

Duval County Public Schools

Chet's Creek Elementary 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	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Chet's Creek Elementary School

13200 CHETS CREEK BLVD, Jacksonville, FL 32224

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

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.

Chets Creek Elementary School is a standards-based learning community committed to preparing students for success in a competitive, interdependent and global workplace.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We envision Chets Creek Elementary as a standards-based learning community where internationally benchmarked performance standards help all learners experience the real life application of basic skills and concepts. Learning leaders use diagnostic tools to assess every student's academic strengths and weaknesses and then develop a course of instruction to meet the learner's academic needs. This diagnostic and prescriptive teaching philosophy has become the cornerstone of our success.

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
Phillips, Susan	Principal	Responsible for implementing and monitoring all strategies related to Reading.
Heybruch, Peggy Sue	Assistant Principal	Responsible for implementing and monitoring all strategies related to Math.
McMillan, Chris	Assistant Principal	Responsible for implementing and monitoring all strategies related to Science.
Nelson, Kathryn	Other	Responsible for monitoring all strategies related to 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.

Data is presented as available to all school staff and the School Advisory Council. Goals/Targets are discussed and used to create strategies for improvement.

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))

Data is collected throughout the school year and used to determine progress towards the schools goals. Changes are made based on that data to ensure the needs of students are being met appropriately.

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)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	55%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	58%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	2	41	38	38	43	38	0	0	0	200	
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	1	0	2	0	0	0	5	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	3	6	1	1	0	0	0	11	
Course failure in Math	0	0	3	10	6	0	0	0	0	19	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	28	25	0	0	0	60	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	15	24	0	0	0	45	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	70	58	48	0	0	0	0	0	180	

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	2	24	21	25	17	22	0	0	0	111

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	4	7	5	10	2	0	0	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

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	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	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	2	48	34	45	33	27	0	0	0	189	
One or more suspensions	0	5	2	1	1	2	0	0	0	11	
Course failure in ELA	2	8	3	16	1	1	0	0	0	31	
Course failure in Math	1	3	3	12	0	1	0	0	0	20	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	14	16	0	0	0	39	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	12	20	0	0	0	38	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	34	45	50	0	0	0	0	0	131	

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	2	36	41	44	12	17	0	0	0	152

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	3	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	3

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*	70	48	53	75	50	56	77		
ELA Learning Gains				69			69		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				65			60		
Math Achievement*	78	58	59	83	48	50	83		
Math Learning Gains				73			72		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				61			72		
Science Achievement*	72	52	54	73	59	59	70		
Social Studies Achievement*					63	64			
Middle School Acceleration					53	52			
Graduation Rate					46	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	63	54	59	53			47		

* 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)	N/A
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	357
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	552
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100
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	49			
ELL	47			
AMI				
ASN	74			
BLK	64			
HSP	61			
MUL	68			
PAC				
WHT	78			
FRL	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%
SWD	51			
ELL	56			
AMI				
ASN	83			
BLK	69			
HSP	63			

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	80			
PAC				
WHT	72			
FRL	60			

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	70			78			72					63
SWD	46			60			43				5	50
ELL	31			58			47				5	63
AMI												
ASN	76			96			73				4	50
BLK	61			61			71				3	
HSP	52			66			58				5	66
MUL	63			78			69				4	
PAC												
WHT	83			87			83				5	55
FRL	56			68			57				5	58

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	75	69	65	83	73	61	73					53
SWD	50	58	57	61	56	49	43					32
ELL	42	59	58	62	71	65	41					53
AMI												
ASN	80	79		93	81							

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	75	74	77	73	58		59					
HSP	58	67	66	72	72	65	56					49
MUL	78	81		84	78		80					
PAC												
WHT	85	66	52	91	75	55	82					70
FRL	61	69	59	71	68	60	47					43

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	77	69	60	83	72	72	70					47
SWD	58	59	47	68	73	83	41					38
ELL	62	72	67	73	81		67					47
AMI												
ASN	86	79		93	77		85					
BLK	59	65		73	65	70	45					
HSP	67	63	56	74	68	50	72					41
MUL	79	50		79	67		58					
PAC												
WHT	85	74	75	90	76	82	76					
FRL	66	62	52	74	68	72	64					43

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
05	2023 - Spring	69%	47%	22%	54%	15%
04	2023 - Spring	71%	50%	21%	58%	13%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	66%	46%	20%	50%	16%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	80%	59%	21%	59%	21%
04	2023 - Spring	77%	58%	19%	61%	16%
05	2023 - Spring	76%	52%	24%	55%	21%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	69%	48%	21%	51%	18%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Reading Proficiency showed the lowest performance. Student regression during the pandemic continues to be an issue in Reading specifically because of the lack of face to face reading and language instruction. In addition large numbers of ELL students, who are not proficient in English continue to struggle in Reading.

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

Reading and Math Proficiency both declined by 2%. We continue to see declines in performance because students are missing prerequisite knowledge from absences during the pandemic. We also have an increased number of ELL students who struggle with English proficiency.

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.

State averages are not included yet.

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

Science proficiency remained the same as the prior year. We had moved to a three way team on fifth grade to increase the amount of time devoted to Science instruction.

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

Student absent 10% or more days of school (200) . The number of students in Fourth and Fifth grade who scored a Level 1 in Reading (53).

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

Reading Proficiency, Reading Learning Gains, Attendance

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**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.

Across all grade levels it will be important to focus on deepening our understanding of the standards and how to implement the curriculum and our assessments with confidence in their alignment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

75% of our students will show proficiency on the state assessment in Reading.

Monitoring:

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

All professional development will be designed around diving deeply into BEST standards and the individual components of the the curriculum tools. All agendas will be developed with the administrator responsible for that content area. They will attend those trainings and follow up with classroom visits and data reviews.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Susan Phillips (phillipss4@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.)

Weekly content specific teacher meetings

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Alignment of curriculum, instruction and assessment to standards is of paramount importance to the success of students.

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.

Implement weekly teacher meetings designed to review standards, plan for instruction and review of assessments and assessment data.

Person Responsible: Susan Phillips (phillipss4@duvalschools.org)

By When: Beginning the week of August 21 and ongoing throughout the school year

Research and study strategies for supporting ELL learners in Reading instruction.

Person Responsible: Susan Phillips (phillipss4@duvalschools.org)

By When: Beginning the week of August 21 and ongoing throughout the school year

Implement differentiated small group instruction within the workshop model (centers and teacher led) in Reading.

Person Responsible: Susan Phillips (phillipss4@duvalschools.org)

By When: Beginning the week of August 21 and ongoing throughout the school year

Review content limitations and item specifications for FAST and rewrite common Reading assessment to align with the standards and the expectations for FAST.

Person Responsible: Susan Phillips (phillipss4@duvalschools.org)

By When: Beginning the week of August 21 and ongoing throughout the school year

#2. 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.

Improving student attendance is paramount to student success as we currently have 19% of our total school enrollment (200 students) who missed 10% of school days or more in the previous year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The percent of students who miss 10% of school days or more will decrease by 5% from 19% (200) to 14% (147).

Monitoring:

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

Daily attendance data will be monitored and reviewed to identify students with poor attendance so that those families can be targeted for the Attendance Intervention Team and meetings scheduled with the families.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Chris McMillan (mcmillanc@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.)

Recognize good and improved attendance monthly.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

If students are at school academic performance can be impacted positively.

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.

Provide regular recognition and incentives to students who have good or improved attendance.

Person Responsible: Chris McMillan (mcmillanc@duvalschools.org)

By When: On the first school day of each month for the month prior.

Reach out to families where students are beginning to show poor attendance to help remove any barriers and provide strategies and support to reduce the absenteeism or tardiness before a referral is made to the AIT.

Person Responsible: Chris McMillan (mcmillanc@duvalschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

Administration will sit in every AIT meeting to stress the importance of school attendance, provide student academic data and help plan for improving student attendance.

Person Responsible: Chris McMillan (mcmillanc@duvalschools.org)

By When: Monthly AIT meetings