Mandarin High School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Mandarin High School

4831 GREENLAND RD, Jacksonville, FL 32258

http://www.duvalschools.org/mhs

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.

Mandarin High School commits to providing an effective learning environment that is rich in academic mastery, while promoting the development of physical, social, and emotional well-being. Through a combination of consistent faculty engagement and community involvement, all students will be prepared to realize their full potential today, tomorrow and in the future.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Mandarin High School will inspire, engage, and educate every student every day, preparing him or her for graduation and entry into global society with career choices and pathways to success.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bravo, Sara	Principal	
Baldwin, Robert	Assistant Principal	
Durkin, Timothy	Assistant Principal	
Pecarek, Elizabeth	Assistant Principal	
Lakatos, Aaron	Assistant Principal	

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.

SAC will fulfill these requirements.

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))

N/A

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	48%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	48%
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: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 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	
One or more suspensions	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	
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	

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	442
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	296
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	187
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	385
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	375
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	

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	377

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	104
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77

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	
	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*	54	46	50	53	45	51	56		
ELA Learning Gains				51			53		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				39			45		
Math Achievement*	61	44	38	51	37	38	46		
Math Learning Gains				53			39		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59			46		
Science Achievement*	62	62	64	47	43	40	58		
Social Studies Achievement*	74	66	66	77	53	48	72		
Middle School Acceleration					52	44			
Graduation Rate	96	88	89	98	50	61	97		
College and Career Acceleration	85	77	65	85	63	67	87		
ELP Progress	42	37	45	56			63		

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	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	474
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	96

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	669
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Graduation Rate	98

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	50			
ELL	50			
AMI				
ASN	89			
BLK	61			
HSP	63			
MUL	74			
PAC				
WHT	77			
FRL	63			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	41			
ELL	48			
AMI				
ASN	81			
BLK	55			
HSP	56			
MUL	58			
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	58			

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	54			61			62	74		96	85	42
SWD	29			35			35	44		68	6	
ELL	14			47			35	40		77	7	42
AMI												
ASN	86			79			83	92		91	6	
BLK	36			45			44	61		83	6	
HSP	46			57			61	68		78	7	39
MUL	47			62			73	76		83	6	
PAC												
WHT	61			68			68	79		88	6	
FRL	45			53			56	62		74	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	53	51	39	51	53	59	47	77		98	85	56
SWD	15	34	32	23	43	43	24	49		90	55	
ELL	13	42	45	42	51	50	22	37		100	65	56
AMI												
ASN	78	67		82	62			85		100	94	
BLK	40	50	42	39	48	58	28	61		98	84	
HSP	39	46	42	50	51	50	41	71		99	80	52
MUL	57	51	23	46	44		50	68		96	91	
PAC												
WHT	59	51	38	57	57	68	58	85		97	85	70
FRL	42	47	37	50	51	55	48	72		93	76	63

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	56	53	45	46	39	46	58	72		97	87	63
SWD	17	37	38	25	36	36	42	41		95	57	
ELL	25	59	53	41	42	42	30	38		98	80	63
AMI												
ASN	63	59		53	50		53	77		100	94	
BLK	42	47	38	38	36	41	53	53		98	81	
HSP	46	52	43	40	48	54	49	60		95	86	55
MUL	52	44	50	47	39		56	83		100	83	
PAC												
WHT	63	54	50	52	37	44	64	80		96	89	82
FRL	46	49	45	43	38	44	58	63		95	79	75

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	59%	44%	15%	50%	9%
09	2023 - Spring	52%	42%	10%	48%	4%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	62%	52%	10%	50%	12%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	63%	52%	11%	48%	15%

| BIOLOGY | | | | | | |
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	61%	64%	-3%	63%	-2%

| HISTORY | | | | | | |
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	73%	60%	13%	63%	10%

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 was Reading Proficiency; however, Reading Proficiency did increase from 53% (2022) to 56% (2023). The contributing factors for Reading Proficiency were new standards (BEST), new curriculum components and textbooks, as well as a new teacher in the content area.

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 and only decline was US History. The contributing factors for this data component decline were shifts in instructional practices, teachers new to the grade level or content, and the AP who oversaw this core content area abruptly not showing up to lead the content.

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.

All data components were higher than the state average. The data component that had the greatest gap compared to the state average was Geometry, while the state average was 49% compared to Mandarin school proficiency of 65%. The contributing factors to this gap were weekly PLC and/or Common Planning with focus on instructional drops and proven best practices. Professional development and common planning led by teachers and administrators, school based instructional supporting the work in the content, return all teachers from the prior year in the content, and scheduling changes in master schedule.

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

The data component that showed the greatest improvement was Biology. The focus and new actions for Biology centered around a shift in administration, realignment of Biology work, new teacher in content and scheduling changes in master schedule.

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

EWS data not available at this time.

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

US History and ELA will be the top priorities for the upcoming school year.

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.

With one year of experience teaching B.E.S.T. English we will continue to ensure all ELA teachers have the resources and training to be successful in preparing students for state assessments. ELA scores for the 22-23 school year proficiency rate showed improvement and Mandarin will continue the upward trajectory in that department with the proper focus, training, and planning for standards implementation.

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

Students taking FAST ELA Reading will score 58% proficient at the final assessment of the 23-24 school year and will show growth from PM1 to PM2 to final end of year assessment.

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

As a school, we will monitor ELA through BWT observations, formal and informal observations, data monitoring of PM1 and PM1, PLC and Common Planning created task, and professional development activities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Elizabeth Pecarek (pecareke@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 evidence-based intervention being implemented for ELA will consist of standards-based, consistent collaborative planning ensures that all students, in all core content classrooms, are equitably exposed to standards-aligned instruction, tasks and assessments. Assessment of data pieces occurs on a regular basis to cover instructional gaps.

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

Standards-based, consistent collaborative planning ensures that all students, in all core content classrooms, are equitably exposed to standards-aligned instruction, tasks and 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. Continue to ensure teachers and administrators are trained on the new BEST benchmarks.
2. Develop PLC and Common Planning Calendar for Core Content Areas.
3. Utilize curriculum and pacing guides aligned to new benchmarks and curriculum to ensure all students are getting necessary exposure to benchmarks as written and assessed by the state.
4. Administer PM assessments as scheduled and utilize data in planning and review of curriculum and

make adjustments immediately as necessary.
5. Admin Team engages in calibration walk-throughs to align findings through use of the BWT Portal.
6. Ongoing engagement in bi-weekly Collaborative Planning sessions within core content areas, producing a product/task at the close of each session.
7. Development of Core Content PLC trainings emphasizing standards-based instructional practices and the ongoing use of data to drive instructional decision-making to be deliveredbi-weekly.
8. Engagement in the Instructional Review Process with District Staff.

Person Responsible: Elizabeth Pecarek (pecareke@duvalschools.org)

By When: April 2024

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

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.

US History scores showed a decrease in 22-23. US History instruction will include a focus on probing questions and moving deeper into specific History content based on the standard. Use of PowerPoint Slides with guided notes and interactive questions built into the learning will be utilized to push students knowledge and accountability for concepts.

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

US History scores will increase to 78% proficiency. This is 5 points above the 2023 results, and one points above the 2022 results. It is imperative that US History scores are redeemed for the improvement of the school grade calculation.

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

Area of focus will be monitored through district progress monitoring assessments, BWT observations, formal and informal observations, PLC and common planning conversations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

Standards-based, consistent collaborative planning ensures that all students, in all core content classrooms, are equitably exposed to standards-aligned instruction, tasks and assessments.

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

Standards-based, consistent collaborative planning ensures that all students, in all core content classrooms, are equitably exposed to standards-aligned instruction, tasks and 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. Train teachers and administrators on expectations for interactive learning, guided notes, and notebooks.
2. Develop PLC and Common Planning Calendar for Core Content Areas.
3. Utilize curriculum and pacing guides aligned to benchmarks and curriculum to ensure all students are getting necessary exposure to benchmarks as written and assessed by the state.
4. Administer district assessments as scheduled and utilize data in planning and review of curriculum and make adjustments immediately as necessary.

5. Admin Team engages in calibration walk-throughs to align findings through use of the BWT Portal.
6. Ongoing engagement in bi-weekly Collaborative Planning sessions within core content areas, producing a product/task at the close of each session.
7. Development of Core Content PLC trainings emphasizing standards-based
instructional practices and the ongoing use data to drive instructional decision-making to be delivered
8. Engagement in the Instructional Review Process with District Staff.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: April 2024

#3. 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.

ELA we need to make sure all teachers of this subject have the resources and training to be successful in preparing students for state assessments. English scores from the 22-23 school year show a slight improvements and with schools only being held accountable for proficiency last year with the new assessments we must shift practice for student success in gains and lower quartiles areas.

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

Students taking FAST ELA Reading will score 58% proficient at the final assessment of the 23-24 school year and will show growth from PM1 to PM2 to final end of year assessment.

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

ELA monitored through data monitoring of PM1 and PM2 as well as BWT observations, formal and informal observations, PLC and common planning discussions, and professional development activities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Elizabeth Pecarek (pecareke@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.)

Standards-based, consistent collaborative planning ensures that all students, in all core content classrooms, are equitably exposed to standards-aligned instruction, tasks and assessments. Assessment of data pieces occurs on a regular basis to cover instructional gaps.

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

Standards-based, consistent collaborative planning ensures that all students, in all core content classrooms, are equitably exposed to standards-aligned instruction, tasks and 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.

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).

N/A

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

N/A

Measurable Outcomes
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

Monitoring

Monitoring
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

N/A

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

N/A

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

N/A

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring

N/A

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The school website and the Florida CIMS website are both used for the dissemination of the SIP and corresponding plans. There will be the first Title I meeting at the school's open house on Monday, September 11.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

The school will continue to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders through collaborative meetings and combine hosted events to fulfill the schools mission.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

The school will continue to strengthen academic programs by adhering to curriculum guides and pacing schedules to ensure curriculum coverage. Ongoing progress monitoring in PLC and CP by teachers and instructional teams.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A

<div style="background-color:#8DB4E2;">

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan
Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

</div>

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

N/A

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

N/A

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies	$0.00

3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes