J. Allen Axson Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

J. Allen Axson Elementary School

4763 SUTTON PARK CT, Jacksonville, FL 32224

http://www.duvalschools.org/jaa

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To provide educational excellence to every student every day using the Montessori Method of instruction.

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Robinson Vanhoy, Cecilia	Principal	Educational Leader: Responsible to support teachers and families in educating Axson students.
Roberts, Amy	Assistant Principal	Educational Leader responsible for employee management, PD, student data, curriculum & instruction, testing, discipline, Title IX, working with students and families to ensure successful learning outcomes for all.
Bryson, Irene	School Counselor	Responsible for mental health and well being of the students at Axson. She connects parents to services based on needs. She does classroom, small and individual counseling as needed and refers families to in house therapist based on her and/or parent recommendation.
Avera, Stacy	Teacher, K-12	Grade Chair for 4th & 5th Grade
Davis, Shannon	Teacher, K-12	Grade Level Chair for 1st-3rd
Dubberly, Robyne	Teacher, ESE	ESE Team Leader
Budd, Tara	Teacher, K-12	Gifted Team Leader
Lee, Jill	Teacher, K-12	Resource Grade Level Team Member
Fitzharris, Adrienne	Teacher, K-12	1st-3rd Grade Teacher and Former Axson Instructional Coach
Nunley, Michelle	SAC Member	Axson SAC Chair
Seng, Henry	SAC Member	SAC Co-Chair
Confiado, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	PK-K Grade Level Chair

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

I put the initial SIP plan together with my AP once school performance data is reviewed. I will present to School Leadership Team the first week of preplanning for input and feedback. During first SAC Meeting in August I will present SIP for revisions and feedback. SAC members are parents, SAC Chair, SAC Co-Chair, Teacher Liaison, SAC secretary, business partner and any additional parents that attend monthly SAC Meeting.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

I review plan each nine weeks to see where we are from our original plan and make tweaks and changes based on FAST PM data and district assessments to ensure subgroup populations are making growth and or adjustments to original support plan for individual students. During PLC's admins also discuss with classroom teachers about their student data to see how teachers can best be supported instructionally.

Demographic Data	
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	55%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	28%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	26	12	9	15	9	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	3
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	0	9
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	21	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	32

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

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

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	1	18	8	9	7	6	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	7
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	0	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	14

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	1	18	8	9	7	6	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	7
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	0	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	14

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	78	48	53	86	50	56	85		
ELA Learning Gains				70			67		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				72			44		
Math Achievement*	85	58	59	84	48	50	79		
Math Learning Gains				84			61		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				85			50		
Science Achievement*	90	52	54	77	59	59	76		
Social Studies Achievement*					63	64			
Middle School Acceleration					53	52			
Graduation Rate					46	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		54	59						

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	84
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	336
Total Components for the Federal Index	4

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	80
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	558
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	74			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	90			
BLK	74			
HSP	70			
MUL	92			
PAC				
WHT	84			
FRL	71			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	72			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	87			
BLK	71			
HSP	80			
MUL	78			
PAC				
WHT	81			
FRL	73			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	78			85			90					
SWD	52			70			91				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	84			94			91				4	
BLK	72			72							3	
HSP	70			70							2	
MUL	86			90							3	
PAC												
WHT	77			88			89				4	
FRL	69			60			75				4	

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
All Students	86	70	72	84	84	85	77					
SWD	70	60	83	68	76		73					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	83	86		92	86							
BLK	71	55		76	82							
HSP	77	79		77	86							
MUL	89	50		79	93							
PAC												
WHT	90	70	71	86	82	83	83					
FRL	73	64	64	73	82	83						

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
All Students	85	67	44	79	61	50	76					
SWD	72	58		64	63	62	50					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	92			88								
BLK	68			68								
HSP	77			73								
MUL	80			75								
PAC												
WHT	89	65		81	67		86					
FRL	68	50		63	42		58					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	85%	47%	38%	54%	31%
04	2023 - Spring	68%	50%	18%	58%	10%
03	2023 - Spring	83%	46%	37%	50%	33%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	*	43%	*	54%	*
03	2023 - Spring	88%	59%	29%	59%	29%
04	2023 - Spring	80%	58%	22%	61%	19%
05	2023 - Spring	95%	52%	43%	55%	40%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	90%	48%	42%	51%	39%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

This past year the state only counted proficiency data for FAST PM Testing since it is a new state assessment. Axson dropped in overall ELA proficiency from 86% in 2022 to 79% in 2023.

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

ELA proficiency from 86% to 79%.

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.

Axson has a proven track record of performing above the state average in ELA, Math and Science proficiency.

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

We gained 13% in our overall science proficiency from 77% to 90% in 2023. In the last four years we have added a science resource person who does labs. When we first started this she worked with 3rd-5th grade students. Now she works with K-5 students in science weekly.

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

1. The number of student below 90% attendance in K-5 grade, 70 students out of 469.
2. Substantial reading deficiency in 1st grade, 21. These 21 students will be in 2nd grade this year and will be identified for support.

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

1. To increase overall ELA proficiency.
2.To identify students with substantial reading deficiencies in 2nd grade and have supports in place by the first nine weeks of school.
3. To decrease the number of students below 90% attendance in K-5, From 70 students to 50.
4. Continue to meet with Teacher PLC groups to look at student data, and have discussions with teachers on classroom needs to support student instructional goals.

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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

Axson dropped from 86% proficiency in ELA to 79% overall school proficiency in 22-23. This need was identified from FLDOE FAST Testing data.
Axson will increase ELA proficiency in 4th(68%) and 5th(85%) for the 23-24 school year.
4th Grade dropped(26%) and 5th Grade dropped(3%) in proficiency raw data.
Axson will also continue to monitor LPQ students and identify specific students who need additional support.

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

Axson will increase proficiency from 79% proficiency to 81% for the 23-24 school year.

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

Administrators will meet with grade level teams in PLCs to monitor ongoing student data (blending learning, class, district and state assessments) to determine students needing interventions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amy Roberts (buncha@duvalschools.org)

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

Teachers will use Montessori materials, Freckle, UFLI Intervention Materials, Waterford(K), RAZ Kids, Benchmark Advance, Heggerty Bridge the Gap and Seeing Stars to support students.
Part time Interventionist will work with identified students in 2nd/5th Grade.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These are specific materials approved from DCPS to increase proficiency and support LPQ students.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

Monthly monitoring of classroom teachers data and PLC Data Chats with teachers once a month to support and implement use of support materials.

Person Responsible: Amy Roberts (buncha@duvalschools.org)

By When: Review monthly and or after each quarterly assessment.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.   One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.
Reduce # of students with 20 or more days absent.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.
Reduce the number of student with chronic absenteeism from 14% to 10%.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.
Monthly monitoring of attendance, tardies and early checkouts.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Irene Bryson (brysoni@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Intervention: Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)
Monthly attendance meetings with leadership, social worker, and school counselor to review attendance and identify families and students who need support.   Monthly AIT meetings with parents to find solutions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.
Utilizing the team approach will ensure we are supporting the student with all levels of support.
Tier of Evidence-based Intervention   (Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)
Tier 1 - Strong Evidence
Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?
No
Action Steps to Implement   List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.
An attendance report will be pulled monthly to identify students with 5 or more days absent in the month.
Person Responsible: Irene Bryson (brysoni@duvalschools.org)
By When: By May of 2024

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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

To increase overall math proficiency. Axson gained 4pts in math proficiency from the previous school. While this is definitely a celebration we want to maintain what we got last year and continue to make proficiency growth.

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

To increase math proficiency from 88% to 89% for the 23-24 school year.

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

Administrators will meet with grade level teams in PLCs to monitor ongoing student data (blending learning, class, district and state assessments) to determine students needing interventions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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

Teachers will use Montessori materials, Freckle, I-Ready, Reveal Math, Waterford and District provided interventions to support students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These are specific materials approved from DCPS to increase proficiency and support LPQ students.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

Monthly monitoring of classroom teachers data and PLC Data Chats with teachers once a month to support and implement use of support materials.

Person Responsible: Cecilia Robinson Vanhoy (vanhoyc@duvalschools.org)

By When: By May 2024

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

NA