Duval County Public Schools

Duncan U. Fletcher Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Duncan U. Fletcher Middle School

2000 3RD ST N, Jacksonville Beach, FL 32250

http://www.duvalschools.org/fms

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.

Fletcher Middle School is a standards based community where performance standards are used to help all learners understand the real life applications of basic skills and concepts. Teachers use diagnostic assessment tools to develop a plan of instruction that meets learner's academic needs.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Duncan U. Fletcher Middle School we focus on every child's success through Academics, Athletics, and the Arts.

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
McKenzie, Joseph	Principal	
Galvez, Mercedes	Assistant Principal	
Gilyard, Jeanna	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.

SAC and PTSA utilize monthly meetings and schoolwide events to solicit school improvement recommendations from our community. These meetings discuss current school data and the needs of the student population to move students to proficiency.

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 SIP will be shared with Department Heads and Grade Level Chairs. It will be a way of work for our weekly common planning meetings and shared with parents and statkeholders. The administration team will meet to discuss critical needs of improvement and support this work in the classroom.
The School Counselor will push into each grade level planning to discuss, assess, track and assist teachers in providing Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction. Through meeting with the entire grade level, we are

anticipating the focus to be stronger with our most at-risk population.
The FRVE will assist our ESE students making sure they are receiving their services and accommodations to receive the most concise instruction and support available.

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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	38%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	52%
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: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	70	91	252
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	32	43	86
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	124	89	278
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	85	72	222
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	94	85	244

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	3	5	1	9

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	43	78	88	209
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	44	54	159
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	54	76	168
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	2	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	54	76	168
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	65	74	191
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	30	34	117

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	48	40	76	164

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	43	78	88	209
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	44	54	159
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	54	76	168
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	2	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	54	76	168
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	65	74	191
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	30	34	117

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	48	40	76	164

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	

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*	54			61	43	50	64		
ELA Learning Gains				48	46	48	56		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				33	39	38	32		
Math Achievement*	62			73	48	54	70		
Math Learning Gains				59	53	58	41		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				55	53	55	38		
Science Achievement*	70			71	47	49	72		
Social Studies Achievement*	67			81	68	71	79		
Middle School Acceleration	84			92			82		
Graduation Rate									
College and Career Acceleration									
ELP Progress	20			71			67		

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	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	357
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	644
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	42			
ELL	30	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN	80			
BLK	46			
HSP	47			
MUL	61			
PAC				
WHT	74			
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	39	Yes	1	
ELL	48			
AMI				
ASN	79			
BLK	57			
HSP	55			

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%
MUL	57			
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	56			

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	54			62			70	67	84			20
SWD	19			34			33	43	79		5	
ELL	20			26			40	43			5	20
AMI												
ASN	70			83			75		90		4	
BLK	27			44			32	58	67		5	
HSP	38			47			53	59	71		6	13
MUL	35			58			60	72	81		5	
PAC												
WHT	63			69			78	71	88		5	
FRL	36			46			47	57	65		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	61	48	33	73	59	55	71	81	92			71
SWD	23	29	21	39	49	46	31	51	61			
ELL	30	37	29	54	53	40	50	64				71
AMI												
ASN	78	57		82	77		92	90				

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
BLK	40	44	36	52	56	54	66	71	90			
HSP	42	38	31	61	54	45	56	61	93			67
MUL	48	36	13	75	59	53	63	68	100			
PAC												
WHT	70	51	36	78	60	62	75	88	91			
FRL	47	43	31	59	57	50	60	69	87			

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	64	56	32	70	41	38	72	79	82			67
SWD	26	34	26	39	26	27	31	53	53			
ELL	33	44	36	41	32	26	24	52	45			67
AMI												
ASN	71	67		79	52							
BLK	35	29	18	41	28	32	33	63	55			
HSP	52	54	37	57	25	28	58	64	78			65
MUL	63	47	35	68	42	47	64	74	79			
PAC	90											
WHT	71	61	33	76	47	43	80	85	85			
FRL	49	46	29	56	32	31	57	66	73			57

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	54%	40%	14%	47%	7%
08	2023 - Spring	48%	41%	7%	47%	1%

ELA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	50%	38%	12%	47%	3%

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	61%	43%	18%	54%	7%
07	2023 - Spring	34%	40%	-6%	48%	-14%
08	2023 - Spring	50%	45%	5%	55%	-5%

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	56%	35%	21%	44%	12%

ALGEBRA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	92%	52%	40%	50%	42%

GEOMETRY

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	95%	52%	43%	48%	47%

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	65%	63%	2%	66%	-1%

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.

7th Grade Math (34%)
New Standards / Lack of depth into knowledge and performance
Inconsistent small group
Lack of paper materials
Lack of benchmark driven real world examples

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

Civics (81% to 65%)
New teachers to Civics (3)
Teacher leaving prior to end of year, class filled with long term substitute.
Loss of position created higher number of students in class.
Movement of all 8th grade Civics to be taken in 7th grade.

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.

7th Grade Math (34%)
New Standards / Lack of depth into knowledge and performance
Inconsistent small group
Lack of paper materials
Lack of bencmark driven real world examples

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

8th Grade Math
Focused intentional lessons.
Small group / tutoring provided.

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

Proficiency in Reading and Math
Attendance

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

1. Civics
2. 7th Grade Math
3. ELA
4. 8th Grade Science
5. PBIS

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

#1. 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 number of Level 1 infractions demonstrate that students are not engaged with the instruction in the classroom. The results of state testing, again revealed that our most at-risk populations did not show proficiency in testing. These two combined, forced the leadership team to revaluate the need for consisitent PBIS throughout our campus.

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

Number of Level 1 Infractions

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

1. Level 1 Infractions
2. PBIS points through Focus
3. Restorative Justice

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mercedes Galvez (galvezm@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. Continual use of PBIS is common areas and classrooms to promote positive culture.
2. Support from school counselors through

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

For the most part, our student population wants to do well. Through the use of focus inspired PBIS points we are challenging students to meet goals and receive awards. Goals are class based and grade level based, focusing on celebrating student success.

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

#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.

Student data last year revealed that students, particularly in ELA and Math (7th grade) are not benefitting from whole group instruction. Key terms, understanding, and requirements need more specific focus. Foundational skills analysis (breaking down the benchmark) is another area of note for improvement.

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

Movement of lowest performing quartile, incresase in gains and proficiency.

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

Weekly grade level meetings, district and state progress monitoring, administrative walk-throughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joseph McKenzie (mckenziej2@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.)

Use of data notebook to target and provide specific instructional resources for students not meeting proficiency.

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

1. Teachers that use data to drive small group instruction are able to work with students on their area of need that will show mastery of benchmarks.
2. The use of pre and post tests for small group instruction will allow the teacher to documents a students progression towards mastery.
3. Through the use of weekly grade-level CLCs, the school counselor will be involved with students needing additional MTSS services.

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. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

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.

Civics (81% to 65%)
Civics results from 22-23 show that teachers did adequately use small group, targeted instruction based on aligned data. Instructional analysis also showed the there were not aligned teacher developed common assessments. Finally, systematic development of vocabulary and metecognative learning practices were not consistent.

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

DMA and Common assessment growth on benchmarks covered.

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

We will use vocabulary protocols and metacognitive strategies such as CUBE to assist in student processing of text. Teachers will use Florida Citizen content to remediate benchmarks which students performed poorly on.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mercedes Galvez (galvezm@duvalschools.org)

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

Teachers will use a common data tracking tool. (notebook or sheet)

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

1. Teachers that use data to drive small group instruction are able to work with students on their area of need that will show mastery of benchmarks.
2. The use of pre and post tests for small group instruction will allow the teacher to documents a students progression towards mastery.
3. Aligned benchmark and test spec remediation from Florida Citizen content (digital).
3. Through the use of weekly grade-level CLCs, the school counselor will be involved with students needing additional MTSS services.

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