Southside Middle School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Southside Middle School

2948 KNIGHTS LN E, Jacksonville, FL 32216

http://www.duvalschools.org/southside

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.

Southside Middle School will achieve its vision by employing highly skilled faculty who support students by providing rigorous and measurable instructional lessons, making educational decisions based on data, and appreciating and celebrating the uniqueness of every individual on our campus.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Southside Middle School seeks to provide a safe environment where culture and diversity is valued and a high-quality standard of education contributes to the development of productive citizens for a global society.

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
Crady, Jennifer	Principal	
Harbison, Megan	Assistant Principal	
Kaufmann, Rebecca	Other	
Parrott, Lauren	Assistant Principal	
Foy, Garrett	Other	
Lee, Clarence	Dean	

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.

SMS has two tiers of school-based leadership involved in the development of the SIP - our Academic Leadership Team (ALT) is comprised of administration, coaches/interventionists, program coordinator, and dean of students as well as our Knights of the Round Table (KORT) which is comprised of representation from each content area department as well as other employee groups including UOPD and Civil Service. These two school-based teams meet weekly to discuss the status of the school, goal-setting, data, and systems for continuous improvement. Our School Advisory Council (SAC) is also involved in the development of our SIP through monthly meetings with school-based representation including employees and students, as well as parents and community partners.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP is a part of ongoing monitoring of systems within our school meeting as a standing agenda item at school-based leadership team meetings, as well as SAC meetings. Data collected through walkthroughs, assessments, and surveys is reviewed as a part of each of these meetings to determine progress or lack thereof and any needed changes to the plan.

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	82%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	91%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI
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: C 2019-20: D 2018-19: D 2017-18: C
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	118	140	133	391
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	48	31	89
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	10	15
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	132	184	175	491
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	115	132	151	398
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	125	176	175	476

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	3	7	8	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	8	18

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	105	78	110	293
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	35	44	92
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	139	128	142	409
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	125	125	137	387
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	124	135	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	2	8	1	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	10

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	105	78	110	293
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	35	44	92
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	139	128	142	409
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	125	125	137	387
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	118	124	135	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	2	8	1	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	10

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*	24	42	49	24	43	50	24		
ELA Learning Gains				35			32		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				32			27		
Math Achievement*	39	49	56	31	35	36	26		
Math Learning Gains				44			30		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				42			31		
Science Achievement*	28	48	49	28	48	53	35		
Social Studies Achievement*	43	66	68	47	53	58	46		
Middle School Acceleration	74	82	73	85	47	49	86		
Graduation Rate					48	49			
College and Career Acceleration					69	70			
ELP Progress	31	31	40	41	85	76	44		

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)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	239
Total Components for the Federal Index	6

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	409
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98
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	16	Yes	4	3
ELL	28	Yes	3	2
AMI				
ASN	43			
BLK	35	Yes	3	
HSP	36	Yes	2	
MUL	42			
PAC				
WHT	47			
FRL	41			

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	24	Yes	3	2
ELL	29	Yes	2	1
AMI				
ASN	58			
BLK	39	Yes	2	
HSP	35	Yes	1	
MUL	48			
PAC				
WHT	52			
FRL	43			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

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	24			39			28	43	74			31
SWD	8			23			7	16			5	25
ELL	12			28			10	38	50		6	31
AMI												
ASN	34			49			44	45			4	
BLK	23			34			18	40	59		5	
HSP	17			33			23	35	76		6	31
MUL	41			41			45				3	
PAC												
WHT	35			51			42	56	83		6	15
FRL	26			40			27	44	71		6	35

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	24	35	32	31	44	42	28	47	85			41
SWD	8	27	31	7	27	39	14	19				40
ELL	11	26	34	22	38	39	13	37				41
AMI												
ASN	37	42		58	57		52	67	91			
BLK	22	32	32	28	44	43	21	43	86			
HSP	16	27	26	22	38	36	21	39	85			39
MUL	48	52		52	60		33	43				
PAC												
WHT	29	49	50	40	49	60	40	57	79			63
FRL	23	35	38	33	46	44	31	47	87			43

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	32	27	26	30	31	35	46	86			44
SWD	9	17	16	5	20	22	6	16				
ELL	15	33	27	25	32	34	18	49				44
AMI												
ASN	36	49		48	46		62	79	80			75
BLK	23	28	32	22	24	22	30	46	89			
HSP	19	32	24	24	33	36	29	42	92			38
MUL	36	25		30	15							
PAC												
WHT	28	34	30	28	32	38	39	36	79			45
FRL	23	31	32	26	27	26	35	42	83			49

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	16%	40%	-24%	47%	-31%
08	2023 - Spring	24%	41%	-17%	47%	-23%
06	2023 - Spring	17%	38%	-21%	47%	-30%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	29%	43%	-14%	54%	-25%
07	2023 - Spring	28%	40%	-12%	48%	-20%
08	2023 - Spring	46%	45%	1%	55%	-9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	10%	35%	-25%	44%	-34%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	68%	52%	16%	50%	18%

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

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	90%	64%	26%	63%	27%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	33%	63%	-30%	66%	-33%

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.

Based on available district data, ELA proficiency scores in 6th and 7th grade reflect decreases from the 2021-22 school year, as well as Algebra I, Grade 8 Science, and Civics. For ELA, contributing factors include the rollout of new benchmarks within the BEST standards, as well as a new state assessment with FAST. For Algebra I, we had a new teacher not as familiar with the content or assessment. In Science and Civics, the leadership within those contents was not consistent including data monitoring and continuous improvement systems.

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

Based on available district data, Algebra I scores decreased the most with a 21% decline. Students were scheduled into the course accurately based on 7th grade FSA Math test scores, but many of those students were first time Level 3s. Our Algebra teacher was new to the content and our math coach had to serve in a full-time classroom capacity due to vacancies, so there was less regular instructional support available to the new teacher. We had also lost UniSIG funding from the year before due to our grade increase and with it, the contracted support of Booming Learning who previously had pushed in to provide Algebra I support. The teacher was not adept to ongoing progress monitoring systems and data analysis to pinpoint student deficiencies, and with a lack of coaching or district math support, unfortunately did not grow in that capacity.

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.

This data is not yet available to me for the 22-23 school year.

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

Our largest growth areas based on available district data were in Biology and Grade 8 math. Our biology teacher has continued to grow within her own content and pedagogical knowledge as she has now taught biology for over three years. She has pursued additional resources and relied on continuous improvement practices to improve lesson delivery. As a school, we also scheduled effectively placing only students in Biology who were proficient on past state assessments in both ELA and Math. In Grade 8 math, teacher effectiveness is the top contributing factor to the growth.

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

The correlation between attendance data and Level 1 assessment data is most concerning. Attendance reveals almost 40% of 6th graders attended less than 90%, almost 48% of 7th graders, and roughly 47% of 8th graders. Roughly 45% of 6th graders are Level 1 in ELA, 63% in 7th, and 62% of 8th graders. Roughly 39% are Level 1 in Math, 45% in 7th, and 54% in 8th.While the data set doesn't necessarily indicate that it is the same students with attendance issues that are also Level 1s in ELA and/or Math, it is likely based on the high percentages that there is a large overlap or correlation. When looking at cohort growth as compared to available district level data from the 22-23 state assessments, it would pose a challenge to maintaining the 46% proficiency in 8th grade math since that would require every student who is not a Level 1 to be proficient as a 3,4, or 5.

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

With low proficiency scores in nearly all school grade cells including ones where only previously proficient students are scheduled (acceleration), the priority for school improvement is clearly in the underlying foundation of teaching and learning which we believe should be focused through school culture elements that will impact quantitative data sets for school grade. We must increase student agency and ownership of teaching and learning. We must increase the capacity of all stakeholders to serve as leaders and self-advocates. We must integrate social emotional learning into all academic learning environments. And we must attend to the research about how people learn, promoting deeper learning that leads to useable and transferrable knowledge for students.

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 Benchmark-aligned Instruction

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.

Area of Focus - Improve standards-based planning process utilizing Collaborative Learning and Collaborative Planning including unpacking of standards, creation/revision of aligned tasks and assessments, instructional focus calendars, and ongoing student work analysis and execution of those plans in all content areas.
Description and Rationale - The data from the instructional walkthroughs previously indicated that the administrative team was calibrated in most instances and that the standards/benchmarks were the key focus of the planning process including the design of student tasks and assessments in all state accountability areas. This year, there is again one new member of our administrative team, and thus there is a need to re-calibrate before progressing forward in the standards-based instructional continuum especially given new standards last year in ELA and Math. There are also 12 new teachers to our campus in core content departments that will require additional professional development to be brought up to speed with our planning processes and task and assessment design to allow us to progress forward in the standards-based instructional continuum. The focus on standards-based instruction will improve proficiency and growth scores in all state accountability areas. The ALT collectively determined that Title I funds will be used to support the entire Area of
Focus through salaried positions. These Title I funds are utilized to supplement our current allocations for personnel and reduce class sizes, as well as to provide interventions in math and reading to students targeted for growth and proficiency including all ESSA subgroups and students in the LPQ.

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

97% of our current core content teachers will engage in successful standards-based instruction planning processes including the implementation of newer benchmarks where applicable in ELA and Math and alignment to all standards through updated district curriculum and 2nd year assessments at the state level.

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

Collaborative learning and planning sessions will be monitored through admin and coach participation, teacher leaders submitting collaborative planning artifacts and through ongoing admin classroom walkthroughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Jennifer Crady (cradyj@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.)

Utilize professional learning communities and common planning processes to improve teachers' abilities to provide effective standards-based instruction in all core content areas including the design of formative and summative assessments, instructional delivery, and student learning aligned tasks.

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

According to research including Standards-Based Learning in Action: Moving From Theory to Practice by Tom Schimmer, Garnet Hilman, and Mandy Stalets, "standards-based

learning is anchored on a teacher's commitment to designing instructional experiences and assessment that make proficiency against standards (not the accumulation of points) the priority outcome. TNTP's published study "The Opportunity Myth" also addresses the need for "consistent opportunities [for students] to work on grade-appropriate assignments" and for "teachers who hold high expectations for students and truly believe they can meet grade-level standards."

DuFour's research on Professional Learning Communities (PLCs), specifically in Learning by Doing: A Handbook for PLCs at Work, also supports the "purpose of school is to ensure all students learn at high levels...helping all students learn requires a collaborative and collective effort...to assess our effectiveness in helping all students learn we must focus on results and use results to inform and improve our professional practice."

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.

Create School Conditions for Effective Professional Learning:
1. Provide structure within master schedule to carve out dedicated time for PLC and Common Planning work.
2. Utilize budget sources (district allocation, Title I) to provide support personnel to assist with coaching teachers and providing student interventions as needed for all ESSA subgroups and students targeted for growth and proficiency including those in the LPQ, as well as funding additional teachers to decrease the class-size to maximize instruction and tutors to provide additional enrichment or remediation for students in need.
3. Hire and retain effectively utilizing district incentives for teachers with Effective or Highly Effective 3-year Aggregate VAM scores to fill teacher vacancies.
4. Provide needed supplies for faculty and students to make instruction successful (supported through multiple budget resources).

Person Responsible: Jennifer Crady (cradyj@duvalschools.org)

By When: ongoing

Establish Structure and Expectations for PLCs:
1. Review the schoolwide expectations for strategic, ongoing PLC work with core content areas for standards-based planning processes including planning for standards with created aligned tasks and assessments and use to guide all ongoing PLC and Common Planning work.
2.Collaborate with Academic Leadership Team (admin, coaches/interventionists, district specialist/coach) to provide ongoing PD through PLCs guided by schoolwide Planning Cycle Protocol and determined school or department needs.
4. Provide ongoing support to core content area teachers through PLC and common planning work focused on conversation around standards/benchmarks including the creation of aligned tasks, materials and student assessments and the reflection of student work and performance on formative and summative assessments (to include weekly meetings and quarterly TDEs for continued professional learning).
5. Provide ongoing PD with curricular supplements designed to enrich standards-based instruction (IXL and other blended learning platforms).

Person Responsible: Jennifer Crady (cradyj@duvalschools.org)

By When: ongoing

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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

Area of Focus - Improve perceptions of school culture relating to supportive environments as measured by the annual Five Essentials survey results of students and other internal survey results.
Description and Rationale - The annual Five Essentials survey data related to Supportive Environment has revealed less than desirable results in Safety practices related to in hallways and in bathrooms on campus and outside around the school. In addition, other internal survey results indicate the need for increased social and emotional safety. The survey also reveals less than desirable results in peer support and student-teacher trust. This area of focus is critical because it speaks to needed improvements in school culture that impact students' basic needs according to Maslow's Hierarchy which can have a great affect on their academic performance.

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

The overall measure of the Supportive Environment essential will improve from Very Weak to at least Neutral which will require more students to respond more favorably in the areas of safety, student-teacher trust, peer support for academic word, and academic personalism.

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

Monitoring for Effectiveness:
1. The existing PBIS team will begin to use 5 Essentials data as a baseline for the survey language and data to establish needed improvements.
2. An SEL survey will be issued to students at the start of the year to capture the needs students have returning to school.
3. A progress monitoring survey will be developed to be given to students at least twice during the year as a measure leading up to the 5 Essentials survey given once per year.
4. Classroom and common area walkthroughs will be conducted by ALT members to measure progress with teachers using provided professional learning to improve safety and "felt safety" on campus.
5. Collective commitments related to this area of focus will be standing agenda items for all tiers of school-based meetings and professional learning sessions and on display on campus.

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.)

Utilize a multi-pronged approach to improve perceptions of physical, social and emotional safety of students including improvements to physical structures, teacher-based programs with Calm Classrooms curriculum, utilized TBRI strategies and/or family meetings, community partnerships including Team Up, school-based clubs, restorative justice skills training in conflict management and social skills, training of teachers in mental health first aid, ongoing PBIS team meetings, and implementation of a self-regulation room on campus. All of these research-based strategies will be explicitly communicated with students and families to improve awareness of these practices so that they can be utilized

by more students. Ongoing work based on change packages in partnership with City Year Network for School Improvement will be implemented related to SEAD, Self-advocacy, and Student and Teacher Leaders. Ongoing work supported through NISL research on How People Learn will be implemented in all learning settings.

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

The joint statement from NAESP, NASSP, SSWAA, NASRO, ASCA, and NASP's Executive Summary provides a detailed framework for improving school safety. in that Framework for Safe and Successful Schools, they state that "school safety and positive school climate are not achieved by singular actions but rather by effective comprehensive and collaborative efforts requiring the dedication and commitment of all school staff and relevant community members." This supports our multi-pronged approach to address many approaches to improving school culture related to school safety.

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.

Physical Structures:
1. Work with the district to improve perimeter fencing including a more secure front gate entrance onto campus with crash gates for allowable egress safely.
2. Repair/replace window coverings to improve hard corner safe zones for Code Red/Active Assailant Drills.
3. Ensure every room has a hard corner safe zone on ceiling instead of floor to ensure marks stay constant.
4. Work with local law enforcement and district law enforcement to ensure all required drills and practices related to any evacuations are consistent and executed correctly.
5. Communicate above steps to all stakeholders explicitly including students.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Crady (cradyj@duvalschools.org)

By When: ongoing

Teacher-Based Interventions:
1. Work with district resources and support to provide PD on Calm Classrooms and/or family meetings. Observe in action and provide feedback.
2. Ensure at least 80% of teachers attend Youth Mental Health First Aid required and offered by the district including hosting a pre-planning training option to increase the percentage of teachers completing the training.
4. Reinstitute monthly Club Days, Culture, and Character lessons for increased student connection with teacher sponsors on Early Release days.
5. Provide restorative justice training to all teachers for increased awareness of intervention through guidance and student services. Allot time in master schedule for teacher to implement increased timely restorative justice sessions.
6. Facilitate professional book study on Cornelius Minor's We Got This.
7. Communicate above steps to all stakeholders explicitly including students.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Crady (cradyj@duvalschools.org)

By When: ongoing

Implement Collective Commitments in Professional Learning and within School Community:
1. Provide PD on the research of how people learn to be implemented in all learning settings with adult and student learners. We will attend to the research in all learning settings for all learners.
2. Provide PD on self-advocacy to be implemented within learning and social settings across campus. We will teach and promote self-advocacy for all beginning by listening to all.
3. Provide PD on learners as leaders to be implemented within learning and social settings across campus. We will recognize all stakeholders as learners and leaders.
4. Provide PD on the integration of social emotional learning in academic learning settings and implement within all classes. We will integrate Social Emotional learning into Academic Development in all learning settings.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Crady (cradyj@duvalschools.org)

By When: ongoing

Community Partnerships:
1. Review existing community partnerships including contact information and yearly goals for support.
2. Utilize Team Up program for all students and by special invitation to participate when school-based data indicates the need for further intervention.
3. Utilize Fidelity Investments annual campus improvement funds to support school initiatives related to improved school safety (Zen Den/self-regulation room creation in lieu of ISSP and increased community connections with Fidelity employees focused on mental health needs and opportunities for calls to action).
4. Utilize faith-based partnerships to aid in efforts on campus including possible mentors or other support mechanisms.
5. Utilize Englewood Full-Service Schools for wraparound services for all students in need of further support. Increase number of referrals and completed intakes.
6. Communicate above steps to all stakeholders explicitly including students.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Crady (cradyj@duvalschools.org)

By When: ongoing

Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support (PBIS):
1. Reestablish team and monthly meetings on campus with calendar invites sent to increase participation and use of Teams to increase access to all.
2. Recognize student and teacher award winners for Knightly behaviors monthly and incentives to decrease our top five types of infractions on campus - skipping class, tardiness, classroom disruptions, cafeteria incidents, and fighting.
3. Earn PBIS Model School status.
4. Communicate above steps to all stakeholders explicitly including students.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Crady (cradyj@duvalschools.org)

By When: ongoing

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