

Duval County Public Schools

William M. Raines High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	8
III. Planning for Improvement	12
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	16
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	17

William M. Raines High School

3663 RAINES AVE, Jacksonville, FL 32209

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

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 prepare for educational excellence in every classroom, for every student, every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every student is prepared for college, career, and life.

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
Hall, Vincent	Principal	The principal is the chief academic instructional leader in the building. He supports assistant principals and teachers in the professional developmental growth of unpacking the standard and ensuring the alignment of standards to the assigned activities/tasks students are to become engaged. The principal is fiscally responsible for allocating resources to improve student achievement and various opportunities. The principal should engage with the community leaders providing opportunities for them to willfully render goods and services.
Scarlett, Anthony	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader responsible for supervising Science and Electives Departments. He is also tasked with managing the master schedule.
Stallings, Brandie	Assistant Principal	Ms. Stallings is the test coordinator and the administrator is responsible for leading the ELA/Reading Department.
Williams, Natasha	Assistant Principal	Instructional leader supervising Math and ESE Departments. She is also responsible for the Gear-up program and Parent Family Engagement Plan.

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.

The SIP is developed from a collaborative effort of the school's faculty, leadership team, and SAC. The various groups reviews the past year's assessment data, discusses academic progression and areas in needs of improvement. The groups then discuss and/or reviews barriers, strategies, and goals for the upcoming year. THE SIP is a fluid document and is always reviewed and sometimes revised based upon the various groups' discussions and most current assessment data.

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 is a fluid document that can be revisited and revised based upon the students' most current assessment data. This document is discussed in whole and in parts in faculty meetings, leadership team meetings, PLCs and in SAC meetings. The various stakeholders are able to review the school's most current district and school-based data to make informed decisions pertaining tot the school's improvement plan.

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)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	98%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
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)* Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP)* White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C

	2019-20: C
	2018-19: C
	2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

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*	18	46	50	18	45	51	14		
ELA Learning Gains				40			30		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47			35		
Math Achievement*	21	44	38	31	37	38	14		
Math Learning Gains				53			22		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49			26		
Science Achievement*	38	62	64	28	43	40	28		
Social Studies Achievement*	37	66	66	30	53	48	24		
Middle School Acceleration					52	44			
Graduation Rate	95	88	89	90	50	61	94		
College and Career Acceleration	89	77	65	81	63	67	92		
ELP Progress	57	37	45						

** 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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	355
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	95
Graduation Rate	95

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	467
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	95
Graduation Rate	90

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	43			
ELL	33	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	49			
HSP	25	Yes	4	4
MUL	100			
PAC				
WHT	39	Yes	1	

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	48			

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	38	Yes	3	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	46			
HSP	9	Yes	3	3
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	50			
FRL	47			

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	18			21			38	37		95	89	57
SWD	14			12			33	23		77	6	
ELL	9										2	57
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	17			20			36	36		89	6	
HSP	29			21							2	
MUL										100	2	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	32			46							2	
FRL	16			20			37	34		90	6	

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	18	40	47	31	53	49	28	30		90	81	
SWD	13	33	37	18	43	29	14	26		82	80	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	17	39	45	30	53	47	26	30		90	81	
HSP	9											
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	32	55		62								
FRL	18	40	47	31	52	48	28	29		94	81	

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	14	30	35	14	22	26	28	24		94	92	
SWD	7	25	24	12	21	25	19	17		85	97	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	14	29	34	14	22	26	29	24		94	92	
HSP												
MUL	19	29		9				40				
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	13	29	37	14	21	20	28	23		94	93	

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
10	2023 - Spring	21%	44%	-23%	50%	-29%
09	2023 - Spring	19%	42%	-23%	48%	-29%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	20%	52%	-32%	50%	-30%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	22%	52%	-30%	48%	-26%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	36%	64%	-28%	63%	-27%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	36%	60%	-24%	63%	-27%

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.

Reading was our lowest performing area last year. Each year, approximately 82% of our incoming ninth grade students enter at a achievement level of one. Last year many of our incoming ninth grade students did not receive high quality instruction as there was a teacher vacancy for most of the year. Although there were creative scheduling attempts to provide good instruction, the attempts were minimal for most students. Another issue compounding the low performing results were easily seen as we were able to review data in real time. Many of the students who had good attendance, did well. As we were calling students in to meet the 95% in order to receive a score, we saw the proficiency data decrease with each accommodating percent.

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

The math proficiency percent decreased from 31% to 22%. This was the only area that declined. There was a vacancy in algebra I for approximately two nine weeks. Students were creatively scheduled to meet with other teachers, but the effort was inconsistent. One of the geometry teachers resigned right before the end of the first semester leaving most of our junior and senior students without a teacher. We were able to enroll students in other geometry classes, but this also changed the dynamics in those classes. One of the geometry teachers was consistently on a coaching cycle with hopes of developing stronger pedagogy and management skills.

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.

Again, this is reading. Our students enter high school as struggling readers. We have seen them make learning gains when given high quality instruction each day. This past year, many of them sat in a class without a qualified instructor.

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

Science increased from 28% proficiency to 37% proficiency. The students were provided high quality instruction by two highly qualified instructors who created lessons using the ALDs, curriculum guides, region based specialist support, pull-outs, after school tutorials, and weekly assessment data. The teachers encouraged their students to own and track their academic progress. The teachers did a great job reteaching content students demonstrated deficits, planned for small group instruction, and monitored their targeted population closely.

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

Attendance is the greatest concern, as we were able to monitor the proficiency of students in real time for reading and math. In each area, we observed a decrease in the percentage of students who were proficient as we comb the the neighborhoods collecting students who had missed over 40% of school.

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

Math, reading, social studies, science, and attendance.

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.

The focus is to develop teachers ability to plan strong benchmark-aligned tasks, activities, and assessments for students each day. The FAST and BEST benchmarks are new and require a much different approach to for students mastery.

Measurable Outcome:

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

assessments.

Measurable

Outcome:

Based upon the instructional review rubric, the vast majority of all content area teachers will be able to create and deliver benchmark- aligned instruction and assessments, as measured by the Benchmark Walkthrough Tool.

Monitoring:

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

Using the Benchmark-aligned Walkthrough Tool weekly to conduct data chats with administrators and teachers during professional learning community and common planning meetings.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Vincent Hall (hallv@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 engage in high quality common planning and professional learning community sessions, yielding students opportunities to demonstrate standards aligned grade level mastery.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to the opportunity Myth, it is our professional responsibility to ensure students are exposed to benchmark aligned instruction and to ensure their preparedness for assessments designed by the state in addition to the following years progression of benchmarks

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.

Ensure teachers are provided opportunities to plan high quality lessons with content shared teachers, content area administrators, region-based specialist, and district-based specialists.

Person Responsible: Vincent Hall (hallv@duvalschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

Provide professional development opportunities focused on the unpacking of benchmarks and how to align that instruction to tasks, activities, and assessments. These sessions will also focus on student work and assessment data.

Person Responsible: Brandie Stallings (stallingsb@duvalschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

Identify Tier I supports and its effective use instruction.

Person Responsible: Natasha Williams (williamsn3@duvalschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

Provide differentiated support for each accountability teacher as identified during PLC, common planning, and weekly observations.

Person Responsible: Anthony Scarlett (scarletta1@duvalschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

#2. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

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.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Monitoring:

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

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 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.

Implement the Early Warning Systems plan where we intentionally focus on the students who are missing more than 10% of school each nine weeks and provide strategies during attendance intervention meetings.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Student attendance will monitored each week using the I CARE(I call and report everyday) approach along with monitoring the days absent in FOCUS. Students who begin missing 3 or more days will be monitored more closely by administrators, social workers and truant officers. This should improve the daily attendance average by 5 or more percent.

Monitoring:

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

The attendance data will be monitored each week by administrators, counselors, social workers, and truant officers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Anthony Scarlett (scarletta1@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.)

A consistent school wide positive behavior system focusing on attendance will result in more time in class on task and improved student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

As we observed the BEST and FAST scores last year, we noticed a decline in the percent of students who were proficient as a result of students who missed many day from school testing to ensure a 95% testing rate. The PBIS team will support and incentivize a student attendance plan.

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

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.

The methods for dissemination of the SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders, students, families, and school staff and leadership, local businesses, and organization are through SAC meetings, school website, and social media.

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))

The School will host at least 8 Parent and Family Engagement activities to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders. Through these activities we will fulfill the mission of creating a learning community that empowers students to succeed in their life after high school.

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)

An area of focus is to increase the implementation of differentiated instruction strategies in all core content areas and increase the graduation rate.

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))

This school is implementing the supplemental Title I, Part A grant project. The activities in the Title I Schoolwide and Parent and Family Engagement plan were derived based on a Comprehensive Needs Assessment Process involving internal and external stakeholders. The Title I Schoolwide and Parent and Family Engagement Budgets include activities reflecting the use of funds and a rationale for each activity. Email title1@duvalschools.org for the school's Title I Schoolwide budget or Parent and Family Engagement plan and budget.

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: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: -- Select below --:	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	\$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