Julia Landon College Preparatory & Leadership Development School

2023-24
Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Julia Landon College Preparatory & Leadership Development School

1819 THACKER AVE, Jacksonville, FL 32207

http://www.duvalschools.org/landon

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.

n/a

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision at Julia Landon College Preparatory and Leadership Development School is to create college bound students with a deep commitment to public service and a true understanding of their leadership skills within the global community.

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
Casey, Ryan	Principal	Leads leadership team and stakeholder meetings, discuss academic data trends, and supports leadership team in implementing the SIP.
Knoll, Alexandrea	Assistant Principal	Creates and delivers professional development, leads professional learning communities, supports Mr. Casey with building community partnerships and cultivating relationships with stakeholders, manages students attendance/AIT team, collaborates with guidance/student services team and district partners to support students, collaborates with content leads and district partners to support instructional needs of staff and academic needs of students, and plays a major role in supporting a positive school culture and climate.
Banks, Antonio	Assistant Principal	Works closely with content leads and leadership team to support teachers and students while creating and implementing school-wide testing calendar, supports student discipline and our Dean in creating/implementing systems for student behavior, supports Dean with PBIS team, collaborates with APC to develop professional development opportunities that support instruction, and plays a major role in supporting a positive school culture and climate.
Bourgholtzer, MiChelle	Dean	Leads PBIS Team, supports student discipline, provides classroom strategies for teachers, works alongside guidance and admin to create and monitor school-wide behavior systems, and a major part of the leadership team impacting school culture and climate.

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.

Julia Landon College Prep truly embodies the shared leadership vision. We meet weekly with our Leadership Team, which consists of our principal, assistant principals, our dean, guidance counselors, our gifted lead, and our ESE lead. We also meet with our extended stakeholder team, which includes grade level chairs, content area leads, and representatives from various organizations on campus. Additionally, we have monthly SAC meetings that parents, community members, teachers, guidance counselors, admin, and other stakeholders are invited.

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))

We will review student achievement data and progress specifically aligned with our SIP at our stakeholders meetings monthly and discuss implementation at weekly leadership team meetings. As we conduct walk throughs, have data chats with students/teachers, and discuss grade level and content area trends, we will revise our plan if necessary and adjust accordingly.

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	51%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	30%
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	33	33	29	95
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	4	13
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	18	13	44
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	7	4	23
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	

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	12	10	8	30

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	1	2	0	3
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	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	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	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	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	

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*	82	42	49	81	43	50	83		
ELA Learning Gains				61			65		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52			53		
Math Achievement*	91	49	56	87	35	36	88		
Math Learning Gains				72			64		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				69			64		
Science Achievement*	76	48	49	81	48	53	86		
Social Studies Achievement*	90	66	68	96	53	58	95		
Middle School Acceleration	91	82	73	88	47	49	92		
Graduation Rate					48	49			
College and Career Acceleration					69	70			
ELP Progress		31	40	60	85	76	50		

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	86
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	430
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	75
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	747
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
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	62			
ELL	78			
AMI				
ASN	95			
BLK	67			
HSP	78			
MUL	85			
PAC				
WHT	88			

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%
FRL	67			

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	59			
ELL	68			
AMI				
ASN	84			
BLK	66			
HSP	65			
MUL	77			
PAC				
WHT	80			
FRL	64			

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	82			91			76	90	91			
SWD	51			73			48	67	72		5	
ELL	67			89							2	
AMI												
ASN	92			98			88	96	99		5	
BLK	71			77			42	76	70		5	
HSP	73			84			74	75	85		5	
MUL	75			84			93	80	91		5	

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
2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
PAC												
WHT	84			93			76	95	93		5	
FRL	64			71			43	77	79		5	

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
2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
All Students	81	61	52	87	72	69	81	96	88			60
SWD	47	47	46	60	58	59	61	93	59			
ELL	56	64	53	81	80	70			80			60
AMI												
ASN	88	71	64	94	84	80	81	97	95			
BLK	65	58	50	68	65	58	64	93	69			
HSP	66	53	29	77	61	48	81	95	79			
MUL	80	66	56	88	73	65	75	100	90			
PAC												
WHT	85	60	55	92	72	77	88	96	92			
FRL	61	55	51	66	66	59	67	86	69			

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
2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
All Students	83	65	53	88	64	64	86	95	92			50
SWD	56	44	32	66	56	56	50	82	74			
ELL	51	55	48	67	53	55		81	55			50
AMI												
ASN	86	81	60	93	73	78	97	95	97			
BLK	68	59	52	73	54	58	63	96	82			
HSP	77	55	40	82	61	50	78	84	79			
MUL	83	62	42	87	65	48	81	88	92			
PAC												
WHT	86	66	57	92	64	71	91	98	95			
FRL	61	57	49	63	45	41	62	88	67			

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	85%	40%	45%	47%	38%
08	2023 - Spring	76%	41%	35%	47%	29%
06	2023 - Spring	82%	38%	44%	47%	35%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	94%	43%	51%	54%	40%
07	2023 - Spring	*	40%	*	48%	*
08	2023 - Spring	87%	45%	42%	55%	32%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	49%	35%	14%	44%	5%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	88%	52%	36%	50%	38%

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	100%	64%	36%	63%	37%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	90%	63%	27%	66%	24%

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.

According to our 2022-2023 student achievement data, 8th grade science, lowest performing quartile reading, and lowest performing quartile math showed the lowest performance on the state assessments. Many of these scores are a result of having all accelerated courses and not having dedicated teachers and resources to meet students needs to strengthen deficiencies. We also believe master scheduling challenges played a role in this as well.

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

Science received the lowest scores in recent history and had the most significant decline. This is partially due to scheduling the highest performing students in the high school biology course. This leaves struggling readers and students with deficiencies in the 8th grade comprehensive science course. Without proper support in reading comprehension, in addition to ensuring students have ALL of the content knowledge from grade 6 through 8, students will not be as successful in this course.

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.

We are on target or ahead of the state averages for most components, with the exception of our lowest performing quartile and 8th grade science.

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

The area we went up the most was our math scores. Math proficiency went up from 87% to 95% and Algebra 1 went up from 83% to 85%. Staffing played a role in this improvement, in addition to teacher collaboration, differentiating for our diverse learning populations.

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

Potential areas of concern would be our students missing 10% of school/attendance issues and our students who received a level 1 in math and/or reading.

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

LPQ Reading, LPQ Math, 8th Grade Science

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 Collaborative Planning

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 will impact our students with disabilities, our minority students, and our students who have failed or must recover credits. This will also positively impact our students performing significantly below grade level in math and reading.

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

Documented data analysis, student work protocols, and strategically aligned resources. Additionally, we will have time for content area teachers to work alongside of our ESE team and gifted lead for best practices.

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

Admin will be present and will deliver professional development in addition to providing time for content area teachers to engage in collaborative planning time and to walk away with lesson plans, student resources, and common assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Alexandrea Knoll (knolla@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 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.

This area of focus will impact our students with disabilities, our minority students, and our students who have failed or must recover credits. This will also positively impact our students performing significantly below grade level in math and reading.

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

Student achievement data and attendance data will improve. We will hopefully decrease our absence rate from 8% to 3%. By focusing on our school culture, students will feel supported academically and personally. If we improve our structures of support and increase positivity, students will enjoy coming to school and feel motivated/encouraged.

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

We will be able to monitor this progress through the decrease in referrals, increase in attendance rate, more students recognized monthly, and through out 5 essential survey data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ryan Casey (caseyr@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

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).

We review school improvement funding allocations through SAC, leadership team meetings, our shared-decision team meeting, and our PBIS team.