Mattie V Rutherford Alt Ed Center School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Mattie V Rutherford Alt Ed Center

1514 HUBBARD ST, Jacksonville, FL 32206

http://www.duvalschools.org/mvr

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.

The mission of Mattie V. Rutherford Alternative Middle School is to provide our students with a holistic and supportive educational experience. We are committed to helping our students achieve the highest level of academic, behavioral, and socio-emotional functioning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Students will leave Mattie V. Rutherford with the capacity to be successful in any middle or high school.

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
Milliner Smith, Sadie	Principal	Mrs. Milliner-Smith is responsible for the oversight of curriculum, instruction, assessment and day-to-day operation of the school. She develops school-wide goals with the faculty that are aligned with school's strategic plan. She uses student achievement data to assist faculty with creating student's academic growth plans. Mrs. Milliner-Smith conduct classroom walkthroughs, and facilitate parent meetings regarding the school's academic progress.
Mosley, Jerome	Assistant Principal	Dr. Mosley, Assistant Principal will facilitate/lead instructional PLC for teachers, and assist in managing the discipline process for students. He will monitor, evaluate and support all content area teachers. He will facilitate all parent engagement meetings and activities as well as conduct emergency and safety drills for the school.
Denson-Butler, Alfreda	Teacher, ESE	Ms. Denson-Butler is the Exceptional Student Education Department chair. She will ensure that ESE support faciitators are providing support to their respective content areas, provide support to teachers by providing data points and effective strategies to meet the needs of students with disabilities.
Sowers, William	Teacher, K-12	Mr. Sowers is the department head for Science. He will distribute instructional materials and information to teachers, assist with facilitating professional development, and analyzing student data to provide support to the Science teachers to enhance students' academic performance
Walker, Joann	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Walker is the department head for Social Studies. She will distribute instructional materials and information to teachers, assist with facilitating professional development, and analyzing student data to provide support to the Social Studies teachers to enhance students' academic performance.
Carter, Angela	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Morton is the department head for ELA/Reading. She will distribute instructional materials and information to teachers, assist with facilitating professional development, and analyzing student data to provide support to the ELA/Reading teachers to enhance students' academic performance.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Butler, Dwayne	Dean	Mr. Butler will monitor students discipline data, referrals, facilitate SESIR Team Meetings, and support new teachers with implementing a discipline plan.
Ruilopez Vega, Ramon	Teacher, K-12	Mr. Ruilopez Vega is the department head for Math. He will distribute instructional materials and information to teachers, assist with facilitating professional development, and analyzing student data to provide support to the Math teachers to enhance students' academic performance.

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

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

All Stakeholders are invited to participate in a school meeting where the agenda is focused on obtaining feedback from all stakeholders and providing their input into the school improvement plan.

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

The School Improvement plan will be regularly monitored during our PLC and parent meetings to provide updated information on current student data and to revise the plan with input from our stakeholders periodically.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School 4-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	84%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	
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)	
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
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	0	0	0	0	6	20	48	59	133
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	6	20	48	60	134
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	1	9	11	17	38
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	11	15	11	38
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	9	29	33	73
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	11	27	30	72
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	0	0	0	0	6	20	49	62	139

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	11	9	31
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	3	16

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	49	26	94
Course failure in 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	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	49	26	94
Course failure in 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	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	6	20	49	62	137

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	1	10	11	9	31
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	3	16

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*		45	53		47	55			
ELA Learning Gains									
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*		46	55		40	42			
Math Learning Gains									
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*		45	52		45	54			
Social Studies Achievement*		62	68		50	59			
Middle School Acceleration		73	70		45	51			
Graduation Rate		72	74		41	50			
College and Career Acceleration		54	53		65	70			
ELP Progress		47	55		68	70			

* 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)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	
Percent Tested	
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				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				

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%
FRL				

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				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL				

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												
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												

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
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students												
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students												
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												

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	*	47%	*	54%	*
07	2023 - Spring	4%	40%	-36%	47%	-43%
08	2023 - Spring	9%	41%	-32%	47%	-38%
04	2023 - Spring	*	50%	*	58%	*
06	2023 - Spring	6%	38%	-32%	47%	-41%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	8%	43%	-35%	54%	-46%
07	2023 - Spring	8%	40%	-32%	48%	-40%
04	2023 - Spring	*	58%	*	61%	*
08	2023 - Spring	9%	45%	-36%	55%	-46%
05	2023 - Spring	*	52%	*	55%	*

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	6%	35%	-29%	44%	-38%
05	2023 - Spring	*	48%	*	51%	*

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

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	24%	63%	-39%	66%	-42%

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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was in 7th grade ELA (4%) and 6th (8%) and 7th grade Math (8%). The contributing factors to last year's low performance was an increase in attendance below 90% and one more or more suspensions.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was in 7th Grade ELA (15% to 4% in 22-23) The factors that contributed to the decline was the high rate of student absenteeism and the lack of allowing students more independent work time through gradual release and the lack of allowing students to take ownership of their thinking and learning.

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.

Mattie V. Rutherford Alternative Middle School does not have comparative data from the state.

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

Based on the 22-23 PM3 data, the most improvement was Civics. (13% to 26%)

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

The potential EWS areas of concern are attendance and suspensions.

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

1. Attendance
2. Suspensions
3. ELA
4. Math
5. 8th grade Science proficiency

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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was in 7th grade ELA (4%). The overall school data for ELA was performing below grade level.

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

In ELA students will grow by more than 1 grade using the Exact Path online platform.

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

Students will master a new skill each week by spending 40 min in the learning path for ELA on the Exact Path platform.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sadie Milliner Smith (milliner-s@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.)

The evident-based intervention being implemented is through small group targeted support.

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

Using Exact Path for targeted intervention will pinpoint student skills gaps, provide age appropriate individualized instruction with automatic remediation.

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.

Students will be diagnosed regarding their strengths and needs.
Student will be placed in appropriate individualized instructions based on their assessment.
Students will spend a minimum 40 minutes a week in the learning path for ELA.

Person Responsible: Sadie Milliner Smith (milliner-s@duvalschools.org)

By When: Students will be expected to maximize growth by completing at least 3 skills with-in their assigned 45 days.

#2. 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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was in 6th (8%) and 7th grade Math (8%). . The overall school data for Math was performing below grade level.

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

In Math students will grow by more than 1 grade using the Exact Path online platform.

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

Students will master a new skill each week by spending at least 40 min in the learning path for Math on the Exact Path platform.

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.)

The evident-based intervention being implemented is through small group targeted support.

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

Using Exact Path for targeted intervention will pinpoint student skills gaps, provide age appropriate individualized instruction with automatic remediation.

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.

Students will be diagnosed regarding their strengths and needs.
Student will be placed in appropriate individualized instructions based on their assessment.
Students will spend a minimum 40 minutes a week in the learning path for Math.

Person Responsible: Jerome Mosley (mosleyj1@duvalschools.org)

By When: Students will be expected to maximize growth by completing at least 3 skills with-in their assigned 45 days.

#3. 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.

The contributing factors to last year's low performance was an increase in attendance below 90% and one more or more suspensions.

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

Students attendance will increase by 10% per assigned 45 days.

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

This area of focus will be monitored by the following:
* The Student Advocacy Team will meet bi-weekly to review student attendance.
* The school social worker will contact parents of those students that have missed 2 days with-in a two week span.
* Attendance meeting will be scheduled with parents of students who has missed 4 or more days within 20 days.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jerome Mosley (mosleyj1@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.)

The evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus is the implementation of Trust Based Relational Intervention.

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

All faculty and staff will be trained in Trust Based Relational Intervention which is designed to meet the needs of all children, especially the complex needs of children who have experienced trauma.

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.

We will communicate with parents the expectations for students attendance during orientation.
The Student Advocacy Team will need to discuss and identify the underlying causes.
The school Social Worker will contact parents of those students that have missed 2 days with-in a two week span of the students absences.

Person Responsible: Dwayne Butler (butlerd1@duvalschools.org)

By When: The Student Advocacy Team will meet bi-weekly to review student attendance. * The school social worker will contact parents of those students that have missed 2 days with-in a two week span. * Attendance meeting will be scheduled with parents of students who has missed 4 or more days within 20 days.