

Duval County Public Schools

Duncan U. Fletcher 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	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	16

Duncan U. Fletcher High School

700 SEAGATE AVE, Neptune Beach, FL 32266

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

Demographics

Principal: Dean Ledford

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

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)	41%
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 (67%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: C (53%) 2014-15: B (61%)
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	15
Budget to Support Goals	16

Duncan U. Fletcher High School

700 SEAGATE AVE, Neptune Beach, FL 32266

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

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	27%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	29%

School Grades History

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

To provide educational excellence in every classroom, for every student, every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every student is inspired and prepared for success in high school, 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
Ledford, James Dean	Principal	Instructional Leader - Oversee all aspects of campus activities.
Archon, Kristen	Assistant Principal	Curriculum, US History, State Testing
Hayes, Mary	Assistant Principal	Facilities, Biology, PBIS
Brown, Mary	School Counselor	Lead Counselor
Stcherbinine, Angela	Assistant Principal	Over Language Arts as well as District Based Testing

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	538	641	495	423	2097
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	41	39	29	140
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	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	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)

106

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/27/2019

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	107	152	104	116	479
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	53	49	16	180
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	95	96	18	276
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	147	84	56	365

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	65%	47%	56%	59%	46%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	48%	51%	45%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	42%	42%	33%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	58%	51%	51%	67%	59%	49%
Math Learning Gains	50%	52%	48%	45%	52%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	47%	45%	41%	45%	39%
Science Achievement	86%	65%	68%	83%	64%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	87%	70%	73%	76%	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	538 (0)	641 (0)	495 (0)	423 (0)	2097 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	31 ()	41 ()	39 ()	29 ()	140 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (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	66%	48%	18%	55%	11%
	2018	57%	48%	9%	53%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	63%	48%	15%	53%	10%
	2018	57%	49%	8%	53%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

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	86%	67%	19%	67%	19%
2018	82%	63%	19%	65%	17%
Compare		4%			

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	86%	68%	18%	70%	16%
2018	76%	64%	12%	68%	8%
Compare		10%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	38%	57%	-19%	61%	-23%
2018	48%	61%	-13%	62%	-14%
Compare		-10%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	67%	61%	6%	57%	10%
2018	52%	57%	-5%	56%	-4%
Compare		15%			

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	22	31	29	38	58	46	73	73		91	78
ELL	33	65	60	33			73				
ASN	63	53		69	62		100			90	
BLK	33	47	37	32	33	29	60	65		97	80
HSP	57	56	45	44	53	55	76	78		94	77
MUL	59	57	50	54	44	30	84	89		100	95
WHT	72	57	47	65	52	48	93	91		96	87
FRL	48	44	39	45	43	39	74	76		92	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
SWD	23	35	28	27	44	40	39	44		95	67
ELL	7	31	18	36							
ASN	62	63		53			67				
BLK	26	38	35	33	44	23	58	53		92	79
HSP	47	45	45	50	59		67	73		90	76
MUL	48	49	38	50	37		81	71		96	91
WHT	64	43	29	56	44	45	90	82		98	82
FRL	40	42	36	44	45	41	69	58		93	71
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	25	27	22	46	38	29	61	45		89	36
ELL		25									
ASN	71	35		80	40					100	64
BLK	33	41	33	49	45	36	63	54		91	52
HSP	46	38	29	53	55	25	84	70		91	47
MUL	50	36	23	70	30	40	73	75		90	58
WHT	65	47	36	69	45	43	86	81		94	66
FRL	44	41	36	58	40	31	72	61		86	48

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	69
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	92
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	764

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	54
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	59
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	73
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	51
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	66
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	66
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	71
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	58
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.

Bottom Quartile Math Showed the lowest performance at 45%. Late hires due to budget constraints, therefore many of our Algebra 1 teachers were in their 1st year.

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

Algebra 1 EOC Proficiency showed a 10% decline from previous year. Many Algebra 1 teachers were in their 1st year due to late hires with budget restraints.

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.

Algebra 1 EOC had a 23 point gap compared to the state. Late hires due to budget constraints, therefore many of our Algebra 1 teachers were in their 1st year.

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

ELA Overall Learning Gains and ELA Bottom Quartile showed the largest gains of 11. We ensured Achieve was being used school wide. During our PLCs we ensured our ELA teachers were planning

activities that were aligned to the standard as well as using text/curriculum that was fully aligned to the standard.

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

Number of students with less than 90% attendance.

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

1. Algebra 1 overall proficiency
2. Algebra 1 Learning Gains and Bottom Quartile
3. Overall Attendance
4. Overall Climate as it relates to SESIR Data
5. Continuing ELA Gains

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Algebra 1 Overall Proficiency
Rationale	Had the largest decrease compared to school, district and state.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our goal is to have 68% of our Algebra students score proficient.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	James Dean Ledford (ledfordj@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>During common planning time we will use district adopted curriculum to plan lesson deliveries as well as activities.</p> <p>Ensure teachers are using common assessments to enhance future data analysis.</p> <p>Ensure teachers are sharing best practices based on student performance.</p> <p>Use a specific walk through form with all admin that will measure how well we are aligned to standards in our Algebra 1 classes.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	<p>These strategies will allow our teachers to use district common assessments to compare results with each other along with other teachers in the district.</p> <p>The evidence will be unit assessments, district quarterly assessments, as well as common planning minutes.</p> <p>The walk through form will give a quantitative analysis of our instruction being aligned to standards.</p>
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create PLCs 2. Ensure common planning during Algebra 1 PLC 3. Adopt planning format to ensure there is time for data analysis as well as planning 4. Create time line for meeting standards 5. Create culture of sharing data
Person Responsible	James Dean Ledford (ledfordj@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).

Overall Attendance - Ensure students have the opportunity to get involved in our various clubs and activities. This will enhance our students' overall engagement of school.

Overall Climate as it relates to SESIR Data - Use our PBIS (Postive Behavior Intervention System) plan to showcase students and their success.

Continuing ELA Gains - Continue to ensure teacher's lessons are aligned to state standards along with their activities and curriculum/text.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

None Title 1 School

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

None Title 1 School

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

None Title 1 School

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

None Title 1 School

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

None Title 1 School

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Algebra 1 Overall Proficiency				\$8,909.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	1000	510-Supplies	2231 - Duncan U. Fletcher High School	School Improvement Funds	2063.0	\$8,909.00
Total:						\$8,909.00