

Duval County Public Schools

Young Mens/Womens Leadership Academy At



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	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	21
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	22

Young Mens/Womens Leadership Academy At Eugene J Butler

900 ACORN ST, Jacksonville, FL 32209

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

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.

We empower our students to excel in rigorous academics and character education while providing a welcoming, and safe learning environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Developing confident, dynamic, educated young women and young women into leaders.

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
Thomas, Catrice	Teacher, ESE	Support VE teachers in writing IEP's to meet the needs of students.
Moore, Ayana	Reading Coach	Support ELA Teachers
Christensen, Treva	Assistant Principal	Administrator over ELA & Social Studies.
Feagins, Tamara	Principal	Administrator over Math and Science
Fryar, Andrea	Math Coach	Support Math Teachers with implementation of Math Bechmarks and Curriculum.

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 YMWLA Leadership Team met and discussed the vision of the school. Upon discussing the school's current data with the entire faculty, collectively the faculty and staff determined the school's focus for the upcoming year.

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 School's Instructional Leadership Team will meet weekly to discuss the implementation of benchmarks a student achievement. Weekly as a team, the school will review student data to ensure ESSA students are on track.

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	96%
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)* Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: D 2018-19: D 2017-18: C
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	44	61	48	153
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	55	45	126
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	59	46	145
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	61	49	142
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	73	58	174

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	3	4	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	1	6

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	19	17	17	53
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	43	61	159
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	2	9
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	41	56	150
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	46	58	141
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	43	61	159

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	40	42	55	137

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	8	0	2	10
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	19	17	17	53
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	55	45	126
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	2	9
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	41	56	150
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	37	46	58	141
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	43	61	159

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	40	42	55	137

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	3	4	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	1	6

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*	25	42	49	18	43	50	16		
ELA Learning Gains				31			24		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				37			23		
Math Achievement*	18	49	56	25	35	36	15		
Math Learning Gains				47			21		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				55			28		
Science Achievement*	8	48	49	22	48	53	12		
Social Studies Achievement*	48	66	68	70	53	58	26		
Middle School Acceleration	58	82	73	83	47	49	56		
Graduation Rate					48	49			
College and Career Acceleration					69	70			
ELP Progress		31	40		85	76			

* 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	31
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	157
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	43

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	388
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98
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	11	Yes	4	3
ELL	23	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	31	Yes	1	1
HSP	25	Yes	3	1
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	27	Yes	1	1

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	26	Yes	3	2
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	45			
HSP	39	Yes	2	

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				
PAC				
WHT	0	Yes	1	1
FRL	42			

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	25			18			8	48	58			
SWD	12			10			0	23			4	
ELL	18			27							2	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	24			18			6	49	56		5	
HSP	25			25							2	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	23			16			4	44	50		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	18	31	37	25	47	55	22	70	83			
SWD	0	19	26	10	46	54	8	43				
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												

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	19	33	38	24	46	55	23	69	95			
HSP	10			33	73							
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	0											
FRL	15	31	39	20	44	56	17	69	86			

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	16	24	23	15	21	28	12	26	56			
SWD	4	13	10	5	23	30	0	12				
ELL	20	40		30	30							
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	15	23	21	14	19	26	12	26	55			
HSP	23	32		27	38		10					
MUL	30			10								
PAC												
WHT												
FRL	13	22	24	12	20	27	9	25	50			

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.

Grade	Year	ELA				
		School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	26%	40%	-14%	47%	-21%
08	2023 - Spring	24%	41%	-17%	47%	-23%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	14%	38%	-24%	47%	-33%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	25%	43%	-18%	54%	-29%
07	2023 - Spring	20%	40%	-20%	48%	-28%
08	2023 - Spring	13%	45%	-32%	55%	-42%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	8%	35%	-27%	44%	-36%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	65%	52%	13%	50%	15%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	47%	63%	-16%	66%	-19%

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.

6th-grade math proficiency showed the lowest performance. Last year the 6th-grade students at The Leadership Academy lost a semester of instruction and went without a teacher for half of the year.

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

Algebra 1 showed the greatest decline from the previous year. The students received inconsistent instruction from their Algebra 1 teacher. The students were moved to another instructor at the beginning of the year.

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.

When compared to the state average (54%), 8th-grade math (13%) had the greatest gap. Last year the 8th-grade students at The Leadership Academy did not receive quality instruction in 8th-grade math.

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

7th grade Language Arts increased from 15% to 27% proficiency. The students were assigned a teacher who understood the benchmark and who could remediate deficient standards. The teacher also assigned equivalent aligned experiences that allowed the students to experience assessment-like questions before taking the finalPM.

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

Attendance and students who have been retained in a previous grade is a huge concern for The Leadership Academy,

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

Algebra 1
6th Grade Ela
7th Grade Math
Civics

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 Teacher Retention and Recruitment**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.

Retention disparities can also result in differences in public education that leave select students behind. Low-income students tend to be particularly impacted by this disparity: A fall 2021 study conducted in Washington state schools indicated that teacher vacancies are substantially greater in high-poverty school districts. Given the drawbacks of high turnover, children in underprivileged school districts are more adversely affected than their counterparts in wealthier districts. Increasing teacher retention can support greater equality across the US education system.

High turnover rates create constant flux, making it significantly more difficult to institute changes in education policies. Experienced teachers who are familiar with the needs of a school and its students are best poised to provide advice on how to meet those needs. When they leave, these voices are lost, and education policy suffers, as senior education administrators no longer receive their feedback on the success (or failure) of different initiatives. Reducing turnover and reliance on temporary substitutes is an integral step toward shaping education policies informed by firsthand insights into local communities.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The Leadership will retain 75% of its teachers.

Monitoring:

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

The Leadership Team will Tier all teachers and provide support in areas identified by the Leadership Team for support. The School Leadership Team will walk weekly to discuss the academic culture and progress of each teacher. The Leadership Team will tier teachers quarterly to evaluate support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tamara Feagins (feaginst1@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 be supported throughout the school year with relevant Professional Development in Professional Learning Communities.

- Teachers will be supported on how to plan aligned lessons to the benchmark, and how to create aligned assessments.
- Teachers will be supported in classroom management
- Teachers will participate in a school-based mentor program
- Teachers will be celebrated monthly

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to the Learning Policy Institute.Oct 13, 2022 Poor teacher retention has been shown to negatively impact students' educational achievement,

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 Professional Learning Communities

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.

Less than 50% of students in science, reading, and math were proficient on the FSA. This year The Leadership Academy would like to focus on improving instruction in the classroom with an emphasis on standards alignment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

100% of core classroom teachers will administer standards-aligned instruction, which will specifically impact student instruction.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored by administration through weekly walkthrough's. The area of Focus will be monitored in Common Planning.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Andrea Fryar (draina@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.)

Based upon the article "The Opportunity Myth" Students spend most of their time in school without access to four key resources: grade-appropriate assignments, strong instruction, deep engagement, and teachers who hold high expectations. Students spent more than 500 hours per school year on assignments that weren't appropriate for their grade and with instruction that didn't ask enough of them—the equivalent of six months of wasted class time in each core subject research says that students not exposed to grade level material as often as needed.

Based on the Standards Walk-through Tool, the YMYW Leadership Team will measure teachers who have implemented aligned standards based instruction in core classes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

In the nearly 1,000 lessons we observed, students were working on activities related to class 88 percent of the time. They met the demands of their assignments 71 percent of the time, and more than half brought home As and Bs. Yet students only demonstrated mastery of grade-level standards on their assignments—a benchmark for being on track for the lives most of them want as adults—17 percent of the time. That gap exists because so few assignments actually gave students a chance to demonstrate grade-level mastery.

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.

All Core teachers will participate in aligned professional development common planning and learn how to write, and deliver standards aligned instruction.

Person Responsible: Ayana Moore (moorea3@duvalschools.org)

By When: End of 2023-2024 Schoolyear

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

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.

Reading and computing mathematics on grade level will be our focus. Our school experienced declines in Reading and Math from the previous year. This was identified as a critical are in our school.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The goal for 2023-2024 school year is to increase our proficiency in all subgroups . We plan to improve reading proficiency by 8% and achieve 50% learning gains. We plan to improve math proficiency by 5% and achieve 50% learning gains LPQ for math.

Monitoring:

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

All data will be tracked bi weekly by standard and Th e Leadership Team will specifically look at student subgroup data. This will allow the team to support teachers in delivering the strategies.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Catrice Thomas (thomasc15@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 be given data tracking forms that will identify all students and the subgroups they fall into. While tracking all student data, teachers will be required to employ strategies that will assist in each subgroup becoming successful. SWD- IEP's will be shared with teachers and lesson plans will be monitored to ensure all accommodations are delivered. Hispanic Students will receive instruction on Imagine Learning to assist in Reading fluency.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

While all students need to receive standards based instruction, students in various subgroups require additional monitoring in order to become successful.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C)).

Duval County Public Schools has a tiered system of support to align interventions for CSI, TSI and ATSI schools. The first tier of support begins with the Superintendent's cabinet of executive leaders who represent all district departments (Human Resources, Academic Services, Division of Schools, Operations, Finance, Technology, etc.). At a minimum, this team meets on a weekly basis to develop, monitor, and implement the district's strategic plan initiatives. The next level of the tier branches out with the Chief of Schools who oversees the district's Division of Schools. Schools are divided by region (Elementary, Middle, High, and Turnaround/Fragile (ISI Region)). Each region has a Regional Superintendent, Executive Directors, and Content Area Specialists who work to ensure that the support is aligned and implemented.

Ensuring adequate funding, resources, and support is available to CSI, TSI and ATSI schools is a driver for district-wide collaboration. To accomplish this, the Division of Schools works with multiple district departments to further tier support for CSI, TSI and ATSI schools.

This support includes but is not limited to the following:

- >Academic Services provides curriculum support and additional content specialists for schools. Academic Services also oversees our district professional development department and coordinates professional development for instructional and non-instructional personnel.
- >Title I – Coordinates the use of funds to best support the barriers that research has shown negatively impacts disadvantaged students. In addition, Title I provides professional development to teachers to improve their pedagogy.
- >The Division of Schools conducts school visits that include instructional reviews and instructional walks. These visits occur on a weekly basis and serve as an opportunity to observe instructional delivery, student learning, and provide feedback to school staff.
- >Finance – Finance provides the funds to provide resources and the personnel needed to address individual school needs.
- >Human Resources – Human Resources works to recruit quality personnel for our most needy schools. This includes a dedicated staffing team to our Turnaround School Region (ISI), priority hiring, and monitoring teacher VAM rating percentage by school. They also work with unions to collective bargain memorandums of understanding that provide for incentives, professional development, and additional strategies to address school needs.

Though the above examples are not comprehensive of all support provided to School Improvement schools, they do provide a snapshot of the layers of support that are available and used to improve student outcomes. Through this layered approach, the district's team along with each school's academic leadership team, teachers, staff, parents, and other stakeholders collaborate on methods of improvement and monitor implementation on a continuous basis.

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.

Parents and community members were informed of the SIP during summer orientation. Parents will also be informed at the school's annual Open House. Parents are informed of current school data and the goals outlined by the SIP and will be invited to attend the Midyear Stakeholder's Meeting to evaluate semester progress. Parents will be invited to attend quarterly Title1 Parent Nights that will assist them in understanding their child's data as well as keep them informed on the school's progress.

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))

Parents will be invited to attend quarterly Title1 Parent Nights that will assist them in understanding their child's data as well as keep them informed on the school's progress. Parents will be invited to SAC and PTSA Meetings to learn of ways to become more involved in the school and learn of ways to support the 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)

The Leadership Academy will hold weekly PLC's with each department. Teachers will breakdown the benchmarks and plan aligned lessons. Teachers will be supported in writing aligned assessments that will help

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: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$0.00
---	--------	--	--------

2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$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