Lavilla School Of The Arts School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Lavilla School Of The Arts

501 N DAVIS ST, Jacksonville, FL 32202

http://www.duvalschools.org/lavilla

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 LaVilla School of the Arts is to prepare our students to meet the high quality academic and pre-professional arts curricula at the high school level; to nurture knowledgeable life-long supporters of the arts; and to provide in-school and out-of-school opportunities that enhance creativity, aesthetic and critical thinking skills, self-discipline, leadership, teamwork, and an appreciation for cultural diversity

Provide the school's vision statement.

LaVilla School of the Arts will prepare all students to achieve success in the arts and academics.

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
Harrison, Kimberly	Principal	Instructional Leadership/ Oversee all processes of the school
Happel, Seth	Assistant Principal	Curriculum/ Scheduling/ Instructional Leadership
Joseph, Johnson	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leadership/ Student Services/Facilities/ Equipment Management
Jackson, Morgan	Teacher, K-12	ELA Department Chair
Martin, Donnie	Teacher, K-12	Testing Coordinator
Ottley, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	Dance Director
Withers, Kori	Teacher, K-12	Professional Development Facilitator
Montoya, Stephanie	Teacher, K-12	Gifted Lead Teacher
Wrenn, Mary	School Counselor	Counseling Services

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.

School Design Team Meetings are held on the first Wednesday of each month. School Advisory Council Meetings are held on the first Thursday of the month at 7:30 AM. The School Advisory Council stakeholders include community members, parents, teachers, staff, and the principal

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 will be monitored and revised, as necessary. Data from PM assessments and DM assessments will be reviewed monthly.

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	55%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	50%
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	63	84	48	195
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	20	13	41
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	17	1	27
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	31	24	65
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	67	40	159
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	57	18	129
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	75	36	163

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	13	18	0	31
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	4

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	76	32	52	160
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	21	18	53
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	1	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	28	16	55
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	32	27	93
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	48	23	136
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	1	0	1

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	36	39	26	101

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	12	4	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	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	76	32	52	160
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	21	18	53
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	1	12
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	28	16	55
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	32	27	93
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	48	23	136
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	1	0	1

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	36	39	26	101

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
					Grade Level					
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	4	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	4	6

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*	66	42	49	72	43	50	67		
ELA Learning Gains				59			51		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44			35		
Math Achievement*	68	49	56	70	35	36	62		
Math Learning Gains				66			40		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58			33		
Science Achievement*	74	48	49	70	48	53	63		
Social Studies Achievement*	85	66	68	87	53	58	77		
Middle School Acceleration	88	82	73	89	47	49	83		
Graduation Rate					48	49			
College and Career Acceleration					69	70			
ELP Progress	64	31	40		85	76			

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

See Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings.

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	74
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	445
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	615
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	51			
ELL	56			
AMI				
ASN	91			
BLK	65			
HSP	76			
MUL	80			
PAC				
WHT	84			

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	66			

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	50			
ELL	57			
AMI				
ASN	69			
BLK	58			
HSP	68			
MUL	75			
PAC				
WHT	76			
FRL	59			

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	66			68			74	85	88			64
SWD	42			42			42	60	69		5	
ELL	62			43							3	64
AMI												
ASN	88			94							2	
BLK	49			56			54	78	88		5	
HSP	75			67			71	90	79		5	
MUL	71			73			89	76	89		5	

| **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
PAC												
WHT	76			78			85	90	90		5	
FRL	55			56			61	75	83		5	

| **2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS** | | | | | | | | | | | |
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	72	59	44	70	66	58	70	87	89			
SWD	42	42	33	38	56	54	37	60	85			
ELL	53	47		65	61							
AMI												
ASN	75	45		85	60		82					
BLK	53	51	33	54	61	55	49	74	94			
HSP	73	62	65	67	65	50	72	87	74			
MUL	76	60	57	73	70	67	82	95	94			
PAC												
WHT	84	65	58	81	69	63	82	93	89			
FRL	58	52	40	55	61	54	52	78	79			

| **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	67	51	35	62	40	33	63	77	83			
SWD	35	37	26	29	29	23	26	58				
ELL	44	53	58	47	33							
AMI												
ASN	71	40		81	35			82	90			
BLK	50	42	31	43	29	27	35	66	73			
HSP	69	56	50	57	47	46	74	85	76			
MUL	70	51		73	48	30	75	80	85			
PAC												
WHT	78	57	39	75	47	43	79	84	89			
FRL	51	44	37	47	31	26	52	58	77			

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	68%	40%	28%	47%	21%
08	2023 - Spring	70%	41%	29%	47%	23%
06	2023 - Spring	57%	38%	19%	47%	10%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	51%	43%	8%	54%	-3%
07	2023 - Spring	79%	40%	39%	48%	31%
08	2023 - Spring	54%	45%	9%	55%	-1%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	72%	35%	37%	44%	28%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	90%	52%	38%	50%	40%

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	97%	64%	33%	63%	34%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	85%	63%	22%	66%	19%

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.

Sixth grade Reading Proficiency from 71% in 2022 to 57% in 2023, which is a 14% decline.
Students entering 6th grade had more reading deficits. Reading scores were lower and the 6th grade class was larger than in years past. This was the first year with a shift in standards and curriculum with moving from the FSA Assessment to the FAST Assessment.

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

Reading Proficiency dropped by 7% from 72% in 2022 to 65% in 2023.
The state standards changed and new curriculum was implemented.

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.

LaVilla's school data was above the state average data sets in all categories.

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

Eighth grade math showed the greatest improvement with an increase of 10% from 44% in 2022 to 54% in 2023.
Teacher collaboration and lesson planning was a priority for the 8th grade math teachers. The teachers attended BEST Standards training and were experienced teachers.

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

Students attendance below 90% and course failures for math are a concern.

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

Reading Proficiency for 6th grade
Math Proficiency for 6th grade
Student Attendance below 90%

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

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

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

Student attendance has declined. In 2023 17% of students had less than a 90% attendance rate, as compared to 13% in 2022.

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

Improve student attendance with less than 10% of the student population has below a 90% attendance rate for the 2023-24 school year.

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

Attendance will be monitored weekly by the school counselors and conferences will be held with students and families to assess the reasons for absences. Resources, such as the school attendance team and access to various programs will be utilized, as needed.
A reward system will be utilized to celebrate students with consistent attendance rates.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mary Wrenn (wrennm@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.)

N/A

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

Student attendance is important and a direct correlation with student achievement.

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.

Monitor student attendance bi- weekly.

Person Responsible: Mary Wrenn (wrennm@duvalschools.org)

By When: Thursdays (bi-weekly)

Reward students for perfect attendance and improved attendance.

Person Responsible: Johnson Joseph (josephj@duvalschools.org)

By When: Quarterly

Conduct monthly Attendance Intervention Team Meetings to address students missing 3 or more unexcused absences and utilized attendance resources / programs for students with excessive absences.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

#2. 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.

Improve reading proficiency for 6th grade students.

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

Improve 6th grade reading proficiency from 57% in 2023 to 62% in 2024, which is a 5% increase.

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

PM data and DA data will be monitored monthly to monitor student progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kimberly Harrison (harrisonk2@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.)

Monitor student Lexile Levels on Exact Path to measure progression in reading. Implement small group instruction that is differentiated to meet the reading deficits of the targeted students.

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

Measuring data in increments and tracking student progress to adjust instructional practices will increase student reading performance.

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.

Monthly data chat and reviews with teachers to monitor reading progress of identified students.

Person Responsible: Seth Happel (happels1@duvalschools.org)

By When: Monthly

Data tracking and goal setting for students to monitor reading performance.

Person Responsible: Seth Happel (happels1@duvalschools.org)

By When: Monthly

Data tracking and goal setting for students to monitor reading performance.

Person Responsible: Seth Happel (happels1@duvalschools.org)

By When: Monthly

Data tracking and goal setting for students to monitor reading performance.

Person Responsible: Seth Happel (happels1@duvalschools.org)

By When: Monthly

Data tracking and goal setting for students to monitor reading performance.

Person Responsible: Seth Happel (happels1@duvalschools.org)

By When: Monthly

Data tracking and goal setting for students to monitor reading performance.

Person Responsible: Seth Happel (happels1@duvalschools.org)

By When: Monthly

Data tracking and goal setting for students to monitor reading performance.

Person Responsible: Seth Happel (happels1@duvalschools.org)

By When: Monthly

Data tracking and goal setting for students to monitor reading performance.

Person Responsible: Seth Happel (happels1@duvalschools.org)

By When: Monthly

#3. 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.
Improve student math proficiency for 6th grade students.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.
Improve 6th grade math proficiency from 51% in 2023 to 56% in 2024, which is a 5% increase.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.
Monthly monitoring of PM and DA data, as well as student performance on Exact Path.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Kimberly Harrison (harrisonk2@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 collaboratively plan lesson and small group instructional activities for students based on math data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.
The goal is to address the specific math deficits for each student.
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.
Data analysis of student performance on PM, DA, and Exact Path Math.
Person Responsible: Kimberly Harrison (harrisonk2@duvalschools.org)
By When: Monthly
Common planning and time for PLC's for teachers.
Person Responsible: Kimberly Harrison (harrisonk2@duvalschools.org)
By When: April 2024

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).

N/A