, allowing for the ability to access the exam and data disaggregation. Assessments are to be given when a new standard is being taught. Assessments should be a minimum of 5 questions with a maximum of 15 questions.

Monitoring:

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

PLC meeting minutes, Data Chats with teachers and student data chats

Ryan Casey (caseyr@duvalschools.org)

Standard based common formative assessment will expose students to content specific test items, such as passages, graphs and content scenarios. Assessments are to be given

once a month or when a new standard is being taught. Assessments should be a minimum

of 5 questions with a maximum of 15 questions (each question should also include the

standard next to the question).

The ASCD research on the use of formative assessment has shown that when teachers

practice good formative assessment and students participate in it, both achievement and motivation increase.

The effects of good formative assessment on achievement can be as much as .4 to .7 standard deviations, the equivalent of moving from the 50th percentile to the 65th and 75th percentile on a standardized test.

The reasons of these effects and numerous. Formative assessment helps identify what

students can do with help and what they can do independently. Participating in formative

assessment involves students in active learning, keeps them on task, and focuses them on

learning goals. Formative assessment, especially peer evaluation and self-evaluation, help

students with the social construction of knowledge. But more important, formative assessment allows students to receive feedback on precisely what they need to do to

improve. It shows them what to do next to get better.

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

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.

Facilitate professional development standard-based instruction as well as creating formative assessments. (Pre-planning)

Person Responsible

Michelle Bell (bellm5@duvalschools.org)

Formative Assessment: Rounds with content specific teams. (Pre-planning) with the expectation that teachers will offer a minimum of two formative assessments each month.

Person Responsible

Tracey Oliver (olivert@duvalschools.org)

Administration will use Standards Based Walk-throughs to both observe and monitor the formative assessments that will be given. Teachers will be required to upload onto a school based calendar when they are giving an assessment (Formative, Quiz, Unit Exam)

Person Responsible

Ryan Casey (caseyr@duvalschools.org)

Administration will meet weekly to discuss the data we are seeing across our content responsibilities:

Are we seeing common assessments?

What does that data look like in performance matters?

Are teachers conducting an item analysis of the formative assessments?

Are teachers planning for a reteach or small group dependent on what the data says?

What are you having students complete?

Is the standard posted?

Are the students able to speak to the standard?

What equivalent experiences are students experiencing daily, weekly, monthly?

Person Responsible

Ryan Casey (caseyr@duvalschools.org)

PLC Formatting will be the same across all contents. The PLC format will include using the Learning Arc Framework to ensure that lesson plans created on every standard are aligned and include an assessment to know which students are proficient on the standard and which students are not, so that reteaching and reassessments can take place.

Person Responsible

Ryan Casey (caseyr@duvalschools.org)

Administration will hold themselves accountable by meeting weekly uninterrupted for a minimum of of an 50 minutes about what we have seen in the minimum of 5 walk-throughs per week. We will additionally post positive feedback for teachers to see what we see going on in each content area. These positive postings will be based on the dials of the continuum (Calibrated Administration, Collaborative Administration, Standards-based Planning, Aligned Observations).

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

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 Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

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

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

TBD

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

TBD

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)

TBD

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

TBD

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.

TBD

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?

TBD

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?

TBD

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**

TBD

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.

We have expanded our Positive Behavior Intervention Strategies to be more inclusive and accessible to teachers and students. We built a school store where students can cash in points that teachers will give them via FOCUS.

We have an active parent group, and we are adding more ways for them to be involved on campus. Family movie nights, volunteer opportunities are just a few new additions to get more stakeholders on campus and involved.

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

Parents are key to promoting and enhancing their students learning we incorporate them as much as possible in a plethora of ways.