

Duval County Public Schools

Duncan U. Fletcher 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	9
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	19
VI. Title I Requirements	21
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	22

Duncan U. Fletcher High School

700 SEAGATE AVE, Neptune Beach, FL 32266

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

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every student is inspired and prepared for success in high school, college or a 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
Ledford, James Dean	Principal	Instructional Leader of the School Specifically, over Language Arts, Visual and Performing Arts, Technology, Physical Education and stakeholder communication.
Archon, Kristen	Assistant Principal	Principal Designee, Assistant Principal over Curriculum, Social Students and Exceptional Student Education.
Hayes, Mary	Assistant Principal	Over facilities as well as Science Department and Discipline
Westberry, Lori	Assistant Principal	Over Technology as well as Mathematics Department and Student Attendance

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.

We meet with our school leadership team weekly to discuss different aspects of the school improvement plan. We also meet weekly with our teachers in professional learning communities to discuss specific aspects of the plan as well as strategies. Our School Advisory Team meets monthly to update progress on the School Improvement Plan. Our School Advisory Council Team consist of 2 Community/Business Partners, 7 Parents, 1 Educational Support, Principal, Teacher and Student.

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 monitored through weekly Leadership meetings along with monthly SIP meetings. We will monitor the progress on school, district and state common assessments throughout the year. Depending on those results we will change or update our overall SIP strategies. Students with greater achievement gaps will be monitored specifically through the school, district and state common assessments.

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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	33%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	41%
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: B
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	163	163	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	86	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	41	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	40	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	174	174	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92	92	
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	0	0	158	158

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	43	43
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	18

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	447	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	239	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	277	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	288	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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	272

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	2	107
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in 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	

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
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*	56	46	50	61	45	51	58		
ELA Learning Gains				49			46		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				36			36		
Math Achievement*	47	44	38	50	37	38	32		
Math Learning Gains				52			18		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54			19		
Science Achievement*	78	62	64	77	43	40	79		
Social Studies Achievement*	78	66	66	82	53	48	77		
Middle School Acceleration					52	44			
Graduation Rate	95	88	89	96	50	61	97		
College and Career Acceleration	84	77	65	84	63	67	86		
ELP Progress	60	37	45	53			79		

** 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	71
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	498
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	95

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	694
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	96

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	48			
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN	85			
BLK	54			
HSP	68			
MUL	67			
PAC				
WHT	78			
FRL	61			

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	44			
ELL	27	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN	76			
BLK	47			
HSP	59			
MUL	57			
PAC				
WHT	70			
FRL	54			

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	56			47			78	78		95	84	60
SWD	24			22			59	35		57	6	
ELL	18			29				27			5	60
AMI												
ASN	57							90		100	4	
BLK	34			28			59	52		59	6	
HSP	42			48			68	62		88	7	73
MUL	39			47			69	71		81	6	
PAC												
WHT	64			53			85	85		87	6	
FRL	45			36			70	61		62	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	61	49	36	50	52	54	77	82		96	84	53
SWD	18	29	27	30	55	54	45	42		86	55	
ELL	11	12	15	46								53
AMI												
ASN	73	56		67			100	82				
BLK	28	32	22	23	46	46	47	67		91	72	
HSP	52	46	28	49	45	50	65	85		92	79	55
MUL	52	43	11	56	43		72			100	80	
PAC												
WHT	68	53	48	57	55	62	85	85		97	87	
FRL	47	41	23	40	49	48	64	72		88	65	

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	58	46	36	32	18	19	79	77		97	86	79
SWD	20	29	29	12	13	15	35	44		92	72	
ELL	33	64	67	18								79
AMI												
ASN	57	35		64				73		100	90	
BLK	32	35	27	18	17	15	63	40		96	74	
HSP	51	41	39	24	22	38	68	82		100	78	70
MUL	46	45	56	22	11	30	84	78		90	95	
PAC												
WHT	65	50	37	39	18	16	83	84		98	88	
FRL	41	38	35	23	16	19	64	56		94	79	

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	55%	44%	11%	50%	5%
09	2023 - Spring	58%	42%	16%	48%	10%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	46%	52%	-6%	50%	-4%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	51%	52%	-1%	48%	3%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	78%	64%	14%	63%	15%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	78%	60%	18%	63%	15%

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.

Math proficiency is our current lowest performing component. This has been historically our lowest area, we dropped 4 points in Algebra and 2 points in Geometry. This is using raw data. We had a new teacher in our Geometry department.

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

US History was the component with the largest decline (4 points). We have made significant gains in US History over the past several years. No changes regarding teachers in the department. Our leadership team feels one area that contributed to the decline was our overall attendance. Especially attendance of students that need extra support.

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.

We lead the state in all components except Algebra 1. We are 17 points under the state average. We test students that have traditionally performed low in mathematics. We also had a teacher new to our school.

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

Our overall Math Proficiency had a greatest improvement at 3 points. We had a new person leading our math department as well as a new teacher on our Algebra 1 team. Their PLC work was much more involved regarding lesson planning and data analysis.

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

Our overall attendance has declined the past year. Students missing more than 10% of school has increased.

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

1. English/Language Arts Proficiency
2. English/Language Arts Overall Learning Gains
3. Math Proficiency
4. US History Proficiency

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Fletcher's high accountability classes averaged 3.2 out of 5 when observing Assessing Student Learning. Students were not given the chance to determine mastery of standards. Most lessons are aligned to the benchmarks, but many benchmarks are not being assessed during the class.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Fletcher's high accountability classes will average a rating of 4 out of 5 in the category of Assessment of Student Learning.

Monitoring:

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

Using Standard Walkthrough Form.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

James Dean Ledford (ledfordj@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.)

Increasing the use of small groups in during work period. Ensuring those students are being assessed and given any further interventions that may needed as a result of assessments.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Fletcher should ensure students are getting the opportunity to show mastery of the benchmark. Student tasks should be on the appropriate level of the benchmark. This will provide all students with success when faced with assessments designed by the state, along with the following years progression of courses.

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 assistant principals and principal are calibrated together on the standard walkthrough form. Specifically in the assessing student learning category.

Person Responsible: James Dean Ledford (ledfordj@duvalschools.org)

By When: September 11, 2023

Conduct school improvement rounds with high school cluster focusing on assessing student learning and ensuring small groups are occurring during work period.

Person Responsible: James Dean Ledford (ledfordj@duvalschools.org)

By When: November 1, 2023

Train teachers to use common planning procedures that enable teachers to build lessons deliveries that will encompass the instructional framework.

Person Responsible: James Dean Ledford (ledfordj@duvalschools.org)

By When: September 25, 2023

Provide training for teachers during PLCs and pre-planning that allow them to obtain information needed to produce lessons that include assessments that are aligned to benchmarks.

Person Responsible: James Dean Ledford (ledfordj@duvalschools.org)

By When: September 25, 2023

In order to prepare students for postsecondary education or work field. We will be enhancing our Business and Technology Programs. This will include the continuation of cohort scheduling of our VyStar Academy of Business and Finance and beginning the cohort scheduling of our Computer Science and Digital Design. These programs will allow students to earn industry certification. We will also continue our ACT and SAT tutoring programs for students. This includes students that are in need of graduation requirements as well as students looking to improve their overall scores to be more competitive for acceptance to the college of their choice.

Person Responsible: Kristen Archon (archonk1@duvalschools.org)

By When: August 14, 2023

#2. 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.

Our next area of focus is around building teacher influence and taking a collective responsibility among staff members. We believe this will improve through leadership development. Every student will benefit across all curricula as the faculty influences each other in a positive manner to improve their overall instructional deliveries. Building leadership among faculty will allow them to take more of a collective responsibility of the overall environment and academic needs of the school. These needs were identified through our 5Essential Survey data. These were the areas that were listed as the needs according to data presentation.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We would like to show a 5% increase in the following areas on our 5Essential Survey - Collective Responsibility and School Commitment.

Monitoring:

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

Through informal conversations and 5Essential Survey Data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

James Dean Ledford (ledfordj@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.)

Using department heads and teacher leaders more around decision making that affects specific departments. Ensure Professional Learning Communities are being utilized in all areas. Identifying teachers that can lead Professional Development sessions during common planning times.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Using department heads as leaders will help provide examples of teachers working with administration to improve specific areas of their departments. Department heads and teacher leaders are specifically picked for their leadership displayed when observing classrooms during data chats. Ensuring professional learning communities are being utilized in all areas will give all subject areas the tools to assist each other and grow as educators. During common planning is when teacher have the most influence on each other. Identifying teachers that can lead professional development will bring more collective responsibility as teachers will buy-in more learning from colleagues.

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.

Set up schedule for department meetings throughout the year. Create agendas and submit them to administration prior to the meetings.

Person Responsible: James Dean Ledford (ledfordj@duvalschools.org)

By When: September 25, 2023

Ensure all teachers have common planning among specific courses. Set up norms for each professional learning community that will enable them to create a positive and productive common planning meetings.

Person Responsible: James Dean Ledford (ledfordj@duvalschools.org)

By When: September 25, 2023

Monitor lesson deliveries through all subject areas and speak with teachers regarding presenting best practices.

Person Responsible: James Dean Ledford (ledfordj@duvalschools.org)

By When: September 25, 2023

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).

We use our School Advisory Committee to review our SIP and provide recommendations. This includes funds specifically dedicated to SIP goals and strategies.

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

NA

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

NA

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

NA

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

NA

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.

NA

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

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?

NA

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?

NA

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**

NA

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.

NA

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))

NA

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))

NA

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

NA

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

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

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

NA

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))

NA

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).

NA

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))

NA

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

NA

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: 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