

Duval County Public Schools

Kernan Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	19
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Kernan Middle School

2271 KERNAN BLVD S, Jacksonville, FL 32276

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

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 build competent and confident students accomplished through standard based instruction, objective and data driven lesson planning, and supporting and empowering students through social and emotional development.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Ensure every child is prepared for high school, without having to remediate what they should have learned in middle school. Students will grow in their confidence and their ability to make a positive impact on their own lives, their school, their community and their world.

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
Akande, Christine	Principal	
Smith, Kristin	Assistant Principal	
Helse, Tyvae	Assistant Principal	

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 teachers participated in SIP contributions on 8/10/23 during common planning sessions. These contributions were taken into account for the final 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))

Weekly leadership meetings, weekly Coaches meetings, weekly admin meetings. District reviews, and SAC And PTSA meetings.

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)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	62%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	76%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
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)* English Language Learners (ELL)* 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: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
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	0	92	107	126	325
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	39	41	96
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	124	145	350
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	96	118	288
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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	110	131	318

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	0	1	1	3	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	2	2	11

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							34	59	65	158
One or more suspensions							10	27	30	67
Course failure in ELA							0	0	1	1
Course failure in Math							0	0	1	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment							83	69	82	234
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment							61	64	100	225
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.							91	78	64	233

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	133	196	232	561

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	1	11	12

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	34	59	65	158
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	27	30	67
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	69	82	234
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	64	100	225
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	78	64	233

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	133	196	232	561

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	1	11	12

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*	47	42	49	49	43	50	52		
ELA Learning Gains				48			45		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41			28		
Math Achievement*	52	49	56	49	35	36	50		
Math Learning Gains				50			33		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41			30		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	56	48	49	54	48	53	57		
Social Studies Achievement*	78	66	68	77	53	58	73		
Middle School Acceleration	80	82	73	91	47	49	75		
Graduation Rate					48	49			
College and Career Acceleration					69	70			
ELP Progress	60	31	40	43	85	76	38		

* 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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	62
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	373
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	543
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
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	38	Yes	2	
ELL	50			
AMI				
ASN	76			
BLK	51			
HSP	57			
MUL	68			
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	51			

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	36	Yes	1	
ELL	40	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	62			
BLK	44			
HSP	50			
MUL	56			
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	50			

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	47			52			56	78	80			60
SWD	30			35			29	53	41		5	
ELL	26			37			41	70	64		6	60
AMI												
ASN	58			77			68	77	100		5	
BLK	35			41			37	70	70		5	
HSP	40			44			48	82	67		6	63
MUL	54			57			61	87	79		5	
PAC												
WHT	56			56			65	80	81		5	
FRL	41			41			45	75	73		6	31

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	49	48	41	49	50	41	54	77	91			43
SWD	27	39	36	29	37	34	33	55				
ELL	24	40	40	30	48	47	22	68				43
AMI												
ASN	63	53	33	70	69	40	75	88	96			30
BLK	32	40	41	30	38	37	36	65	79			
HSP	42	46	42	39	42	36	39	80	91			43
MUL	49	47	40	53	49	60	51	71	84			
PAC												
WHT	59	52	39	59	56	44	68	79	93			
FRL	41	45	44	38	43	36	42	71	84			58

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	52	45	28	50	33	30	57	73	75			38
SWD	32	35	21	31	34	33	39	67	59			
ELL	42	55	37	39	26	20	39	68	73			38

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
AMI												
ASN	67	60	37	69	41	29	72	88	78			42
BLK	37	35	23	32	28	35	32	64	72			
HSP	45	43	33	45	30	20	49	58	77			31
MUL	53	43	47	50	33	33	61	83	93			
PAC												
WHT	58	49	25	56	35	32	67	80	72			
FRL	39	39	28	36	29	28	44	66	60			26

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
07	2023 - Spring	38%	40%	-2%	47%	-9%
08	2023 - Spring	48%	41%	7%	47%	1%
06	2023 - Spring	39%	38%	1%	47%	-8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	50%	43%	7%	54%	-4%
07	2023 - Spring	26%	40%	-14%	48%	-22%
08	2023 - Spring	42%	45%	-3%	55%	-13%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	47%	35%	12%	44%	3%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	81%	52%	29%	50%	31%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	98%	52%	46%	48%	50%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	64%	36%	63%	37%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	77%	63%	14%	66%	11%

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.

Our lowest performance in proficiency was in ELA. Proficiency for 6th grade was 39%, 7th was 38%, and 8th was 48%. For an overall average of 41.2% .

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

Our Algebra 1 proficiency showed the greatest decline. Several factors that contributed to this:

1. Our Algebra 1 Teacher from the previous year resigned.
2. We had a greater percentage of low level 3s than the year before.

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.

Our greatest gap was in 7th grade math. Our proficiency was 26% and the state's was 48%. A novice teacher and a permanent sub had the majority of our 7th grade students.

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

Our greatest area of improvement was in our 8th grade math.

1. Our advanced 7th graders took the 8th grade math test.
2. We had a strong teacher in both pre algebra and accelerated 7th.

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

20% of students have a substantial reading deficiency.

20% of students scored level 1 in math.

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

1. Reading Growth
2. Math Growth
3. Algebra 1 Proficiency
4. 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 Benchmark-aligned Instruction

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 student growth in reading and math across all subgroups, we will focus on standard aligned tasks and close the achievement gap, and provide an equitable education to all students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our LPQ Growth in reading and math will improve from 41/41 to 50/50 respectively on the state reading assessment.

Monitoring:

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

1. Standards based walkthroughs
2. District progress monitoring assessment
3. Common teacher assessments
4. Lexile Score growth

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christine Akande (bickslerc@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.)

Math interventionist and reading interventionist will pull out small groups from electives to provide targeted instruction based on standards based data. They will also push into classes to work with small groups. Math and ELA teachers will implement regular small group instruction in the classroom.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To increase the growth of our LPQ reading and math students they will receive regular targeted interventions through elective classes, and regularly in the classroom.

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.

Each teacher create small groups based on the most recent data available for small group standard remediation

Person Responsible: Kristin Smith (smithk4@duvalschools.org)

By When: Each Quarter

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

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 8th grade science proficiency across all subgroups we will focus on small group instruction to target the lowest performing standards.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Using small group standard aligned instruction our 8th grade science proficiency will increase by 5 points from 47% to 52%

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored through DMAs, FAST testing, and common assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christine Akande (bickslerc@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.)

1. We have a teacher partially released (no classes on B-days) to work with students on low standards by either pushing into teacher's classes or pulling students out.
2. Intentional Common planning for small groups each week.
- 3.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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.

ELL Students and Students with disabilities performed below 41 percent in the 21-22 school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase student proficiency in our ELL and SWD subgroups to 50%.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored by several progress monitoring assessments: DMAs, FAST tests, Edmentum and common teacher assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kristin Smith (smithk4@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.)

Our reading and math interventionists will push in to ELA and Math classrooms to assist in small group instruction. They will also pull out students during electives on a weekly basis to review low performing standards.

The ESOL para will support teachers in classrooms with WIDA level 1-2.5.

We will have PD during early release from the district ESOL office and the district ESE to support our general education teachers in instructing our ELL and ESE students.

VE will plan with the subject area they support.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

These strategies will provide more effective instruction in the classroom and targeted interventions based on student needs.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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).

The funding will go towards resources to support our ELL and SWD students. Books will be purchased for teachers that explain strategies to reach ESOL students. We will have an ESOL parent night to encourage parent engagement among our ELL And ESE parents.

We will also purchase curriculum for our small group instruction provided by our interventionists.

We utilized Title 1 funds for our reading interventionist position.

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Will be available at the school in English and Spanish. Will be posted on the school website. Will be disseminated through SAC, through our Collaborative learning communities, and available to all visitors in the main office.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Several parent nights including a family data night, parent principal chat, and ESOL parent night will take place.

Weekly communication to all families.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

We plan to strengthen these areas by fostering strong common planning to create standards based instruction in all classrooms. We will utilize interventionists to enrich targeted learning for identified students. Interventionists will also support all teachers with less than 3 years of experience in lesson planning. Small group instruction will take place on a weekly basis to further support out Students with disabilities and our ESOL students.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

NA

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

We have a full time school based Mental health counselor through full service.

All students have access to a counselor during the lunch period every day through our counselor's corner.

We also have mentors available to students who show patterns of low academic performance and multiple referrals.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

We offer several courses in career and technical education. Courses offered include: information, Communication, and Technology, Coding Fundamentals, and Digital Discoveries Each of these courses offers a CET certification test. We also offer SLS through FSCJ to our pre early college students in the 8th grade. This provides them with college and high school credit.

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

We implement a school wide positive behavior intervention system. This includes positive behavior referrals, restorative justice, full service referrals, and small group instruction through our counselors based on behavior needs, and we utilize the district lunch and learn programs.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

Professional development takes place in all small learning communities on the collection and use of data to drive instruction. This takes place 3 times a year. Professional development is also provided on small group instruction, standards based learning, supporting our ESE students, and supporting our ELL students.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

NA