

Duval County Public Schools

Paxon School/Advanced Studies School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

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

Paxon School/Advanced Studies

3239 NORMAN E THAGARD BLVD, Jacksonville, FL 32254

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

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.

At Paxon School for Advanced Studies, we believe passionately that every student must feel he or she belongs while being held to the highest standards to experience the greatest future success in life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be recognized internationally as the exemplary, comprehensive educational experience for the multifaceted student.

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
Turner, Royce	Principal	The principal oversees all facets of the school.
Allen, LaShanda	Assistant Principal	APs support the school's principal and staff in all facets of the school.
Martin, John	Teacher, K-12	
Bowen, Andrew	Teacher, K-12	
Culpepper, Krystal	School Counselor	
Mullen, Michelle	School Counselor	
Pauley, Zamira	Teacher, K-12	
Shingles, Samuel	Teacher, K-12	
Viscariello, Vincent	Teacher, K-12	
Valaro, Matthew	Dean	
Devoe, Kenneth	Teacher, K-12	

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.

Stakeholders are informed of the school's academic progress monthly via School Advisory Council meetings, newsletters, school leadership meetings and faculty meetings and PLCs. Stakeholders are provided an opportunity to provide feedback regarding the academic progress of the school. This feedback, along with data from various sources, is used to compose the initial draft of the school improvement plan. This plan is made available to the entire school community for feedback and revision.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP is tied directly to the instruction of our school and therefore is monitored regularly. Implementation and impact on student learning are monitored through data, classroom walkthroughs, observations, and teacher feedback.

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	72%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	47%
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	

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*	81	46	50	80	45	51	83		
ELA Learning Gains				66			67		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				58			63		
Math Achievement*	78	44	38	76	37	38	59		
Math Learning Gains				70			30		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				55			29		
Science Achievement*	91	62	64	75	43	40	71		
Social Studies Achievement*	98	66	66	98	53	48	98		
Middle School Acceleration					52	44			
Graduation Rate	99	88	89	97	50	61	99		
College and Career Acceleration	96	77	65	96	63	67	96		
ELP Progress		37	45						

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	91
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	543

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	99

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	77
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	771
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	97

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	64			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	98			
BLK	88			
HSP	94			
MUL	82			
PAC				
WHT	93			
FRL	90			

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	74			
ELL	90			
AMI				
ASN	91			
BLK	72			
HSP	87			
MUL	86			
PAC				
WHT	83			
FRL	69			

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	81			78			91	98		99	96	
SWD	58			60			75				3	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	91			100			100	100		97	6	
BLK	74			71			89	98		95	6	
HSP	83			86			94	100		100	6	
MUL	86			77							2	
PAC												
WHT	88			84			92	97		97	6	
FRL	79			80			93	100		92	6	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	80	66	58	76	70	55	75	98		97	96	
SWD	63	42								100	90	
ELL	90											
AMI												
ASN	96	84		100	73		92	91		100	95	
BLK	71	60	52	68	64	50	64	96		98	95	
HSP	90	73	80	87	73		90	100		92	100	
MUL	83	67								100	92	
PAC												
WHT	87	69	66	85	80	64	85	100		94	97	
FRL	70	59	50	67	60	44	63	96		83	100	

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	83	67	63	59	30	29	71	98		99	96	
SWD	67	68	50	50	27							
ELL	58	75										
AMI												
ASN	95	97		76	40		92	100		100	93	
BLK	74	61	56	46	28	26	63	98		99	94	
HSP	88	69		63	35		75	100		100	96	
MUL	95	78		65	38		71			100	100	
PAC												
WHT	91	70	71	74	27	36	79	98		99	98	
FRL	78	64	62	45	24	30	64	97		99	94	

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	82%	44%	38%	50%	32%
09	2023 - Spring	83%	42%	41%	48%	35%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	12%	52%	-40%	50%	-38%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	80%	52%	28%	48%	32%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	90%	64%	26%	63%	27%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	97%	60%	37%	63%	34%

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 school's academic area that demonstrated the lowest performance was mathematics. Our mathematics scores are trending upward on the state assessment. Our scores have increased a total of 21 points over the past two years. We contribute current performance to teacher professional development, consistent monitoring of mathematics instruction, and consistent use of safety nets and instructional resources.

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

At Paxon, we experienced no declines on state assessments. Although not a focal point of our school improvement plan, we experienced some declines in various AP and IB assessments. For IB, we attribute the decline to changes in post covid changes in the way that students are assessments. IB subjects experienced declines globally.

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.

Paxon School for Advanced Studies exceeds the state average in all assessed areas.

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

At Paxon, our science (Biology) scores demonstrated the greatest improvement. Our scores increased from 73% to 90% over the past year. We attribute this improved performance to teacher professional development, instructional planning during common planning sessions, teacher communication with parents and students, and teacher feedback sessions with students.

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

The areas identified as potential areas of concern are the percentage of students scoring a level 1 on the math and/or reading assessment for the 2022-2023 school year.

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

1. Mathematics performance
2. Attendance
3. ELA Performance

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 Math**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.

Based on data analysis, although still above the state average, was the lowest performing area for Paxon.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We would like to maintain or increase the positive gap of achievement between the state and school average for mathematics.

Monitoring:

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

Mathematics performance will be monitored through classroom observations, instructional walkthroughs, performance data on state PMs and districts assessments, teacher classroom assessments, common planning, and professional learning communities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Royce Turner (turnerr@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.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. 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.

This area of focus was identified based on the number of teachers who did not return to the school this school year. These teachers left due to a mixture of retirements, personal issues, and concerns with the social climate in the State of Florida.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Paxon would like to see a decrease in the number of instructional staff who choose to leave the school.

Monitoring:

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

School administrations will have periodic check-ins with faculty, new teacher programs and initiatives, observation pre and post conferences, and principal stay meetings

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Royce Turner (turnerr@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.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus