Jefferson Schools K 12 School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Jefferson Schools K 12

50 DAVID RD, Monticello, FL 32344

www.jeffersonschools.net

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Jefferson County School Board on 8/14/2023.

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.

Jefferson Pre K-12 promotes a culture that maximizes student achievement and fosters the development of responsible, self-directed learners in a safe and enriching environment to support future life-long learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We believe that….
- Trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring and citizenship are essential to all.
- Everyone has intrinsic value.
- Every person can contribute something of worth to society.
- Individuals are responsible and accountable for their choices and decisions.
- Individuals need caring relationships and a nurturing environment in order to grow.
- Supportive family relationships are the foundation of the community.
- High expectations lead to higher performance which in turn, empowers the individual and strengthens society.
- Continuous learning is a lifelong process!

Trustworthiness, Respect, Responsibility, Fairness, Caring, and Citizenship are guiding character traits that are found in the Core Values at JCS. Individual worth and high expectations for all students are also part of this value system. JCS will use a common approach in effort to show that children matter, values matter, character matter, and academic excellence matters in our community as well as our country.

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
Pons, Jackie	Principal	
Corder , Kathy	Instructional Coach	
Wilson, Kristin	Assistant Principal	The A.P. assists with planning and preparing the SIP implementation. Additionally, the A.P. assists in monitoring the SIP and ensuring that it is implemented with fidelity.
Burnum, Jennifer	Other	Set up calendar invites for stakeholder, staff and other meetings as requested by the principal. Takes notes for the meetings when requested. Assists in gathering documentation as requested by the principal.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The school hosts a school advisory council meeting every month. These meetings include all required stakeholders, and they assist in giving input into the SIP to help the school reach its mission and vision. These meetings are also open to the entire community.

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 school administrators will monitor the implementation and impact on student achievement by ensuring that walkthroughs through classrooms are done, lessons are up to the correct grade level rigor, and are following the approved lesson plans. Additionally, the school administration, educators, and staff will follow the data to make any needed adjustments as the school year progresses. Teams will plan in common planning to ensure that all grade levels are uniform (including utilizing the uniform grading categories), and that each student is getting the education needed to succeed academically. We are currently working with the BSI team as well as our academic coaches that are doing consistent walkthroughs and assisting with the common planning.

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)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	81%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	95%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	Yes
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) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)*

School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: D 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	44	32	42	45	40	41	40	47	45	376
One or more suspensions	10	2	17	33	16	28	36	38	45	225
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	10	13	13	27	0	2	7	5	16	93
Course failure in Math	7	7	13	27	2	1	12	10	14	93
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	9	11	19	30	29	19	18	31	27	193
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	3	4	9	22	31	30	17	28	26	170
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	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	19	12	8	23	12	12	15	14	7	167
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	0	8	12	3	6	6	2	1	0	95
Course failure in Math	0	5	4	1	4	5	0	21	15	97
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	26	20	19	27	31	320
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	14	24	19	32	30	189
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	5	7	2	12	12	10	9	19	140

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	3	2	3	1	4	8	82

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	19	12	8	23	12	12	15	14	7	122
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	8	12	3	6	6	2	1	0	38
Course failure in Math	0	5	4	1	4	5	0	21	15	55
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	26	20	19	27	31	123
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	14	24	19	32	30	119
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	5	7	2	12	12	10	9	19	76

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	3	2	3	1	4	8	21

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*	28	27	53	30		55	33		
ELA Learning Gains				36			29		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				21			38		
Math Achievement*	26	26	55	47		42	34		
Math Learning Gains				48			18		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				36			23		
Science Achievement*	22	21	52	32		54	9		
Social Studies Achievement*	43	42	68			59			
Middle School Acceleration	64	60	70			51			
Graduation Rate			74			50			
College and Career Acceleration			53			70			
ELP Progress	23	23	55	48		70	50		

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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	33
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	231
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	96
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	37
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	298
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97
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	6	Yes	3	2
ELL	18	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	23	Yes	4	1
HSP	24	Yes	1	1
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	48			

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	26	Yes	3	1

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	27	Yes	2	1
ELL	44			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	35	Yes	3	
HSP	44			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	49			
FRL	33	Yes	2	

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	28			26			22	43	64			23
SWD	9			4			5				3	
ELL	7			28			14				4	23
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25			19			17	35			5	
HSP	22			30			19				4	24
MUL												

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	42			46			39	64			4	
FRL	26			20			14	41			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	30	36	21	47	48	36	32					48
SWD	22	24	14	23	36	42	31					
ELL	30	30		50	60							48
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	27	37		42	47	23	35					
HSP	24	36		48	64							46
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	47	42		71	36							
FRL	28	34	10	45	46	40	29					

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	33	29	38	34	18	23	9					50
SWD	14	15		14	0		0					
ELL	29			31								50
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29	19		31	5	20	0					
HSP	35			19								50
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	44	46		54	50		29					
FRL	31	32	45	33	15	18	9					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	36%	35%	1%	50%	-14%
05	2023 - Spring	36%	36%	0%	54%	-18%
07	2023 - Spring	25%	25%	0%	47%	-22%
08	2023 - Spring	24%	21%	3%	47%	-23%
09	2023 - Spring	26%	25%	1%	48%	-22%
04	2023 - Spring	21%	21%	0%	58%	-37%
06	2023 - Spring	38%	33%	5%	47%	-9%
03	2023 - Spring	22%	22%	0%	50%	-28%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	26%	24%	2%	54%	-28%
07	2023 - Spring	24%	23%	1%	48%	-24%
03	2023 - Spring	37%	37%	0%	59%	-22%
04	2023 - Spring	18%	18%	0%	61%	-43%
08	2023 - Spring	34%	33%	1%	55%	-21%
05	2023 - Spring	23%	23%	0%	55%	-32%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	3%	2%	1%	44%	-41%
05	2023 - Spring	15%	15%	0%	51%	-36%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	23%	18%	5%	50%	-27%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
N/A	2023 - Spring	62%	62%	0%	48%	14%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
N/A	2023 - Spring	47%	47%	0%	63%	-16%

CIVICS						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
N/A	2023 - Spring	33%	29%	4%	66%	-33%

HISTORY						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
N/A	2023 - Spring	43%	41%	2%	63%	-20%

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.

Algebra I EOC showed the lowest performance with 10% at level 3 or above. There were only 13 students that took the Algebra 1 EOC testing. The school had 3 proficient students and 3 Level 2 students, 7 students scored Level 1. Since only a small number of students took this test, we will be planning with our teachers to ensure that we provide data analysis to identify the necessary standards to ensure the students are able to reach proficiency.

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

5th grade science data showed the greatest decline with a 16% decrease. 5th grade had a beginning teacher that worked with a departmentalized science department, and this was her first time in the science content area.

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.

Grade 4 math the Algebra 1 EOC had the largest gaps with both having a 43% difference from the state average. Midway through the year we had a Grade 4 teacher leave and the teacher was replaced with a departmentalized teacher that had an ELA strength because midyear it was difficult to locate a math teacher. There were only 13 students that took the Algebra 1 EOC testing. The school had 3 proficient students and 3 Level 2 students, 7 students scored Level 1.

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

Geometry and Biology showed the most improvement. Geometry was even above the state average. The school brought in a dedicated science coach, as well as a new certified math teacher that had experience and supported them through the common planning process to ensure that the curriculum is directly aligned with the standards.

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

4th and 5th grades had minimal course failures in comparison to state testing achievement.

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

1. Algebra I
2. 5th and 8th grade science
3. 3rd and 4th grade ELA
4. 4th grade math

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 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.

The data was reviewed by the administrative team and instructional coaches to identify this area of improvement. To address this, the coaches will work closely with teachers to manage the standards and monitor the fidelity of the alignment to the standards in their instruction with weekly walkthroughs of teacher classrooms by administration and coaches to ensure that the teachers are ensuring lesson/ standard alignment. We will pay for a trainer/consultant Dr. Szbryka to work with 5th and 8th grade standards alignment training. Dr. Szbryka is working with teachers on curriculum mapping and standard alignment inside of their PLCs. She is also working directly with the coaches to help ensure that teachers are meeting the needs of their students and that the rigor of the standards is being met and taught as well. She currently works successfully with several other Florida school districts doing the same work with positive results.

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

The goal is to have students make at least a 5% gain overall from the previous year's achievement scores in both the 5th and 8th grade science assessment.

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

Progress monitoring, common planning, data chats, and walkthroughs as well as lesson plan reviews by coaches/leadership team.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jackie Pons (jpons@jeffersonschools.net)

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.)

Hiring certified science teachers in the lower grade levels to ensure students are better prepared for the cumulative 8th grade assessment. More frequent formative assessments to track annually assessed standards for the students. Once the teachers have the formative assessment data they can reteach the standards that are not at proficiency. We are utilizing interactive computer simulations through Explore Learning called Gizmos. Teachers are supported by utilizing the curriculum maps that Dr. Szbryka is working with the team to create and teachers also have a coach to assist them in lesson planning, modeling as well as alignment and rigor.

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

We noticed teachers may have taught the standards but it may not have been to the rigor of the assessment or it was not retaught to those that did not meet proficiency the first time around. Due to this finding, we are supporting teachers with more coaching and a trainer/consultant that has assisted several other districts in bringing up students' science scores. The trainer/consultant will work with teachers inside of their PLCs to address student needs and how to reteach lessons without slowing the pace of the instruction for the entire class.

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.

Interviewing and hiring science teachers for the lower grade that are certified in the sciences.

Person Responsible: Jackie Pons (jpons@jeffersonschools.net)

By When: By August 7, 2023

Formative assessments across grade levels in the lower grades

Person Responsible: Kristin Wilson (kwilson@jeffersonschools.net)

By When: Quarterly

Utilizing the programs that offer formative assistance that are aligned to the Florida Standards.

Person Responsible: Kristin Wilson (kwilson@jeffersonschools.net)

By When: Each quarter these will be completed and given to the instructional coach for review by the AP.

#2. 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.

3rd-5th math we identified that students are struggling with technology skills and technology exposure for successful FAST testing. We will provide some computerized assistance to be utilized in small groups and in instruction (as well as intervention time). The i-Ready program will ensure that students are able to practice the standards they are not meeting proficiency in.

In addition, the team also identified Algebra I as an area of focus concerning math.

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

3rd-5th math will gain 5% overall as measured on the FAST PM3 data.

Algebra I students will have a 5% gain overall on the Algebra I end of course exam.

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

Progress monitoring, common planning, data chats, and walkthroughs as well as lesson plan reviews by coaches/leadership team.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jackie Pons (jpons@jeffersonschools.net)

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.)

i-Ready is being utilized in grades 3-6 to help with technology as well as standards-based instruction and data for teachers to utilize for re-teaching and lesson extension. We are also providing additional time for math instruction in grades K-6.

The district has also purchased a new Algebra I curriculum "Florida Reveal Algebra I" that is aligned to the B.E.S.T. standards. We will also utilize the FDOE Algebra I toolkit to enhance the understanding of the standards, clarify the reporting of categories on the Algebra I end-of-year course exam and support instruction with tasks that are well aligned with the benchmarks. Based on the data, teachers will identify underperforming students in reporting categories and utilize a fraction of their instructional period to reteach the standards that students need.

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

Seeing the team identified technology as an issue for our students, i-Ready will give them the technology exposure and skills, it also gives the teachers data to utilize in the classroom in real-time.

The FDOE has created the toolkit to assist teachers and schools to help ensure that the students are meeting proficiency. The toolkit also provides a section that covers quality instructional practices to support teachers. Additionally, the texts are aligned to the new B.E.S.T. standards so that students will have on-grade-level texts to utilize each day.

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.

Purchase i-Ready

Person Responsible: Jackie Pons (jpons@jeffersonschools.net)

By When: August 7, 2023

Preplanning training on i-Ready for teachers that will be utilizing it in the classroom

Person Responsible: Jackie Pons (jpons@jeffersonschools.net)

By When: August 9, 2023

Lesson plans will reflect the usage of i-Ready and the data of the students to assist teachers in reteaching areas that the students are not proficient in.

Person Responsible: Jackie Pons (jpons@jeffersonschools.net)

By When: Weekly

Walkthroughs to ensure i-Ready usage and data monitoring by admin or coaches.

Person Responsible: Jackie Pons (jpons@jeffersonschools.net)

By When: Weekly

Additional time to be spent on math in the classroom during classroom intervention times and small group times.

Person Responsible: Jackie Pons (jpons@jeffersonschools.net)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year with data sharing done after formative assessments and progress monitoring.

#3. 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.

3rd and 4th grade levels were identified as an area of focus due to proficiency levels on the FAST PM3.

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

3rd and 4th grade will improve by at least 5% overall from PM3 (22-23) to PM3 (23-24).

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

Progress monitoring, common planning, data chats, and walkthroughs as well as lesson plan reviews by coaches/leadership team. The administration and instructional coaches will complete weekly walkthroughs to ensure that teachers are teaching the rigor of the standards and that standards are aligned to the teaching of the lessons. Teachers received PD this summer and in planning this fall over i-Ready and rigor in the standards.There will be additional opportunities utilizing instructional coaches and outside sources for teachers to gain more PD in literacy and the science of reading.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jackie Pons (jpons@jeffersonschools.net)

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.)

Small groups with reading mastery will be used as well as additional intervention time using Lexia.

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

Both reading mastery and Lexia are proven effective to utilize with these grades to meet proficiency.

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.

Purchase Reading Mastery and Lexia

Person Responsible: Jackie Pons (jpons@jeffersonschools.net)

By When: August 7, 2023

PD for reading mastery and Lexia for teachers not yet trained during pre-planning.

Person Responsible: Jackie Pons (jpons@jeffersonschools.net)

By When: August 10, 2023

Lesson plan and teaching utilizing the Reading Mastery and Lexia to be sent to the admin team weekly. Walkthroughs to ensure that each is being implemented with fidelity.

Person Responsible: Jackie Pons (jpons@jeffersonschools.net)

By When: Weekly throughout the year.

#4. 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.

Experienced teachers with effective and highly effective VAM scores are difficult to locate in rural areas. Therefore, we are going to focus on ensuring our teachers are supported with professional development, mentoring programs, coaching when requested or needed, common planning as well as a competitive salary in comparison to the other rural districts in Florida.

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

We will retain 80% of our effective and highly effective teachers. This retention rate also applies to those without a VAM score but had students with large learning gains and/or met proficiency utilizing the FAST progress monitoring.

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

End of year data on those that are effective and highly effective that are retained at Jefferson County K-12 school.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jackie Pons (jpons@jeffersonschools.net)

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.)

During common planning, we will also ensure that input is gathered from the teachers on how we can improve our school culture and create a positive learning climate for all stakeholders.
Additionally, the district is paying a highly competitive wage compared to any other district in the surrounding rural areas. The district is providing quite a bit of professional learning for teachers including stipends for time that is outside of their contract hours.

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

It has been proven time and time again that effective and highly effective teachers are able to reach all students in their classroom and help promote a positive learning environment for all stakeholders.

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.

Monitoring or FAST progress monitoring results by teacher.

Person Responsible: Jackie Pons (jpons@jeffersonschools.net)

By When: Once results are available the principal has 3 weeks to review the data and discuss it with teachers.

Planning for professional learning by the administrative team with instructional and non-instructional staff input.

Person Responsible: Jackie Pons (jpons@jeffersonschools.net)

By When: Every 9 week period.

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).

School data is reviewed with the leadership team, including instructional coaches, to ensure that the resources needed are planned for based on the data and that it can be effectively implemented and monitored.

Title I Requirements

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

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

The school takes all of these plans to the School Advisory Council and the school board for approval. Additionally, copies of plans are available on the district's website, board docs from the school board meeting (an online portal), and there are copies in the school office. The school's website is: www.jeffersonschools.net.

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

The plans cover parent and family engagement, how to be involved as well as being planned with community members, the school advisory committee input, and our community partnership school personnel. The school sends home communications via Facebook as well as a one-call system that sends out automated calls. The school sends home progress reports at every half quarter and report cards at the end of every 9-week period. Teachers frequently communicate with parents and parents are encouraged to keep the lines of communication open. Teachers offer parent/teacher conferences face to face as well as through phone calls and emails when necessary to meet the families' needs. There is

also a translator available for parents who do not speak English.
The school's website is: www.jeffersonschools.net.

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))

All four areas of focus allow for a strengthening of the academic program by reaching the needs of the students based on the data and trends that were identified. Each one was identified using the most current data given to us from FDOE and allowed the team and its stakeholders to also give input into the 4 identified areas and ways to help improve the students' educational experience.

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))

Title II offers professional development for staff, ARP Afterschool and weekend program provides additional tutoring in all of the targeted areas, 21st CLCC is offered and offers assistance in core curriculum as well as TSSSA funds that are utilized for additional staff. The community partnership school provides support in expanded learning, family and community engagement, and health and wellness. Additionally, Title I offers funding for parent and family involvement. Family nights are still being planned but are being done every other month with parent meetings every month. There is a meeting in October that will have several business leaders, community members and various services that are available to parents to assist them in meeting their family needs as well as their child's educational needs. These are planned with parents, administration from the school and district, teachers, non-instructional staff and community members as well as our Community Partnership School personnel.

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

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

The school has a community partnership school and personnel that assists with mental health (including Apalachee services for counseling when needed). Additionally, the school is contracted with the local health department to assist in meeting needs that are outside of academics but may keep students from being able to learn at school. The community partnership additionally assists in ensuring students have food, clothing, medical care, etc. to make sure that all of our students' basic needs are met.

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

Students are given guidance by the guidance counselor on all available CTE programs. Additionally, middle school students are able to visit each CTE program in the spring to help boost interest in the CTE courses offered. All students are required to take at least one CTE course to help them graduate with at least one certification in a course.

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

The school utilizes PBIS and MTSS to help ensure that students' behavioral needs are being met. The team meets to discuss students who are showing behaviors that are distracting them (and other students) from learning and work to meet the needs of the students to help them to be successful.

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

The school has built-in in-service days this school year to offer PD in areas that are identified by the admin team. This may be an extension of pre-planning PD on the new curriculum, standards alignment in planning, reteaching standards, etc.

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

Preschool teachers work closely with the kindergarten teachers to ensure students leave their classrooms on grade level and are able to be successful in the kindergarten classroom. Teachers plan and meet several times during the school year.

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				$95,387.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	120	0111 - Jefferson Schools K 12	School Improvement Funds	1.0	$47,000.00
			Notes: Science teacher for lower grades with a certification in science to assist students in meeting the standards.			
	5100	210	0111 - Jefferson Schools K 12	School Improvement Funds		$7,150.00
			Notes: Retirement for teacher			
	5100	220	0111 - Jefferson Schools K 12	School Improvement Funds		$5,200.00
			Notes: Social Security			
	5100	230	0111 - Jefferson Schools K 12	School Improvement Funds		$11,000.00
			Notes: Group insurance			

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	240	0111 - Jefferson Schools K 12	School Improvement Funds		$942.50
			Notes: Worker's compensation			
	5100	369	0111 - Jefferson Schools K 12	School Improvement Funds		$5,000.00
			Notes: Gizmo-tech rental			
	5100	140	0111 - Jefferson Schools K 12	School Improvement Funds		$1,000.00
			Notes: Substitute for when the teacher is out of the classroom.			
	5100	220	0111 - Jefferson Schools K 12	School Improvement Funds		$80.00
			Notes: Social Security			
	5100	240	0111 - Jefferson Schools K 12	School Improvement Funds		$14.50
			Notes: Worker's Compensation			
	6400	310	0111 - Jefferson Schools K 12	UniSIG		$18,000.00
			Notes: Consultant for 5th and 8th grade science alignement			
2	**III.B.**	**Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**				**$111,128.88**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	369	0111 - Jefferson Schools K 12	School Improvement Funds		$9,630.15
			Notes: i-Ready tech rental			
	5100	520	0111 - Jefferson Schools K 12	UniSIG		$23,018.23
			Notes: Florida Reveal Algebra I			
	5100	120	0111 - Jefferson Schools K 12	UniSIG	1.0	$55,000.00
			Notes: Math Teacher for Algebra I			
	5100	210	0111 - Jefferson Schools K 12	UniSIG		$6,050.00
			Notes: Retirement for math teacher			
	5100	220	0111 - Jefferson Schools K 12	UniSIG		$4,538.00
			Notes: Social Security for math teacher			
	5100	230	0111 - Jefferson Schools K 12	UniSIG		$11,000.00
			Notes: Group insurance for math teacher			

	5100	240	0111 - Jefferson Schools K 12	UniSIG		$798.00
			Notes: Worker's Compensation for math teacher			
	5100	140	0111 - Jefferson Schools K 12	UniSIG		$1,000.00
			Notes: Substitute for when math teacher is out of the classroom			
	5100	220	0111 - Jefferson Schools K 12	UniSIG		$80.00
			Notes: Social Security for math substitute			
	5100	240	0111 - Jefferson Schools K 12	UniSIG		$14.50
			Notes: Worker's Compensation for math substitute			
3	**III.B.**	**Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**				**$108,342.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2023-24
	5100	369	0111 - Jefferson Schools K 12	UniSIG		$10,000.00
			Notes: Lexia tech rental intervention and online PD with one on one coach			
	5100	369	0111 - Jefferson Schools K 12	UniSIG		$20,000.00
			Notes: Reading Mastery-tech rental			
	5100	120	0111 - Jefferson Schools K 12	UniSIG		$55,000.00
			Notes: A classroom teacher for ELA			
	5100	210	0111 - Jefferson Schools K 12	UniSIG		$6,050.00
			Notes: Retirement			
	5100	220	0111 - Jefferson Schools K 12	UniSIG		$4,400.00
			Notes: Social Security			
	5100	230	0111 - Jefferson Schools K 12	UniSIG		$11,000.00
			Notes: Group insurance			
	5100	240	0111 - Jefferson Schools K 12	UniSIG		$797.50
			Notes: Worker's Compensation			
	5100	140	0111 - Jefferson Schools K 12	UniSIG		$1,000.00
			Notes: Substitute for when classroom teacher is out			
	5100	220	0111 - Jefferson Schools K 12	UniSIG		$80.00
			Notes: Social Security			

	5100	240	0111 - Jefferson Schools K 12	UniSIG		$14.50
			Notes: Worker's compensation			
4	**III.B.**	**Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment**				**$0.00**
					Total:	**$314,857.88**

Budget Approval

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

No