

Duval County Public Schools

Andrew Jackson High School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Andrew Jackson High School

3816 N MAIN ST, Jacksonville, FL 32206

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

Demographics

Principal: Truitte Moreland

Start Date for this Principal: 6/25/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	87%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: D (40%) 2014-15: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Duval County School Board on 10/1/2019.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Andrew Jackson High School

3816 N MAIN ST, Jacksonville, FL 32206

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	90%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	B	B	D

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Duval County School Board on 10/1/2019.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our Mission is to provide educational excellence in every school, in every classroom, for every student, every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our Vision is to ensure every student is inspired and prepared for success in college or a career and life.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Clinch, Tracolya	Principal	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 6/25/2019

Prior Year - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Prior Year - Updated**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	30%	47%	56%	20%	46%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	36%	48%	51%	33%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	42%	42%	29%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	51%	51%	51%	78%	59%	49%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Learning Gains	52%	52%	48%	69%	52%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	47%	45%	58%	45%	39%
Science Achievement	73%	65%	68%	57%	64%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	56%	70%	73%	34%	64%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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
09	2019	30%	48%	-18%	55%	-25%
	2018	30%	48%	-18%	53%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	29%	48%	-19%	53%	-24%
	2018	30%	49%	-19%	53%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	72%	67%	5%	67%	5%
2018	59%	63%	-4%	65%	-6%
Compare		13%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	56%	68%	-12%	70%	-14%
2018	44%	64%	-20%	68%	-24%
Compare		12%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	45%	57%	-12%	61%	-16%
2018	64%	61%	3%	62%	2%
Compare		-19%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	53%	61%	-8%	57%	-4%
2018	55%	57%	-2%	56%	-1%
Compare		-2%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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
SWD	13	44	48	27	50		46	36		100	85
BLK	26	35	43	45	48	47	68	52		95	79
HSP	46	50									
MUL	47	13									
WHT	51	47		80	76		82				
FRL	22	35	41	48	54	52	67	55		91	76

2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	15	48	40	24			17	20		100	53
BLK	22	43	41	55	67	76	49	42		87	63
WHT	60	65		86	91						
FRL	28	47	39	58	72	81	57	42		83	60
2017 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	4	17	20				23	6		79	55
BLK	17	31	26	78	70	67	54	34		83	79
WHT	45										
FRL	19	31	28	77	67	53	54	30		83	77

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	559
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	50
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	

Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	54
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	48
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	30
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	67
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	54
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

needs to be completed

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

needs to be completed

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.

needs to be completed

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

needs to be completed

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

needs to be completed

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

1. needs to be completed
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Multi-Racial Students
Rationale	ESSA Federal Index is below the 40% threshold.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Meet Federal Index of 40%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tracolya Clinch (clincht@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Utilize the Plan, Do, Check, Act problem solving process to ensure multiracial students are college and career ready. All students need to meet college and career readiness standards set by the Florida Department of Education. And the PCDA problem solving process is a research-based process proven to improve organizational performance. See reference below:
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Langley, Gerald J.; Moen, Ronald D.; Nolan, Kevin M.; Nolan, Thomas W.; Norman, Clifford L.; Provost, Lloyd P. (2009) [1996]. The improvement guide: a practical approach to enhancing organizational performance (2nd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. ISBN 9780470192412. OCLC 236325893.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hire additional staff (core teachers: Social Studies and Language Arts) to focus on multi-racial students and cohort students and decrease the class sizes so that students' individual needs are met. 2. Identify multiracial students and create a data profile with goals for each student. 3. Progress monitor multiracial students' performance using district assessments and Achieve 3000. 4. Identify multiracial students who can benefit from additional tutoring; pay teachers for after school and summer tutoring to close the achievement gaps with multiracial students. 5.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#2	
Title	Math Proficiency & Gains
Rationale	Math FSA scores decreased in proficiency, gains and BQ gains
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Math FSA scores will increase to the following: Proficiency- 60% Gains- 70% BQ Gains- 75%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tracolya Clinch (clincht@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Implement evidence-based standards-alignment protocol in all math classrooms.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Math FSA assessments test students mastery of standards. Ensuring that teachers are providing instruction that aligns to standards will improve student outcomes/performance.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hire an additional math teacher. 2. Double block all non-proficient students. 3. Schedule students with teachers based on teachers' strengths. 4. Purchase IXL to improve BQ students skills during small group rotations. 5. Purchase laptop cart for BQ classes to increase the frequency of small group rotations and fidelity.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]
#3	
Title	Culture of Trust
Rationale	Results from 5 Essentials Data shows a need for improvement in culture.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase the responses and improvement ratings on 5 Essentials survey.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tracolya Clinch (clincht@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Develop and sustain a culture of trust and safety for both adults and students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Research shows that positive, trusting relationships amongst faculty, staff and students will improve culture and performance.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create urgency around being present and engaged during instruction by maximizing instructional time. 2. Minimize tardies to class. 3. Increase student participation in after school activities. 4. Dedicate and provide for mental health education for students. 5. Provide PD to on research-based student engagement strategies.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]
Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)	

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).