

Duval County Public Schools

John Stockton Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

John Stockton Elementary School

4827 CARLISLE RD, Jacksonville, FL 32210

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

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.

Our commitment to our learning community is to inspire lifelong learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Be a learning community where highly qualified staff, motivated students, devoted parents, and committed business partners work together to create a positive school culture meeting the needs of the 21st century student.

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
Brannan, Stephanie	Principal	The main roles of the administration team is to oversee he instructional and managerial processes of the school. Administration observes, supports, provides professional development and evaluates teachers and all other members of the school. The principal oversees the school budget, professional development, school activities and engages stakeholders. The principal also engages with the students on a daily basis providing small group support as well as academic goal setting.
Doss, Angela	Assistant Principal	The main roles of the administration team is to oversee he instructional and managerial processes of the school. Administration observes, supports, provides professional development and evaluates teachers and all other members of the school. The assistant principal oversees school discipline, professional development, school activities and engages stakeholders. The assistant principal also engages with the students on a daily basis providing small group support as well as academic goal setting.
Fulton, Sunshine	School Counselor	The main roles of the school counselor is to serve as an advocate for all students. She provides a comprehensive school counseling program that meets the academic and social/emotional needs of our students. She assists students with accessing additional resources needed to ensure they are successful in school. The school counselor also facilitates all of our Mutli-Tiered System of Supports meetings and Multidisciplinary Team meetings. As a former teacher and math coach, Mrs. Fulton is also able to provide instructional support to teachers and students as needed.

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.

Throughout the school year, we meet with all constituents/parent groups to determine strengths and areas of concern so that we can make adjustments the following year which in turn is used for the SIP. We also hold a special School Advisory Council meeting to share the plan once it is completed and allow time for questions and suggestions.

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))

Administration will share the plan with other schools who have similar demographics to gather ideas for areas of improvement. Administration will do regular walk throughs to ensure the various components of the SIP are being implemented appropriately. In the event the components are not being implemented, professional development will be provided as needed.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	36%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	37%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A

	2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	7	5	6	10	10	0	0	0	38
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	6	13	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	3	4	0	0	8
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	16	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	2	0	2	3	5	0	0	0	12

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	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	6	6	5	9	3	0	0	0	29
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	1	0	0	0	7
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	6	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	1	6	3	5	3	1	0	0	0	19

The number of students identified retained:

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

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	6	6	5	9	3	0	0	0	29
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	1	0	0	0	7
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	6	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	1	6	3	5	3	1	0	0	0	19

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

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

Accountability Component	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	82	50	56	85	50	57
ELA Learning Gains	71	58	61	66	56	58
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53	51	52	64	50	53
Math Achievement*	94	59	60	92	62	63
Math Learning Gains	85	63	64	82	63	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	75	57	55	79	52	51
Science Achievement*	76	47	51	74	48	53
Social Studies Achievement*		0	50		0	
Middle School Acceleration						
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress						

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	77
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	536
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

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	53			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	90			
BLK	66			
HSP	88			
MUL	87			
PAC				
WHT	84			
FRL	73			

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)

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	82	71	53	94	85	75	76					

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
SWD	44	54	40	75	73	69	15					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	80			100								
BLK	60	67	50	77	75	69						
HSP	75			100								
MUL	82			91								
PAC												
WHT	87	74	69	97	89	88	84					
FRL	67	63		83	83	79	60					

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	83	51	42	87	71	45	80					
SWD	47	10		67	60							
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	90			100								
BLK	61	50		69	53		75					
HSP	94			94								
MUL	82			71								
PAC												
WHT	87	52	46	92	75		82					
FRL	64	50		64	64		71					

2018-19 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
All Students	85	66	64	92	82	79	74					
SWD	59	60		64	75							
ELL												
AMI												

2018-19 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
ASN												
BLK	64	45		83	74		40					
HSP	93			93								
MUL	100	70		88	70							
PAC												
WHT	86	72	68	93	83	81	75					
FRL	75	68	62	83	68	71	65					

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
05	2023 - Spring	81%	47%	34%	54%	27%
04	2023 - Spring	72%	50%	22%	58%	14%
03	2023 - Spring	77%	46%	31%	50%	27%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	93%	59%	34%	59%	34%
04	2023 - Spring	88%	58%	30%	61%	27%
05	2023 - Spring	87%	52%	35%	55%	32%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	86%	48%	38%	51%	35%

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.

Reading proficiency was our lowest performance area dropping from 82% to 77% from the previous school year. Since the 2017-2018 school year we have seen a gradual decline in reading proficiency, (86%, 85%, 83%, 82%, 77%). We believe the new benchmarks, new state testing and the new curriculum all played a role in the decline this past year. However, we have noticed a slight decline in the number of teachers who are consistently and effectively doing guided reading, which we believe is a factor in the trend data.

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

Both reading and math declined by 5 percentage points from the previous year. Although math is typically our strength, we believe the new benchmarks, new state testing and new curriculum all played a role in the slight decline of our scores. We also had teachers who were new to their content and/or grade level.

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.

Although all of our content areas exceeded the states average, we saw the largest difference in the areas of math and science. Science was 35 points above the state average while 3rd grade math was 34 points and 5th grade math was 32 points above the state average. We believe this is somewhat due to the fact that we are a STEM magnet school. We place a lot of emphasis on STEM related projects and PBL as well as a large emphasis being placed in the homes.

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

The area in which we showed the most improvement was 5th grade science with a 10% gain from the previous year. Because we had a new teacher in that role, the district provided a lot of support. She was consistent and data driven.

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

We do have a small group of students who have excessive absences and tardies who are included in the EWS data. We are also concerned with the impact that the truancy has on their academic performance.

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

1. Reading proficiency
2. Math Proficiency
3. LPQ
4. Decrease number of referrals

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Reading proficiency was our lowest performance area dropping from 82% to 77% from the previous school year. Since the 2017-2018 school year we have seen a gradual decline in reading proficiency, (86%, 85%, 83%, 82%, 77%). Although Reading proficiency is our main area, we are cautiously monitoring LPQ for reading as well.

Measurable Outcome:

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

At least 82% of our students will be proficient on the 23-24 state assessment for reading, which is where we placed in 2021-2022 school year.

Monitoring:

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

The leadership team will monitor classrooms to ensure teachers are consistently and effectively implementing small group instruction as well as utilizing the dedicated intervention time block for students in need.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephanie Brannan (shepards@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.)

All reading teachers will be expected to implement guided reading daily.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research shows that students who participate in guided reading regularly improve in the areas of comprehension, fluency and vocabulary.

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.

Professional development will be provided to teachers through PLCs as well as district led trainings.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Brannan (shepards@duvalschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

Although not directly related to the intervention of guided reading, we will be implementing vertical articulation sessions during our early dismissal days as that will overall improve reading proficiency.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Brannan (shepards@duvalschools.org)

By When: ongoing

During PLCs, teachers will be able to observe model classrooms to see guided reading/ reading instruction. We will also frequently assess informal and formal data and have data chats with teachers regarding their next steps.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Brannan (shepards@duvalschools.org)

By When: ongoing

#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.

Our math proficiency, although still high, did decline 5 percentage points from the previous year. Although math proficiency is one of our main areas, we are cautiously monitoring LPQ for math as well.

Measurable Outcome:

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

At least 94% of our students will be proficient in math on the state assessment.

Monitoring:

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

The leadership team will monitor classrooms to ensure teachers are consistently and effectively implementing small group instruction as well as utilizing the dedicated intervention time block for students in need.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephanie Brannan (shepards@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.)

All math teachers will be expected to implement small group differentiated instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research shows that students who participate in small group instruction allow the teacher to close the academic gaps.

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.

Professional development will be provided to teachers through PLCs as well as district led trainings.

Person Responsible: Angela Doss (dossa@duvalschools.org)

By When: ongoing

Although not directly related to the intervention of small group instruction, we will be implementing vertical articulation sessions during our early dismissal days as that will overall improve math proficiency.

Person Responsible: Angela Doss (dossa@duvalschools.org)

By When: ongoing

During PLCs, teachers will be able to observe model classrooms to see small group math instruction. We will also frequently assess informal and formal data and have data chats with teachers regarding their next steps.

Person Responsible: Angela Doss (dossa@duvalschools.org)

By When: ongoing

#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.

Over the past 4 years our office discipline referrals have steadily increased.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will decrease discipline referrals by 15%.

Monitoring:

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

PBIS Team will monitor referral data monthly using our student information system- Focus.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Angela Doss (dossa@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.)

Continue and modify our school-wide positive behavior interventions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research shows anytime you reinforce positive behavior, the negative behavior will decrease.

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.

Quarterly schoolwide discipline assemblies

Person Responsible: Stephanie Brannan (shepards@duvalschools.org)

By When: ongoing

Implementation of positive referrals

Person Responsible: Angela Doss (dossa@duvalschools.org)

By When: ongoing

Continue effective positive reinforcements already in place (ie pizza with the principals, student of the month, awards, incentive charms, cafeteria incentives, etc...)

Person Responsible: Angela Doss (dossa@duvalschools.org)

By When: ongoing