

Duval County Public Schools

Atlantic Coast 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	7
Planning for Improvement	12
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Atlantic Coast High School

9735 R G SKINNER PKWY, Jacksonville, FL 32256

www.duvalschools.org/achs

Demographics

Principal: Michael George

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

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	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	57%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (50%) 2014-15: B (60%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	7
Planning for Improvement	12
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Atlantic Coast High School

9735 R G SKINNER PKWY, Jacksonville, FL 32256

www.duvalschools.org/achs

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	37%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	60%

School Grades History

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

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
Spaulding, Zeina	Principal	
Smith, Michael	Assistant Principal	
Menard, Rachel	Teacher, K-12	Testing
Moses, Timothy	Dean	Safety and Discipline

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	52%	47%	56%	48%	46%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	48%	51%	43%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	42%	42%	33%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	56%	51%	51%	54%	59%	49%
Math Learning Gains	69%	52%	48%	42%	52%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	47%	45%	37%	45%	39%
Science Achievement	74%	65%	68%	70%	64%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	75%	70%	73%	71%	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)
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	50%	48%	2%	55%	-5%
	2018	48%	48%	0%	53%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	49%	48%	1%	53%	-4%
	2018	48%	49%	-1%	53%	-5%
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	70%	67%	3%	67%	3%
2018	67%	63%	4%	65%	2%
Compare		3%			

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	72%	68%	4%	70%	2%
2018	71%	64%	7%	68%	3%
Compare		1%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	47%	57%	-10%	61%	-14%
2018	37%	61%	-24%	62%	-25%
Compare		10%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	58%	61%	-3%	57%	1%
2018	58%	57%	1%	56%	2%
Compare		0%			

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	35	45	44	44	55	40	57	34		85	48
ELL	22	46	45	47	73	71	50	58		81	86
ASN	81	66		71	70		84	83		98	96
BLK	36	46	38	41	56	37	62	64		95	77
HSP	41	41	41	55	73	58	69	73		95	82
MUL	56	49	31	64	80		86	81		94	94
WHT	64	62	64	68	74	66	81	81		90	81
FRL	39	46	45	46	67	56	62	70		91	74
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	28	38	24	44	56	46	35	58		81	39
ELL	25	43	38	36	58		42	43		81	86
ASN	74	58	36	71	72		88	81		97	81
BLK	33	37	21	40	48	37	43	63		86	69
HSP	49	53	41	49	61	73	69	64		88	80

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
MUL	51	40	17	47	44		80	78		88	76
WHT	64	57	35	64	74	69	83	80		94	78
FRL	42	42	25	46	54	54	60	62		86	67
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	19	26	15	30	31	17	35	61		58	30
ELL	11	26	26	24	48	50	27			71	47
ASN	71	59	70	61	40		85	76		84	76
BLK	31	35	28	42	40	36	56	61		92	29
HSP	43	44	34	51	39	38	65	71		83	55
MUL	39	36	29	43	33		79	71		100	36
WHT	57	45	33	61	45	42	76	76		89	55
FRL	32	36	29	43	39	34	59	65		82	35

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	42
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	695
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	49
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	56
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	81
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	55
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	60
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	71
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	72
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	59
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.

All areas showed growth or remained the same. We will continue to work on BQ in ELA and math...with tutoring and push ins.

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

NA

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.

NA

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

BQ in ELA. We will continue to provide our most fragile students the most support

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

NA

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

1. ELA proficiency
2. ELA BQ
3. Math BQ
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Improving Math Bottom Quartile
Rationale	In the 18-19 school year, math BQ scores decreased by 5 points
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	In 19-20 we will increase our BQ math scores by at least 5 points
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Zeina Spaulding (khanachetz@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	By double blocking all students in the BQ into Algebra or Geometry and implementing evidenced based standards alignment protocol, math BQ will increase
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Increasing instructional time focused on standards
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. double blocking (build master schedule that can handle double blocking) 2. data driven PLC led by AP 3. Admin team is trained on standards walk 4. small group based on needs 5.
Person Responsible	Michael Smith (smithm6@duvalschools.org)
#2	
Title	Building a Culture of Trust
Rationale	Responses in the 5 Essentials Data
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	increased improvement ratings on 5 Essentials
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Zeina Spaulding (khanachetz@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Develop and sustain a culture of trust and safety for both adults and students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. creating sense of urgency to be in class, minimize tardies 2. maximize instructional time 3. increase student participation in after school activities 4. mental health lessons 5. student engagement
Person Responsible	Timothy Moses (mosest1@duvalschools.org)
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).