

Duval County Public Schools

Douglas Anderson School Of The Arts



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Douglas Anderson School Of The Arts

2445 SAN DIEGO RD, Jacksonville, FL 32207

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

Demographics

Principal: Tina Wilson

Start Date for this Principal: 4/17/2017

| | |
|--|---|
| 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) | 32% |
| 2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: A (80%) 2017-18: A (79%) 2016-17: A (72%) 2015-16: A (69%) 2014-15: A (79%) |
| 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 | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Douglas Anderson School Of The Arts

2445 SAN DIEGO RD, Jacksonville, FL 32207

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

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 | No | 22% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 39% |

School Grades History

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

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.

Douglas Anderson School of the Arts will be the leading public arts high school in the nation.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Where Arts and Academics Meet in Excellence

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 |
|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Hammer, Melanie | Principal | |
| Cinotti, Jacquelyn | Assistant Principal | Curriculum and Scheduling |
| Cowgill, Patti | Teacher, ESE | Fully Released VE Teacher |
| Lamp, Bonnie | Teacher, K-12 | Gifted Teacher |
| Spell, William | Assistant Principal | AP |
| Sproch-Boyd, Tammy | Dean | Dean of Students |

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 | 1 | 282 | 337 | 281 | 289 | 1190 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | |
| 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 | 10 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 13 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 13 | 4 | 1 | 29 | |

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 | 20 | 18 | 13 | 11 | 62 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 12 |
| 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)

1,191

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/23/2019

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-------|
| Attendance below 90 percent | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| One or more suspensions | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|-------|
| Students with two or more indicators | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

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 | 86% | 47% | 56% | 85% | 46% | 53% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 70% | 48% | 51% | 63% | 45% | 49% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 69% | 42% | 42% | 62% | 39% | 41% |
| Math Achievement | 80% | 51% | 51% | 70% | 59% | 49% |
| Math Learning Gains | 63% | 52% | 48% | 48% | 52% | 44% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 64% | 47% | 45% | 34% | 45% | 39% |
| Science Achievement | 97% | 65% | 68% | 99% | 64% | 65% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 92% | 70% | 73% | 88% | 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 | 282 (0) | 337 (0) | 281 (0) | 289 (0) | 1189 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 () | 0 () | 1 () | 0 () | 1 (0) |
| One or more suspensions | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 10 (0) | 3 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 13 (0) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 11 (0) | 13 (0) | 4 (0) | 1 (0) | 29 (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 | 85% | 48% | 37% | 55% | 30% |
| | 2018 | 84% | 48% | 36% | 53% | 31% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 10 | 2019 | 87% | 48% | 39% | 53% | 34% |
| | 2018 | 89% | 49% | 40% | 53% | 36% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 3% | | | | |

| 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 | 97% | 67% | 30% | 67% | 30% |
| 2018 | 95% | 63% | 32% | 65% | 30% |
| Compare | | 2% | | | |
| 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 | 92% | 68% | 24% | 70% | 22% |
| 2018 | 92% | 64% | 28% | 68% | 24% |
| Compare | | 0% | | | |
| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 69% | 57% | 12% | 61% | 8% |
| 2018 | 75% | 61% | 14% | 62% | 13% |
| Compare | | -6% | | | |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 84% | 61% | 23% | 57% | 27% |
| 2018 | 80% | 57% | 23% | 56% | 24% |
| Compare | | 4% | | | |

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 | 58 | 51 | 50 | 44 | 42 | 23 | 92 | 71 | | 100 | 60 |
| ASN | 87 | 57 | | | | | | 100 | | | |
| BLK | 68 | 62 | 60 | 61 | 53 | 42 | 95 | 82 | | 100 | 65 |
| HSP | 81 | 60 | 69 | 82 | 62 | | 97 | 97 | | 100 | 75 |
| MUL | 90 | 68 | | 62 | 36 | | 95 | 92 | | | |
| WHT | 92 | 75 | 80 | 91 | 71 | 87 | 98 | 95 | | 99 | 86 |
| FRL | 78 | 61 | 65 | 71 | 61 | 52 | 93 | 92 | | 100 | 66 |
| 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 | 60 | 67 | 59 | 61 | 79 | | 83 | 63 | | 93 | 57 |
| ASN | 100 | 75 | | | | | | 100 | | 100 | 95 |
| BLK | 69 | 60 | 62 | 61 | 49 | 52 | 90 | 85 | | 100 | 78 |
| HSP | 85 | 73 | 69 | 76 | 54 | | 89 | 95 | | 100 | 76 |
| MUL | 85 | 72 | | 73 | 69 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 92 | 72 | 70 | 85 | 62 | 63 | 99 | 94 | | 99 | 84 |
| FRL | 78 | 64 | 63 | 71 | 50 | 55 | 95 | 86 | | 98 | 72 |
| 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 | 63 | 55 | 43 | 44 | 38 | | | 69 | | | |
| ASN | 85 | 63 | | 80 | 50 | | 100 | 80 | | | |
| BLK | 71 | 57 | 54 | 51 | 41 | 21 | 96 | 83 | | 98 | 60 |
| HSP | 81 | 50 | 50 | 55 | 40 | 15 | 95 | 74 | | 100 | 67 |
| MUL | 82 | 50 | | 61 | 35 | | 100 | | | 100 | 91 |
| WHT | 90 | 68 | 71 | 77 | 51 | 45 | 99 | 92 | | 99 | 74 |
| FRL | 81 | 64 | 62 | 61 | 41 | 24 | 95 | 81 | | 98 | 57 |

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 | 80 |
| 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 | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 802 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|--|-----|
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 59 |
| 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 | 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 | 69 |
| 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 | 80 |
| 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 | 74 |
| 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 | |
|--|-----|
| 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 | 87 |
| 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 | 74 |
| 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.

Our SWD subgroup scored the lowest in ELA and math. Many of these students have a lower Lexile and lower prior assessment scores than their non-disabled peers.

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

Hispanic students dropped in ELA from 85% to 81%. Our Hispanic population has grown over the past 2 years and several of these students were ELLs.

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.

Our school is above the district and state average in all areas. We have spent the past two years strategically targeting our "bubble" students and this had led to significant gains.

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

Math improved in all areas, from 79% to 80% in proficiency, 59% to 63% in gains and 62% to 64% in LPQ gains. We closely reviewed student data to ensure correct placement of students. We also strategically placed teachers in courses that matched their strengths. We spent the year analyzing district and classroom assessment data that helped to drive instruction and identify remediation needs.

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

Historical data indicated that our biggest challenge is attendance. We have revamped our Attendance Intervention Team (AIT) process as well as

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

1. Learning Gains in ELA
2. Learning Gains in Math
3. LPQ Gains in ELA
4. LPQ Gains in Math
5. Arts Recruitment and scholarship amount

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

| | |
|---|--|
| Title | Students who scored a 2.2. on the 2018-2019 FSA ELA |
| Rationale | For the 2018-2019 Douglas Anderson moved 58% of students who were in the 2.2 bubble group to proficiency during FSA administration. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | The plan is to provide strategic instructional support to this group of students in order to achieve proficiency. Established goal is to move 100% of all 2.2 FSA ELA students who were identified from the 2018-2019 administration. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | William Spell (spellw1@duvalschools.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | The evidence-based strategy that will be the primary resource used is Achieve3000. This tool will provide each students activities that are on their current Lexile levels and challenge them to perform at higher levels. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Based on school wide student usage data, this program has improved student performance results at a growth rate of 1.5 years per school year. It has greatly assisted in closing the educational gap for our lower performing quartile students. This platform provides teachers with monthly adjusted student data that is connected to standards helping identify where remediation is needed. |

Action Step

| | |
|---------------------------|---|
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Establish Lexile Baseline 2. Student/Teacher Developed Growth 3. Teacher Monthly Data Review and support strategy adjustments 4. Administrative review of PMA data. 5. Administrative pull out sessions for additional support providing direct instruction 6. Common Planning data review to identify students who are not making adequate progress. |
| Person Responsible | William Spell (spellw1@duvalschools.org) |

| #2 | |
|---|---|
| Title | Students who scored a 2.2 on the 8th Grade Math FSA or the Algebra I FSA |
| Rationale | There are 27 students who earned a 2.2 in the previous year's assessment will impact our school grade the most and are close to reaching proficiency on the following assessment. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | The plan is to provide strategic instructional support to this group of students in order to achieve proficiency. Established goal is to move 100% of all 2.2 FSA Math/Alg 1 students who were identified from the 2018-2019 administration. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Melanie Hammer (hammerm@duvalschools.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | The evidence-based strategy that will be used is small group pull-outs. Teachers and administrators will review district PMA results and classroom informal and formal assessment data during PLC meetings and use it to inform their planning, instruction, and remediation. After reviewing the data, small group pull-outs will be conducted by administrators and business partners such as Mathnasium tutors. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Standards that require remediation will be taught in small groups so that students get individual attention for those standards they have not yet mastered. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Review 1819 data to identify target group. 2. Student/Teacher developed growth plan. 3. Teacher monthly data review and support strategy adjustments. 4. Review PMA data and identify standards that need remediation. 5. Administrative pull out sessions for additional support providing direct instruction. 6. Use common planning to review data to identify students who are not making adequate progress towards mastery of the standards. |
| Person Responsible | Melanie Hammer (hammerm@duvalschools.org) |

| #3 | |
|---|---|
| Title | Students who miss more than 10% of school |
| Rationale | Data from the 2018-2019 school year showed that more than 10% of our students were absent 20 days or more. We need to improve daily attendance rates as well as period by period attendance. |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | The plan is to improve our process in identifying truant students and move them through the Attendance Intervention Team (AIT) process in order to affect change in their attendance patterns. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome | Jacquelyn Cinotti (cinottij@duvalschools.org) |
| Evidence-based Strategy | Initial parent contact by teachers, followed by meetings with counselors and administrators, and finally referral to the AIT. |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy | Most of AIT meetings we have had in the past have resulted in improved attendance patterns for referred students. The attendance tracking form has proven especially effective; 75% of the students who went through the process last year improved their attendance. We need to identify these students sooner and start the process earlier in the year. |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers contact parents of students who miss 3 or more days and keep a contact log. 2. Teachers alert counselors and admin if attendance continues to be an issue. 3. Counselors and/or AP check in with students, devise a plan for improving attendance. 4. AP monitors excessive absent area in FOCUS and refers students as needed to the AIT. 5. The AIT meets with parent to determine course of action which may include, but is not limited to, attendance contract, attendance tracking form and daily check-ins with counselor. |
| Person Responsible | Jacquelyn Cinotti (cinottij@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).

Other remaining school-wide improvement priorities will be addressed in faculty meetings, Early Release Day professional development and other stakeholder meetings. These other priorities include student recruitment, safety, recruiting high-level artist-teachers, scholarship documentation, and attendance. Subcommittees will be created at the school level to address these areas. They will identify strategies and action steps.