

Duval County Public Schools

Twin Lakes Academy 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	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Twin Lakes Academy Middle School

8050 POINT MEADOWS DR, Jacksonville, FL 32256

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

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.

Every student is inspired and prepared for success in high school.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Provide every student, in every classroom, every day with a safe, caring, engaging and challenging learning environment that promotes the rigorous and relevant educational experiences necessary to perform at or above grade level standards.

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, Aurelia	Principal	Facilitate the leadership team meetings where we review and evaluate academic and behavior Tier 1 data to create the plan for Tier 2 academic and behavior support for all students impacted by Tier 1 data. Principal Williams will work with the math department to create a targeted plan to focus on students who are in need of Tier 2 or Tier 3 academic support. Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students for high school education.
Copeland, Daniel	Assistant Principal	As the Science and Social Studies Instructional Lead and AP of Curriculum, AP Copeland will assist with facilitating the leadership meetings where we review and evaluate academic and behavior Tier 1 data to create the plan for Tier 2 academic and behavior support for all students impacted by Tier 1 data. AP Copeland will work with his science accountability teachers to address the academic support for students who need Tier 2 and possibly Tier 3 support. Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students for high school education.
Story, Godfrey	Dean	As the Dean, Mr. Story will review and evaluate Tier 1 and Tier 2 behavior data with the PBIS team. The team will develop strategies aligned with positive interventions to decrease at risk behaviors that negatively impact student learning and academic growth. Utilizing the MTSS model, the sustainable system of service delivery will prepare all students for high school education.
Bryan, Molly	Teacher, ESE	As the FRVE, Ms. Bryan will review and evaluate academic and behavior Tier 1 data to create the plan for Tier 2 academic and behavior support for all students under the ESE subgroup impacted by Tier 1 data. Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students for high school education.
Bolden, Myra	Teacher, K-12	As the Math Department Chair, Ms. Bolden along with the math department will review and evaluate academic and behavior Tier 1 data to create the plan for Tier 2 academic support for all students impacted by Tier 1 data. Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students for high school education.
Madison, Felecia	Teacher, K-12	As the Social Studies Department Chair, Mrs. Madison along with the Civics teachers will review and evaluate academic and behavior Tier 1 data to create the plan for Tier 2 academic and behavior support for all students impacted by Tier 1 data. Utilizing the MTSS model, we will develop a sustainable system of service delivery that prepares all students for high school education.

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.

The school leadership team reviews the data from the state assessments as well as the UChicago survey to design the plan of action. Also, the information gathered from the stakeholders meeting is incorporated in the development of the SIP. The team takes a deep dive into the silos for each grade level and the respective subgroups within each silos to determine the need. After the deep dive, the team review the students impacted in those silos and take a cross curriculum look into the individual test history and level of support. A visual is completed to bring all the factors into the plan to ensure we did not overlook any areas of concerns. This information is shared with the faculty, staff, and SAC to gain feedback and insight.

SIP Monitoring

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

The SIP will be reviewed by the leadership team after each state progress monitoring assessment to ensure continuous improvement. The team will also review and adjust based on district and school level monitoring assessment in order to meet the targets. This information will also be shared with faculty, staff, and SAC for feedback and insight.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	70%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	72%
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)* English Language Learners (ELL) Native American Students (AMI) 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: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
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	155	89	110	354	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	80	76	186	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	45	33	85	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	29	28	59	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	150	146	153	449	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	138	147	102	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		

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	152	162	139	453	

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	8	14	22	44
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	5	7	62

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	48	47	200	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	62	72	150	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	3	12	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	13	36	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	92	118	131	341	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	103	106	131	340	
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	73	109	119	301

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	4	21	4	29
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	13

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	48	47	200	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	62	72	150	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	3	12	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	20	13	36	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	92	118	131	341	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	103	106	131	340	
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	73	109	119	301	

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	4	21	4	29
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	5	13

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*	40	42	49	39	43	50	39		
ELA Learning Gains				45			40		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				36			30		
Math Achievement*	39	49	56	44	35	36	44		
Math Learning Gains				49			35		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49			33		
Science Achievement*	45	48	49	48	48	53	52		
Social Studies Achievement*	61	66	68	72	53	58	68		
Middle School Acceleration	78	82	73	85	47	49	80		
Graduation Rate					48	49			
College and Career Acceleration					69	70			
ELP Progress	29	31	40	47	85	76	39		

** 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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	292
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	514
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	18	Yes	2	2
ELL	26	Yes	1	1
AMI	27	Yes	1	1
ASN	72			
BLK	46			
HSP	43			
MUL	57			
PAC				
WHT	60			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	43			

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	25	Yes	1	1
ELL	41			
AMI	48			
ASN	77			
BLK	44			
HSP	49			
MUL	57			
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	46			

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	40			39			45	61	78			29
SWD	15			19			11	28			4	
ELL	15			24			23	41			5	29
AMI	23			31							2	
ASN	61			66			58	81	92		5	
BLK	30			33			31	54	83		5	
HSP	28			28			44	55	72		6	30
MUL	45			40			55	67	79		5	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	56			49			55	66	74		5	
FRL	32			31			33	55	70		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	39	45	36	44	49	49	48	72	85			47
SWD	9	26	25	13	35	38	12	38				
ELL	20	34	28	25	39	37	25	58	100			47
AMI	36	55		27	73							
ASN	67	65		72	65		70	100	100			
BLK	26	37	33	31	44	45	33	59	84			
HSP	32	42	32	38	47	48	43	70	91			43
MUL	48	44	45	50	52	43	65	75	93			
PAC												
WHT	51	52	43	57	50	51	57	83	78			58
FRL	30	39	29	34	47	50	38	60	80			50

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	39	40	30	44	35	33	52	68	80			39
SWD	9	23	29	12	24	27	13	49				
ELL	18	36	31	23	34	35	19	41	50			39
AMI	42	36		25	36							
ASN	68	57	27	72	61		82	83	95			
BLK	27	33	27	27	22	28	33	65	59			
HSP	34	40	32	40	34	25	40	52	78			37
MUL	55	55		55	42	42	64	75	81			
PAC												
WHT	45	42	32	57	44	42	64	79	90			50
FRL	30	35	27	32	25	26	39	65	63			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	37%	40%	-3%	47%	-10%
08	2023 - Spring	37%	41%	-4%	47%	-10%
06	2023 - Spring	34%	38%	-4%	47%	-13%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	25%	43%	-18%	54%	-29%
07	2023 - Spring	42%	40%	2%	48%	-6%
08	2023 - Spring	29%	45%	-16%	55%	-26%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	33%	35%	-2%	44%	-11%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	80%	52%	28%	50%	30%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	92%	52%	40%	48%	44%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	97%	64%	33%	63%	34%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	55%	63%	-8%	66%	-11%

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 the 2022-2023 FAST data, 6th grade math showed the lowest performance. This sub group dropped 12 percentage points, but the math proficiency only dropped one percentage point overall. The factors contributing to last year's low performance was the poor attendance due to health reason for one teacher. The students missed out on valuable effective instruction that could have sustained their learning from one grade level to the next. This subgroup has struggled over the last two years with sustaining high performing students, but normally comes out with a short single digit drop.

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

Based on the 2022-2023 state assessment data, Civics has the greatest decline from the prior year. The school year started with a surplus from high school teacher with Civics experience teaching the course. After PM1, the teacher's data revealed a need for pedagogical support for the teacher by the region specialist and mentor. Support was provided, but the monitoring data didn't show the growth needed. After the results from PM2, the decision was made to switch the teacher to a different course with a teacher with a stronger Civics pedagogy and relationship with the students in January. The outcome shows a 11 percentage points drop, but the based on the previous data leading to the assessment had the school with a 20+ percentage points drop.

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.

Based on the 2022-2023 state assessment data, the greatest gap when compared to the state average is ELA. ELA did not show any growth for proficiency; it remain stagnant from the previous year. For 6th grade, a teacher resigned in March due to family emergency caused for relocation, vacancy in Reading, and a struggling 8th grade teacher are factors that contributed to the stability and no movement in proficiency. ELA also is the subgroup that has no other content that can count for proficiency for this subgroup e.g. acceleration courses count for math and science. The previous year assessment for 7th grade showed a 3 percentage points increase which is the first in the last three year. This grade level normally shows little to no growth.

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

Based on the 2022-2023 state assessment data, 7th grade math made the most improvement. This grade level had an 11 percentage points increase from the previous year. One new action was the school incorporated the new 7th grade acceleration course to strengthen the student pedagogy for Algebra. These students had an experience teacher with a proven track record to teach the skills needed to support learning and growth for these subgroup of students. The grade level team was anchored by the Foundational teacher who used Ignite to support the learning gap for a targeted group of students who needed additional teacher support via tutoring. These actions played a significant role in the improvement for this grade level success.

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

Based on the EWS data from Part I, my two potential areas of concern are attendance and suspension. Both play a critical role in the academic success of students. If students are not in school, then there is a lost opportunity to support the students academically and behaviorally which will have a direct impact on their academic growth.

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

My highest priorities for school improvement in the upcoming school year will be math, Civics, and ELA. Reading is the foundation for all content, so strengthen our students' ability to engage with grade level context through aligned task and consistent progress monitoring will provide the data needed to plan for student's academic success.

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 Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Based on the Math data, we should have a laser focus approach on being strategic and intentional with how we address and meet the individual academic needs of our ESE, targeted proficiency and LPQ students. The data revealed that some of the students who should have made gains or proficiency based on previous data did not made gains not proficiency based on the FAST data.

Measurable Outcome:

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

If we implement benchmark based instruction using the MTRs to create grade level aligned task/activity for procedural fluency and practice and progress monitoring with fidelity, then student achievement will increase for our LPQ students in math. We will use individualized prescriptions fully aligned with grade level expectations in math using PMA data and teacher developed common assessment for progress monitoring.

Monitoring:

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

We will use PMA data, district level assessment, and teacher developed common assessments to assist with monitoring and decision to shift in practice if needed to meet the grade level math expectations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Aurelia Williams (raya@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.)

Allow time for teachers to collaborate and engage in collaborative planning opportunities involving analysis of student achievement data, the creation of individualized prescriptions with prescriptive strategies and the opportunity to unpacking standards to ensure the alignment of tasks and assessments are measuring the depth of standard.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Using the individualized prescriptions to progress monitor student achievement, teachers will consistently collect student achievement data to review and assess growth as determined by grade level cut scores. We will use state, district, and school level data for progress monitoring.

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.

Providing teachers time during Common Planning and Early Release for professional development sessions to progress monitor and collaborate with peers in disaggregating student data, identifying

prescriptive interventions and resources, and developing activities to remediate students' instructional areas of weakness and enrich students' instructional strengths based on student prescriptions.

Person Responsible: Aurelia Williams (raya@duvalschools.org)

By When: Admin will complete weekly Benchmark Based Walkthroughs and provide timely and specific feedback utilizing Common Learning and Planning as the forum to address the teaching and learning gaps.

Provide teachers with the learning opportunity to participate in common planning sessions with administration and District Specialist to review data from current assessments and utilize data trackers to identify and progress monitor learning.

Person Responsible: Aurelia Williams (raya@duvalschools.org)

By When: Admin will complete weekly Benchmark Based Walkthroughs and provide timely and specific feedback utilizing Common Learning and Planning as the forum to address the teaching and learning gaps.

Model the process of creating and monitoring effective prescriptive sets and the use of resources such as a Standard Protocol to ensure standard based instruction and aligned tasks and assessments are being used to measure the depth of standards.

Person Responsible: Myra Bolden (boldenm@duvalschools.org)

By When: Admin will complete weekly Benchmark Based Walkthroughs and provide timely and specific feedback utilizing Common Learning and Planning as the forum to address the teaching and learning gaps.

#2. 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.

After reflecting on the 2023 FAST data, we still have work to do in the area of aligned instruction as it relates to student tasks and activities as it relates to benchmarks/standards based instruction. The data from the benchmarks walkthroughs continues to show that the instruction matches the information on the focus board and the materials used were not consistently aligned with the posted benchmark/standard, but the most crucial part of learning was the student task alignment did not often coordinate with the posted benchmark/standard which didn't allow for procedural practice, student discourse, or evidence of learning. This missed opportunity impacted the mastery of the benchmark/standard and the learning gaps not being addressed appropriately.

Measurable Outcome:

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

With a fairly new staff, teachers will engage in a refresh in benchmarks/standards based instruction learning plans procedures to strengthen Tier 1 instruction to build pedagogical capacity. By December 2023, we will want the benchmark walkthrough dashboard to reveal a better alignment with instructional materials and student task alignment as evident by a positive growth on the district or state progress monitoring assessment.

Monitoring:

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored by using the approved district Benchmark Walkthrough tool and informal observations with timely authentic feedback and opportunity for . Based on the Benchmarks Walk-through Tool, our admin team can measure classrooms that have student task alignment that coordinates with the benchmarks/standards and use their classrooms as models for best practices for other teachers to see during a classroom gallery walk with admin.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Aurelia Williams (raya@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teachers will continue to collaborate and engage in tiered professional common learning opportunities involving unpacking standards to create aligned activities and tasks that are content grade level appropriate for where the teacher should be in the objective of the posted benchmark/standard.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Collaboration and engaging in tiered professional learning opportunities will allow teachers the opportunity to work together on potential solutions to address common barriers that are impacting student individual and collective achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Providing teachers time during common planning and Early Release for professional development sessions to progress monitor and collaborate with peers in disaggregating student data, identifying prescriptive interventions and resources, and developing activities to remediate students' instructional areas of weakness and enrich students' instructional strengths based on student prescriptions.

Person Responsible: Aurelia Williams (raya@duvalschools.org)

By When: Admin will complete weekly Benchmark Based Walkthroughs and provide timely and specific feedback utilizing Common Learning and Planning as the forum to address the teaching and learning gaps.

Focus Walks opportunities will be created by admin to allow time for teachers to observe best practices of the targeted focus. We will use the Benchmark Walk-through tool to guide our calibration.

Person Responsible: Daniel Copeland (copelandd@duvalschools.org)

By When: Admin will complete weekly Benchmark Based Walkthroughs and provide timely and specific feedback utilizing Common Learning and Planning as the forum to address the teaching and learning gaps.

Benchmarks Walk-through by admin will focus to ensure we have shared common definitions, evidence, and expectations across all grade level and contents will yield to evidence that our content teams consistently plan benchmarks/standards based instruction with aligned tasks and assessments. Admin will complete at least 2 walks together a day to ensure calibration is aligned with our vision and mission for our school culture and climate.

Person Responsible: Aurelia Williams (raya@duvalschools.org)

By When: Admin will complete weekly Benchmark Based Walkthroughs and provide timely and specific feedback utilizing Common Learning and Planning as the forum to address the teaching and learning gaps.

#3. 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.

Academic growth is higher when students feel safe both in and around their school learning environment. Due to the poor rating on the UChicago Survey in the area of school safety and culture, we will address building a positive culture and environment for all students.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The UChicago Survey will show an improvement from poor to neutral with the hopes of substantial growth to a good indicator that we are on our way to building A+ PACK mentality.

Monitoring:

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

This Area of Focus will be monitored by providing all stakeholders especially students the opportunities to share their input or ideas for improving our school safety and culture. Use the data generated from the stakeholders to tweak our plan of action to better serve our school community. PBIS and the monitoring of our NSI City Year Initiative will also be contributing factors for monitoring our desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Godfrey Story (storyg@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.)

Provide students with information regarding emergency procedures on a daily basis. Use the discipline data to address the areas of needs for students and teachers. Teachers and staff consistency with school policies especially during the transition of classes will help decrease the unwanted behaviors and increase the positive behaviors.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Verbally preparing students for an emergency situation to help them to recall action steps in case of an actual emergency. Limiting the number of students in the hallways and restrooms will also make the environment less overwhelming and easier to supervise for teachers in the hallways. Posting GFS(Guidelines for Success) in specific locations to remind students of the expected behaviors.

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.

Incorporate ERT protocol in the morning announcements

Person Responsible: Aurelia Williams (raya@duvalschools.org)

By When: Students will receive the emergency and safety protocols during the morning announcements daily.

Signage posted pertaining to Guidelines for Success. As teachers are greeting their students at their door, they will be able to monitor the behaviors during transitions. Security will monitor the hallways and restrooms during the instructional periods.

Person Responsible: Godfrey Story (storyg@duvalschools.org)

By When: Daily by assigned faculty and staff.

The Dean will provide quarterly code of conduct assemblies for students. Teachers will be provided the discipline data to address the areas of concerns and how it will be address as a collective faculty during the early release days or faculty meetings. The Dean will review the feedback from the monthly fire and active shooter drills.

Person Responsible: Godfrey Story (storyg@duvalschools.org)

By When: Admin and the Dean will monitor these actions weekly and tweak as needed.

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 SAI funds will be used to provide targeted morning/afternoon tutoring or lunch bunch tutoring with the purpose of addressing learning gaps based on district and state progress monitoring assessment. Each accountability teacher will identify their target groups based on the number of points needed for proficiency or learning gains as it relates to the current data. Using designed benchmark/standards based instructional plans to address the learning gaps, the teachers will monitor students progress and address accordingly. The bookkeeper will be about of the fiscal monitoring of the funds allocated to ensure the resources are appropriately being used and allocated to meet the needs of the students and meet the expected outcomes.