

Duval County Public Schools

Stanton College Preparatory 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

Stanton College Preparatory

1149 W 13TH ST, Jacksonville, FL 32209

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

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.

The mission of Stanton College Preparatory School is to provide educational excellence in every school, in every classroom, for every student, every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Stanton College Preparatory School is to ensure every student is inspired and prepared for success in college or a career and life.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
------	----------------	---------------------------------

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 school leadership team along with department chairs collaborated on the school improvement plan. Its purpose and areas of strength and weakness as evidenced by the data from the last school year were perused. All the information is drafted and taken to the School Advisory Council (SAC). Our SAC has representation in the following areas: parents, community members, student government, teachers, and school leadership. SAC members are given an opportunity to read the SIP draft so that they can collaborate as a group afterwards. They ask questions to gain a deeper understanding about the data and then they offer suggestions for improving the SIP. The SIP is treated like a living document in that SIP looks at it throughout the year to check on the progress that is made after each district assessment.

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 treated like a living document in that SAC members, the leadership team and professional learning communities look at it throughout the year to check on the progress that is made after each district assessment. The leadership team analyzes the data and shares the findings with department chairs. Department chairs share the information with professional learning communities who in turn collaborate and find out where the gaps are so that instruction can be adjusted as needed. We go for

continuous improvement and the only way to facilitate that process is by having schema for checking progress and adjusting instruction based on what the data looks like.

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	68%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	27%
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	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 English Language Arts (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	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

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	74	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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

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

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

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

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	91	46	50	94	45	51	92		
ELA Learning Gains				81			69		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				80			66		
Math Achievement*	86	44	38	90	37	38	75		
Math Learning Gains				66			33		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				74			41		
Science Achievement*	93	62	64	88	43	40	89		
Social Studies Achievement*	98	66	66	98	53	48	97		
Middle School Acceleration					52	44			
Graduation Rate	99	88	89	100	50	61	100		
College and Career Acceleration	100	77	65	100	63	67	100		
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	95
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	567
Total Components for the Federal Index	6

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	99

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	87
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	871
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	100

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	72			
ELL	79			
AMI				
ASN	98			
BLK	90			
HSP	90			
MUL	92			
PAC				
WHT	97			
FRL	91			

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	85			
ELL	71			
AMI				
ASN	87			
BLK	83			
HSP	89			
MUL	87			
PAC				
WHT	91			
FRL	87			

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	91			86			93	98		99	100	
SWD	72										1	
ELL	85			75			77				3	
AMI												
ASN	94			98			96	98		100	6	
BLK	90			78			87	94		97	6	
HSP	83			73			82	100		100	6	
MUL	83			77				100		100	5	
PAC												
WHT	93			90			98	99		100	6	
FRL	85			81			84	98		100	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	94	81	80	90	66	74	88	98		100	100	
SWD	90	80										
ELL	77	83	83	75	50		60					
AMI												
ASN	93	81	76	84	68		87	98		100	100	
BLK	89	76	79	79	70	69	72	96		100	98	
HSP	94	77	82	94	79		85	88		100	100	
MUL	95	92	80	92	30		92	100		100	100	
PAC												
WHT	97	80	84	98	64		96	99		100	100	
FRL	93	85	85	94	72	85	89	95				

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	92	69	66	75	33	41	89	97		100	100	
SWD										100	100	
ELL	59	59	54	55	55		58					
AMI												
ASN	94	67	66	83	41	45	93	98		100	100	
BLK	80	62	64	47	36	47	70	92		100	100	
HSP	89	74	71	69	21		90	97		97	100	
MUL	97	75	77	93	23			100		100	100	
PAC												
WHT	94	69	63	81	36	50	91	96		100	100	
FRL	85	61	67	65	35	56	79	95		100	100	

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	93%	44%	49%	50%	43%
09	2023 - Spring	90%	42%	48%	48%	42%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	89%	52%	37%	48%	41%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	93%	64%	29%	63%	30%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	98%	60%	38%	63%	35%

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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance is Geometry. Our students are expected to have Algebra I to be admitted to our school. We have realized that most of them take a rushed online Algebra class to fulfill this expectation and this leads to some coming in with inadequate Algebra skills. To this extent the teachers are beginning the school year brushing up on Algebra skills. Having new benchmarks, our teachers realized that partitioning had more items on the test than anticipated. They realized that the students struggled with weighted averages.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline was 9th grade reading. Although some of the students in the 10% did not reach proficiency level, they showed growth. Some of the students in our intensive reading classes had a language barrier and it took a little while to find them translation dictionaries and other resources. Some of the students struggled with non-fiction.

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.

None of our data components were below state averages.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement is Biology. Our teachers took time to unpack the benchmarks at the beginning of last school year to make sense of all. One of our teachers conducted push ins twice a week. These push in sessions were for the targeted population. We set a threshold of 1080 lexile score based on achieve 3000 data. These students were also monitored using data from classroom assessments.

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

Based on the EWS, the areas of concern are students that are at level 1 and 2 in Reading and retained students.

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

1. Reading
2. Geometry
3. Biology
4. Retained students
5. 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.

Our Reading data declined from 94% to 92%. Also, after looking at the incoming 9th grade students' data, we noticed that we had to add more Intensive Reading classes to our master schedule because we have more students coming in that are not at proficiency level.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We are currently at 92% overall proficiency level in Reading. The target for this year is to be at 95% in Reading proficiency.

Monitoring:

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

Both the 9th and 10th grade PLCs will collaborate about the data and the work during their common planning. The monitoring will be facilitated by a deep look at common assessments and district DMAs. Additionally, teachers will examine the Exact Path/Edmentum diagnostic test results to determine next steps.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Kerr (kerrm@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 use Exact Path/Edmentum data priority skills to determine where the gaps or weak areas are. Additionally, the Intensive Reading/ELA teachers partners will look at the common writing diagnostic to guide steps for the writing process.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers will use Exact Path/Edmentum because the data has a great feature that shows what students are deficient in after completing the work. Teachers are able to know what the priority skills are, for example, if they score low on figurative meanings of words, the teacher is able to touch on that during Direct Instruction. The writing diagnostic was administered to guide the writing process. That data will be used as baseline to improve on the writing throughout the year as students complete other assessments.

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.

1. Exact Path/Edmentum Diagnostic
2. Exact Path/Edmentum on-going usage

3. Common Writing Diagnostic

4. Writing on-going process

Person Responsible: Michael Kerr (kerrm@duvalschools.org)

By When: 1. August 30, 2023 2. August 14 through June 2 3. August 30, 2023 4. August 14 through June 2

#2. 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.

Our Geometry data component moved from 90% to 89%.. It is for this reason that we have identified this area to focus on.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal or target is to move from 89% to at least 92%.

Monitoring:

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

Our three Geometry teachers will collaborate about the data and the work during their common planning. The monitoring will be facilitated by a deep look at common assessments and district DMAs. Additionally, teachers will examine the Delta Math technology based mini assessments to determine next steps.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nongongoma Majova Seane (majovan@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.)

The teachers will use Delta Math to put emphasis on Average Weight and Constructions. Additionally, they will utilize common assessments and spiral throughout the year as they see fit based on the data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Average weight was a preferred method, and it was new. Teachers were accustomed to using partitioning. Delta math will be used because it allows teachers to create their own questions. These questions will serve as a base for common assessments. Additionally, based on data, constructions were another weak area. Teachers will use Delta Math since it has a strong construction interface that will allow teachers to demonstrate for the students. Delta Math will also be used along the way as a resource for other weak areas as presented by district DMAs.

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.

1. Administer a Pre-test for each area of concern prior to teaching it and use this data as a formative assessment
2. Deliver mini lessons, assess and determine next steps
3. Use Delta Math for modeling and assessing

Person Responsible: Nongongoma Majova Seane (majovan@duvalschools.org)

By When: August 14 through June 2

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Based on the school climate data we did a good job of developing PMPs for students who were at level 1 in Reading when we were at 91% (still not 100%), we failed to complete most PMPs as we only completed 63% this past year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We plan to have 100% of all PMPs completed for all students who are level 1 and 2 in Reading.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers must complete a PMP for all Level 1 and 2 students that are in their classrooms. Every Lead administrator will monitor their subject area.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nongongoma Majova Seane (majovan@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.)

Expectations will be shared and monitored..

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

They MUST be done as this is a non-negotiable.

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.

Let teachers know that PMPs are a non-negotiable and that they must be completed for all Level 1 and 2 students that are in their classrooms.

Person Responsible: Nongongoma Majova Seane (majovan@duvalschools.org)

By When: October 30, 2023