

Duval County Public Schools

Jean Ribault Middle School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	7
III. Planning for Improvement	12
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	17
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	17
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Jean Ribault Middle School

3610 RIBAUTL SCENIC DR, Jacksonville, FL 32208

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

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.

To provide exceptional educational opportunities for every student, everyday.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All students are motivated to capitalize on every learning opportunity that will prepare them for high school and beyond.

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
Williams, Ronnie	Principal	
Brown, Latoya	Assistant Principal	
Burroughs, Lakeisha	Math Coach	

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.

During our annual development meetings, families are given the opportunity to provide input. Throughout the school year, during our monthly SAC and leadership team meetings, our SIP plan is discussed and feedback is given.

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))

Our SIP will be monitored in a variety of ways, not limited to the following: observational data (evidence of), assessment data, administrative/teacher input, etc. At least once a semester, our SIP will be re-visited to ensure we are adhering to it and/or re-vise the plan based on needs.

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	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	95%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
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)* 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: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: D
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

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

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	29	42	49	25	43	50	24		
ELA Learning Gains				41			31		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45			38		
Math Achievement*	41	49	56	32	35	36	28		
Math Learning Gains				47			27		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54			26		
Science Achievement*	21	48	49	21	48	53	24		
Social Studies Achievement*	52	66	68	46	53	58	56		
Middle School Acceleration	85	82	73	90	47	49	46		
Graduation Rate					48	49			
College and Career Acceleration					69	70			
ELP Progress		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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	228
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	401
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	98

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

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	30	Yes	3	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	44			
HSP	42			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	51			
FRL	44			

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	34	Yes	2	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	45			
HSP	27	Yes	1	1
MUL	43			
PAC				
WHT	47			
FRL	44			

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	29			41			21	52	85			
SWD	30			26			24	41			4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	27			40			19	51	85		5	
HSP	35			48							2	
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	45			50			58				3	
FRL	27			41			18	50	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	25	41	45	32	47	54	21	46	90			
SWD	25	38	37	31	45	44	31	20				
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25	42	45	31	46	54	21	46	95			
HSP	11	29		28	40							
MUL	33	27		50	60							
PAC												
WHT	34	50		39	56			58				
FRL	23	39	44	30	45	54	20	46	94			

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	24	31	38	28	27	26	24	56	46			
SWD	32	36	31	37	38	38	39	53				
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	24	32	39	28	26	25	23	57	48			
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	32	25		43	33							
FRL	21	28	37	25	24	24	23	54	38			

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	23%	40%	-17%	47%	-24%
08	2023 - Spring	27%	41%	-14%	47%	-20%
06	2023 - Spring	21%	38%	-17%	47%	-26%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	34%	43%	-9%	54%	-20%
07	2023 - Spring	19%	40%	-21%	48%	-29%
08	2023 - Spring	55%	45%	10%	55%	0%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	16%	35%	-19%	44%	-28%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	91%	52%	39%	50%	41%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	51%	63%	-12%	66%	-15%

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.

Science and ELA proficiency showed the lowest area of performance. New and inexperienced ELA teachers; new ELA curriculum and B.E.S.T. standards. In addition, there was some teacher turnover and thereby no consistency in both areas. Historically, ELA/Reading and Science proficiency has been a challenge at JRMS. However, we have shown increase with student growth in ELA/Reading. Little to no consistent growth in Science.

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

8th grade Science proficiency decreased 5 points. Of the 5 total Science teachers, 3 were new to the school and they taught 8th grade Science. Only 1 of them had prior teaching experience. This teacher left in January. A new teacher was hired in Feb./Mar., she resigned before the end of the year. Teacher inexperience and turnover contributed to this decline. Historically, Science proficiency has been a challenge for Ribault Middle. We made a key teaching assignment adjustment in 8th grade Science that I believe will make our team of Science teachers stronger as a cohesive unit.

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.

ELA proficiency. Historically, at least half of students who come to us are already below grade level in Reading. The factors that contribute to this gap are: teacher inexperience/turnover and ineffective curriculum that has been beneficial to our struggling readers.

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

Last year, math proficiency (+12) showed the most improvement. Teacher taught the new benchmarks using the district curriculum, monitored the data, and made instructional adjustments (alignment of instruction/task/assessment and small group instruction) based on student needs.

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

Attendance

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

Science

Civics

ELA proficiency/growth

Math growth

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.

Historically, ELA proficiency has been low-mid 20%. Literacy has been a focus for our school. If we improve students ability to comprehend, they will be proficient/show growth in Reading.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our goal for ELA proficiency is 35%.

Monitoring:

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

Daily/Weekly via classroom walkthroughs, lesson plans, student work samples, teacher-led small group instruction, and assessment results.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ronnie Williams (williamsr9@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.)

Implementation of R.A.C.E.S. strategy; reading strategies: selective highlighting/underlining, one-sentence summary

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy will provide a framework for how students should read, comprehend, and respond to text-based questions/prompts. The reading strategies will help students be able to break down complex passages to better comprehend them.

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.

Reading coach will provide a professional development training to ELA teachers on the use of R.A.C.E.S

Person Responsible: Ronnie Williams (williamsr9@duvalschools.org)

By When: August 7-preplanning (ongoing)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**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.

Historically, our Science proficiency has been low compared to other middle schools with similar demographics.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our Science proficiency goal is 40%. Last year, our Science proficiency was 16%, the year before it was 21%.

Monitoring:

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

The area of focus will be monitored through collaborative and common planning sessions. In addition, it will be monitored by assessment and observational data. This may include teacher made quizzes and tests, district and mini-assessments, exit tickets, and informal checks for understanding.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Latoya Brown (brownl7@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 use of the 5 E's lesson development framework (Engage, Explore, Explain, Elaboration, and Evaluation) as a means of planning lessons to aligned to the standard being taught. Another strategy that will be utilized is the interactive student notebooks.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting this specific strategy is it will provide a framework that will allow teachers to plan and deliver effective instruction aligned to the standard.

Interactive notebooks are a great resource for students that will serve as evidence of their learning throughout the year and help them become independent learners. They will be able to refer to current and previously taught concepts using their interactive notebooks.

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.

Teacher use of the 5E framework lesson plan document with fidelity. Teachers have been trained how to use the framework. Teachers will use daily/weekly for lesson planning.

Person Responsible: Latoya Brown (brownl7@duvalschools.org)

By When: August 7-preplanning (ongoing)

Teachers train students on how to set up their interactive notebook. Students will follow expectations as instructed.

Person Responsible: Latoya Brown (brownl7@duvalschools.org)

By When: Beginning of Sept. (ongoing)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

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

Teacher retention and recruitment is increasingly becoming a challenge.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Last school year, we hired 9 new teachers out of 44 total last year and this year, we hired about 8 new teachers out of 42 teachers total.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor teacher progress daily/weekly through classroom walk-throughs, evaluations/ observations, formal/informal conversations and feedback. In addition, through the PDF will monitor their progress towards their certification.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lakeisha Burroughs (burroughsl@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.)

Our PDF and district specialist will conduct monthly check-ins as well as provide PD. The deans will provide monthly classroom coaching clinics designed to provide classroom management support to struggling teachers. We will assign teacher mentors to novice/struggling teachers for additional support.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This strategy provides a forum to collaborate with novice/struggling teachers who need additional support. Teacher mentors give teachers a "go to" person if they have questions and are in need of assistance.

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)).

The process to review school improvement funding allocations is done through our School Advisory Council and voting members.

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.

School's website

Monthly School Advisory Meetings

Parent engagement nights

One page SIP overview flyer to be emailed to families

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))

Engage parents via social media platforms, such as, Bloomz and Twitter

Weekly automated calls/emails to families

Distribute quarterly progress reports and report cards

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)

Build capacity within teachers to be able to plan and deliver instruction aligned to the standard through our collaborative and common planning sessions. Analyze and monitor ELA and Science data on a continuous basis. Provided differentiated and small group instruction and reassess students to determine if lesson was effective. Also, we will provide additional learning opportunities via After-School Learning and Saturday School.

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