

Duval County Public Schools

# John E. Ford K 8 School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>24</b>

## John E. Ford K 8 School

1137 CLEVELAND ST, Jacksonville, FL 32209

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

### 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 John E. Ford PK-8 English/Spanish Montessori School is to provide educational excellence in every classroom, for every student, every day.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

John E. Ford teachers and staff will work cooperatively in a nurturing, challenging, multi-cultural environment to create productive, life-long learners. We will provide a safe and civil environment fostering cultural consciousness; challenging each of our students to develop socially, emotionally, and intellectually to their highest potential prepared for college and career.

### 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
Bennett, Tina	Principal	
Ingram, Shana	Assistant Principal	
Winterbottom, Shauna	School Counselor	
Curran, Elizabeth	School Counselor	

#### 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.

Parents, teachers, and community members are involved in the development of the SIP through monthly SAC meetings and yearly surveys. The initial SAC and Title One Development meetings both address the state and needs of the school along with academic goals.

A PDF of the school SIP is posted on the school website in the fall after submission to DOE for access to parents and the public. The SIP document is a living doc and district staff have access or can be easily supplied access if needed. After submission, a copy is available, onsite, in the parent resource room.

#### 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))

Ongoing SIP review occurs on a regular basis during weekly Leadership Team meetings, monthly SAC meetings as well as SIP review with individual PLC's. Revisions will be made after quarterly data analysis.

### Demographic Data

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

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	Yes
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	88%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	94%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	Yes
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

### 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	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	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	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	0	0	0	

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

**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	1	0	5	10	8	11	3	38	
One or more suspensions	6	10	12	3	6	8	3	1	3	52	
Course failure in ELA	0	2	3	0	1	0	3	0	0	9	
Course failure in Math	0	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	5	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	27	22	26	15	11	8	109	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	22	29	32	17	11	2	113	
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	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	5	5	12	3	0	0	0	0	25
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	1	0	5	10	8	11	3	38	
One or more suspensions	6	10	12	3	6	8	3	1	3	52	
Course failure in ELA	0	2	3	0	1	0	3	0	0	9	
Course failure in Math	0	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	5	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	27	22	26	15	11	8	109	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	22	29	32	17	11	2	113	
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	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	5	5	12	3	0	0	0	0	25
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*	46	45	53	44	47	55	36		
ELA Learning Gains				55			48		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51			43		
Math Achievement*	46	46	55	41	40	42	31		
Math Learning Gains				59			39		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				64			32		
Science Achievement*	54	45	52	33	45	54	29		
Social Studies Achievement*	91	62	68	95	50	59	100		
Middle School Acceleration	94	73	70	100	45	51	76		
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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	375
Total Components for the Federal Index	6

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	542
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
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	42			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	60			
HSP	43			
MUL	67			
PAC				
WHT	77			
FRL	50			

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	41			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	51			
HSP	59			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	49			

#### 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	46			46			54	91	94			
SWD	38			43			47				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	41			42			48	90	92		6	
HSP	40			45							2	
MUL	67			67							2	
PAC												
WHT	76			76			80				3	
FRL	37			33			46	100			5	

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	44	55	51	41	59	64	33	95	100			
SWD	32	30	53	35	42	69	25					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	36	53	50	34	56	63	23	94				
HSP	57	63		48	67							
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	74	61		74	64							
FRL	33	52	54	30	53	60	19	91				

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	36	48	43	31	39	32	29	100	76			
SWD	27	36		19	30	33	38					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29	46	44	25	34	32	26		73			
HSP	33	42		30	50							
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	73	80		72	80							
FRL	23	41	42	18	33	39	21		80			

### 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	50%	47%	3%	54%	-4%
07	2023 - Spring	40%	40%	0%	47%	-7%
08	2023 - Spring	48%	41%	7%	47%	1%
04	2023 - Spring	50%	50%	0%	58%	-8%
06	2023 - Spring	33%	38%	-5%	47%	-14%
03	2023 - Spring	40%	46%	-6%	50%	-10%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	39%	43%	-4%	54%	-15%
07	2023 - Spring	35%	40%	-5%	48%	-13%
03	2023 - Spring	43%	59%	-16%	59%	-16%
04	2023 - Spring	44%	58%	-14%	61%	-17%
08	2023 - Spring	71%	45%	26%	55%	16%
05	2023 - Spring	37%	52%	-15%	55%	-18%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	48%	35%	13%	44%	4%
05	2023 - Spring	52%	48%	4%	51%	1%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	52%	48%	50%	50%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	91%	63%	28%	66%	25%

### 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.**

All levels increased in ELA, Science and Math, with the exception of Civics which dropped 4% points at 91%. ELA up 1% point at 43%, Math up 8% points at 44%, Science up 15% points at 51% (53% for 5th grade and 48 % for 8th grade) and Algebra maintained at 100%. ELA is lowest performing component.

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

The greatest decline was Civics. Contributing factor includes lack of consistent standards based and data driven teacher led small groups as well as intentional/consistent lesson planning.

**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.**

No State data provided for a comparison

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

Most improved component is Science.

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

N/A

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

Reading proficiency and gains, Math proficiency and gains and 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.

We achieved a 46% proficiency in overall ELA. Our goal is reach 50% proficiency at all grade levels this year. The Benchmark Based Walk Through tool showed that students were not engaged in ELA standards aligned tasks consistently. According to the standards walkthrough dashboard, student task alignment is 1.3. Without this item in place, students cannot achieve grade level proficiency or mastery.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

We will monitor growth between PM1 to PM2 and PM2 to PM3. Administration will look to see an improvement in ELA Student Aligned Tasks, on the standard walkthrough dashboard, from 1.3 to 3.0, by December 2023. We will monitor Benchmark Advance implementation and Montessori individualized workplan implementation for ELA during walkthroughs.

**Monitoring:**

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

Consistent Administrative walkthroughs  
Professional Learning Communities  
Quarterly Data Chats  
Weekly review of Benchmark Based Walkthrough Tool

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Tina Bennett (bennett@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.)

Quality instructional delivery aligned to grade level standards gives students the opportunity to participate in grade level appropriate tasks and assessments and prepare them for promotion.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In the Opportunity Myth it states that students should be given grade appropriate, standards aligned tasks, assignments and assessments to ensure they are prepared for the state assessments and grade level promotion.

**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.

1. Elementary Bi-Weekly Common Planning...Elementary teachers will participate in common planning sessions with administration to review weekly standards, aligned tasks and assessments. Montessori Scope and Sequence will be used for each grade level at elementary. Standards, Montessori works and

district curriculum will be aligned for use in classrooms at all grade levels. Montessori training is provided to new teachers at Ford giving us the ability to select and retain highly qualified teachers and exposing students to the Montessori Method.

**Person Responsible:** Tina Bennett (bennett@duvalschools.org)

**By When:** Ongoing throughout the year

2. Standards Based Walk Throughs: Administration and Teachers will carve out time to observe Student Aligned Tasks within classroom settings during planning time. Data will be reviewed bi-weekly by school admin and best practices of colleagues and students will be shared and discussed during PLC.

**Person Responsible:** Shana Ingram (ingram@duvalschools.org)

**By When:** Ongoing throughout the year.

3. Fidelity to Montessori Methods/Standards Based Instruction: During work-cycle, students will be given individual workplans that include targeted, aligned, differentiated instruction. Teachers will pull small groups to remediate instruction based on student needs. This will include multi-aged grade level groupings.

**Person Responsible:** Tina Bennett (bennett@duvalschools.org)

**By When:** Ongoing throughout the year.

4. Ensure all stakeholders are part of the vision for standards aligned instruction... (Admin, Teachers, Paras, Students)

**Person Responsible:** Shana Ingram (ingram@duvalschools.org)

**By When:** Ongoing throughout the year.

**#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.

Proficiency in math has been an ongoing struggle at Ford. We are working to move our 2024 proficiency rate to at or above 50%.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Data will show improvement in math proficiency between FAST PM 1 to PM2 and PM2 to PM3.

**Monitoring:**

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

Administration will monitor the weekly math assessments given and small group instruction through Reveal Math during walkthroughs. Montessori math lessons will also supplement the Reveal Math curriculum and will be evident on student workplans observed during classroom walkthroughs. Task alignment to standards will be monitored during weekly admin walkthroughs.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Tina Bennett (bennett@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.)

Consist Administrative walkthroughs  
Professional Learning Communities  
Quarterly Data Chats  
Weekly review of Standards Based Walkthrough Tool

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In the Opportunity Myth it states that students should be given grade appropriate, standards aligned tasks, assignments and assessments to ensure they are prepared for the state assessments and grade level promotion.

**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.

Bi-Weekly Common Planning...Elementary and middle school math teachers will participate in common planning sessions with administration to review weekly standards, aligned tasks and assessments. Montessori Scope and Sequence will be used for each grade level at elementary. Standards, Montessori works and district curriculum will be aligned for use in classrooms at all grade levels. Montessori training is provided to new teachers at Ford giving us the ability to select and retain highly qualified teachers and exposing students to the Montessori Method.

**Person Responsible:** Tina Bennett (bennett@duvalschools.org)

**By When:** Ongoing throughout the year.

**#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.

In order to maintain instructional focus within classrooms, peace areas and peaceful expectation have been established in every classroom at Ford. The Dean of Students will support the overall environment of the school to maintain order and focus in every classroom. Peaceful environments promote learning within the classroom and allow students to better focus on the instruction given by teachers.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Dean Of Students...Our referral numbers will decrease schoolwide due to our use of a Dean of Students on campus. Admin will monitor referrals monthly.

During weekly walkthroughs Admin will monitor the use of the Peace Environment and culture of classrooms visited.

**Monitoring:**

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

The Principal will pull referral data monthly to determine if a decrease in referrals is occurring.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Tina Bennett (bennett@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.)

Quality instructional delivery aligned to grade level standards gives students the opportunity to participate in grade level appropriate tasks and assessments and prepare them for promotion.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students need to have consistent focus during instruction and a peaceful environment to make gains toward proficiency. These expectations allow that environment to exist for 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.

Referrals will be monitored monthly for a decrease in numbers and severity.

**Person Responsible:** Tina Bennett (bennett@duvalschools.org)

**By When:** Ongoing throughout the year.

Classroom environments will be monitored during instructional walkthroughs weekly to ensure peace and focus are occurring in every classroom.

**Person Responsible:** Tina Bennett (bennett@duvalschools.org)

**By When:** Ongoing throughout the year.

### **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)).

N/A

## **Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)**

### **Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

### **Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA**

There are no grade levels below 50% proficient.

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

The grade levels we will focus on to increase proficiency are 3rd grade (40%), 6th grade (33%), 7th grade (40%), and 8th grade (48%). We will monitor PM1 to PM2 and PM2 to PM3. We will also monitor Benchmark Advance assessments, STAR assessments, and Edmentum Exact Path for progress.

### **Measurable Outcomes**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

**Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes**

None at this time.

**Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes**

Students will make progress on PM1 to PM2 and PM2 to PM3 at 50% or higher for proficiency in grades 3,6,7,and 8.

**Monitoring****Monitoring**

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

We will monitor PM1 to PM2 and PM2 to PM3. We will also monitor Benchmark Advance assessments, STAR assessments, and Edmentum Exact Path for progress at 50% or higher for proficiency.

**Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Bennett, Tina, bennett@duvalschools.org

**Evidence-based Practices/Programs****Description:**

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Benchmark Advance, STAR, Montessori practice

**Rationale:**

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Benchmark Advance is aligned to BEST Standards. It is comprised of all levels of learning from phonics to comprehension. We will be using all parts of the curriculum, along with Montessori practice to ensure students are supported with evidence based programing. Both of these curriculums are based around the Science of Reading.

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Assessment will show progression toward measurable outcomes.	Bennett, Tina, bennetttt@duvalschools.org
Professional Learning. Teachers will be provided with professional learning during bi-weekly PLC's and monthly district professional development.	Bennett, Tina, bennetttt@duvalschools.org

**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.

John E. Ford uses the Parent and Family Engagement Plan.

**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))

N/A

**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)**

N/A

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))

N/A

#### 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))

N/A

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))

N/A

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).

N/A

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))

N/A

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))

N/A

### Budget to Support Areas of Focus

#### Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00

3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

**Budget Approval**

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes