Mayport Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Mayport Middle School

2600 MAYPORT RD, Atlantic Beach, FL 32233

http://www.duvalschools.org/mayportmiddle

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.

Our mission is to teach through an interdisciplinary focus on rigorous, interrelated core academic subjects and electives, which prepare learners for the stringent requirements of high school Advanced Placement courses. Our methodology will be inquiry-based, differentiated, and aligned with preparing our students to enter any high school acceleration program. Our students will become self-directed researchers, analytical thinkers, problem-solvers, prolific readers and writers, and lifelong stewards of the coastal environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Mayport Coastal Sciences Middle School is to enable all students to reach their full potential as creative, inquiring learners who respect our Florida Marine Ecosystems.

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
Koek, Chris	Principal	Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS, conducts assessment of RtI skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation, and communicates with parents regarding schoolbased MTSS plans and activities - Instructional Lead for Math/Science -Athletics -Grants - Band Booster Liaison - SAC Liaison
Sullivan, Jill	Assistant Principal	Principal designee, and MTSS/RTI Lead: Grade retention, curriculum, and standards-based administrator. Provides information about core instruction, participates in student data collection, delivers Tier 1 instruction/ intervention, collaborates with other staff to implement Tier 2 interventions, and integrates Tier 1 materials/instruction with Tier 2/3 activities. - Threat Assessment Team - Attendance Intervention Team - Builds Master Schedule - Instruction Lead for EESS/Guidance/ELA/Reading - 6th and 7th grade House Administrator - Curriculum Administrator
Hitzeman, Brooke	Assistant Principal	Grade 8 House Administrator. Safe and Civil Schools and Attendance administrator. Monitors and provides interventions based on attendance and behavior referrals data. Responsible for community engagement and building partnership with local business. - 8th Grade House Administrator - Instructional Lead for Social Studies/Journalism/Band/PE/Health/ CTE/Foreign Language - AVID Coordinator - Safety and Operations Manager - TEAM UP Liaison - PTSA Liaison
Garvey, Donyale	Teacher, K-12	ELA Department Head

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Howell, Loravie	Teacher, K-12	Math Dept Head
Romano, Miranda	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies Department Head Gifted Lead Teacher
Fernandez, Jessica	Teacher, K-12	CTE Lead Teacher
Rose, Jeff	Dean	Develops and implements discipline protocols for classroom managed and office managed behaviors; investigates and processes discipline incidents and referrals; assigns and monitors discipline consequences based on the DCPS Code of Student Conduct; collects, analyzes, and presents discipline data to faculty and staff; participates in design and delivery of professional development; provides support for PBIS. Demographic Information
Wakefield, Heather	School Counselor	Guidance Dept Head-Identifies systematic patterns of student need while working with district personnel to identify appropriate, evidence based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk;" assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection, and data analysis; participates in the design and delivery of professional development; and provides support for assessment and implementation monitoring.

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 utilize the input and analyzes of previous school year achievement on state assessments along with current data from the students enrolled in 23-24 school year. We utilize the student input from the climate survey. We utilize input from our school shared decision making team, ILT, and our SAC to develop our SIP. We will continue to monitor and edit our plan as needed through out the year involving all stakeholders.

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))

After each state and district progress monitoring assessment, we analyze the data with our ILT and SAC to monitor student progress. Through this monitoring, these groups will work together to make any necessary edits or adjustments to our plan based on the needs of our students.

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	45%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	59%
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	69	63	52	184
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	47	46	106
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	6	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	10	13	25
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	93	84	215
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	67	43	150
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	42	82	62	186

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	10	7	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	5	6	13

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	60	44	52	156
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	25	23	52
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	68	69	171
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	73	52	157
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	18	57	48	123

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	1	3	1	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	7

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	60	44	52	156
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	25	23	52
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	68	69	171
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	73	52	157
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	18	57	48	123

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	1	3	1	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	3	7

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	42	49	55	43	50	53		
ELA Learning Gains				52			46		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				40			32		
Math Achievement*	61	49	56	60	35	36	52		
Math Learning Gains				61			39		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				57			28		
Science Achievement*	69	48	49	69	48	53	69		
Social Studies Achievement*	77	66	68	83	53	58	75		
Middle School Acceleration	83	82	73	88	47	49	88		
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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	346
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	565
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	53			
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN	86			
BLK	60			
HSP	60			
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	74			
FRL	58			

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	43			
ELL	39	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN	80			
BLK	54			
HSP	60			

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	63			
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	53			

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			61			69	77	83			
SWD	31			46			52	63	73		5	
ELL	33			58							2	
AMI												
ASN	74			84			92		92		4	
BLK	37			45			55	70	91		5	
HSP	48			60			52	68	74		5	
MUL	56			48			77	86	59		5	
PAC												
WHT	63			68			74	79	85		5	
FRL	45			52			60	66	69		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	55	52	40	60	61	57	69	83	88			
SWD	25	36	33	39	48	45	33	58	67			
ELL	29	31		44	53							
AMI												
ASN	86	57		90	65			100				

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	44	47	41	42	53	55	57	63	86			
HSP	47	55	40	52	59	65	54	78	88			
MUL	48	52	31	62	64	71	75	83	80			
PAC												
WHT	60	53	41	68	64	49	77	90	90			
FRL	43	44	37	50	53	47	54	73	76			

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	53	46	32	52	39	28	69	75	88			
SWD	26	32	27	31	30	27	41	50	82			
ELL	28	41	30	29	19							
AMI												
ASN	76	67		73	60							
BLK	41	39	24	36	27	26	43	53	78			
HSP	45	35	28	46	38	36	71	84	100			
MUL	56	56	36	49	39	40	63	67	79			
PAC												
WHT	57	48	36	59	42	25	77	83	90			
FRL	35	36	29	36	27	28	52	59	81			

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	50%	40%	10%	47%	3%
08	2023 - Spring	58%	41%	17%	47%	11%

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

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	38%	43%	-5%	54%	-16%
07	2023 - Spring	67%	40%	27%	48%	19%
08	2023 - Spring	57%	45%	12%	55%	2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	58%	35%	23%	44%	14%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	80%	52%	28%	50%	30%

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

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	94%	64%	30%	63%	31%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	75%	63%	12%	66%	9%

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.

Our lowest performing data component is ELA achievement. We maintained the same score as the previous year in this data component. Over the last 5 years, we have improved our overall school achievement in this data component by 6% as a whole school. Our lowest performing subgroups each of the last 5 years was our ELL and SWD.

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

Civics was our data component that showed the greatest decline this past year. Over the last 5 years, we have achieved 75% or higher each year, so even though we had our greatest decline in this data component it is still a strength for our school. It is typically one of our highest achieving data components over the last 5 years. The main factor that contributed to this decline was our average Lexile score of the students enrolled this year was lower than the previous 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.

Not enough data from the state available to complete.

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

Science was our most improved data component this year. Our teachers consistently help common planning and utilized a vertical alignment of the standards throughout the three year progress of the students that took the state test last year. They utilized Standard exemplar graphic organizers in all classrooms throughout the whole year. Utilized student interactive journals and standard data tracking documents department wide.

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

Our 7th grade EWS was significantly higher than the other 2 grade levels. The number of level 1 students in math and ELA was concerning and significantly higher than the other 2 grades. A direct correlation to the lower performance is they had the highest level of attendance concerns as well.

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

Our priorities for the upcoming school year are LPQ ELA, LPQ Math, and Civics.
Additional support for students with an IEP is the main priority to help the improvement of these focus data components.

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

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

A positive culture and environment is an essential component for a successful school. We are focusing on our SWD student population specifically this year to help promote higher achievement and lower EWS for this group of students.

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

By focusing on a positive culture and environment with our SWD student population to reduce EWS our performance in ELA and Math will improve for these students.

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

Administrators will monitor the desired outcome through classroom walks and student achievement. Will collaborate with the SWD student case managers to receive updates and progress monitoring reports.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Chris Koek (koekc@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.)

Providing more small group instruction to ensure the students have direct instruction that will promote positive interactions to establish relationships with their instructors. Progress monitoring through student data tracking to promote efficacy and accountability for learning.

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

As students increase connection with instructors and see success, it will increase their motivation to continue improvement.

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 2 - Moderate 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 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.

Teacher will conduct professional development to enhance their understanding of the new B.E.S.T standards. Our goal is to strengthen standards-based planning to enhance instruction and assessment, ultimately leading to student growth across all subject areas.

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

Teachers will participate in standards-based instructional planning to align lesson plans to the appropriate achievement level of the new B.E.S.T. standard, as measured through student work. The outcome will allow students to increase their Lexile level in reading and quantile score in math by one year expected growth.

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

Administrators will monitor the desired outcome through classroom walks
and student achievement on standard based work.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Chris Koek (koekc@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.)

Common planning will focus heavily on student work and lesson plan analysis measured by standards-based "walk-throughs." Teachers and school leaders will collaborate to continuously improve standards-based
alignment, thus strengthening instruction.

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

If planning and instruction is aligned to the new B.E.S.T Standard with appropriate Achievement level for the standard, then student work will provide evidence of standard 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.

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).

School Improvement Funds will be used to support faculty instruction through the purchase of non-recurring resources. These needs are determined through our shared decision making team in collaboration with our SAC as analyzes is conducted throughout the year.