Stanton College Preparatory

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Stanton College Preparatory

1149 W 13TH ST, Jacksonville, FL 32209

http://www.duvalschools.org/stanton

Demographics

Principal: Nongongoma Majova

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2010

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)	27%
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 (84%) 2017-18: A (85%) 2016-17: A (86%) 2015-16: A (80%) 2014-15: A (92%)
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

Stanton College Preparatory

1149 W 13TH ST, Jacksonville, FL 32209

http://www.duvalschools.org/stanton

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	16%

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	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.

The mission of Stanton College Preparatory School is to provide educational excellence in every school, in every classroom, for every student, every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Stanton College Preparatory School 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
Majova Seane, Nongongoma	Principal	
Hemphill, Matthew	Assistant Principal	
Kerr, Michael	Assistant Principal	
Gaiter, Sonya	Assistant 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	465	397	364	354	1580
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	8	14	32
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4	0	13
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	21	16	73
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	1	0	0	24

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	8	3	11
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
Thursday 8/15/2019

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	95%	47%	56%	98%	46%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	73%	48%	51%	79%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	73%	42%	42%	78%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	84%	51%	51%	86%	59%	49%
Math Learning Gains	61%	52%	48%	67%	52%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	62%	47%	45%	62%	45%	39%
Science Achievement	95%	65%	68%	95%	64%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	97%	70%	73%	98%	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	465 (0)	397 (0)	364 (0)	354 (0)	1580 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	10 ()	8 ()	14 ()	32 (0)
One or more suspensions	4 (0)	5 (0)	4 (0)	0 (0)	13 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	36 (0)	21 (0)	16 (0)	73 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	23 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	24 (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	94%	48%	46%	55%	39%
	2018	96%	48%	48%	53%	43%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	96%	48%	48%	53%	43%
	2018	97%	49%	48%	53%	44%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

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	95%	67%	28%	67%	28%
2018	96%	63%	33%	65%	31%
Compare		-1%			

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	97%	68%	29%	70%	27%
2018	97%	64%	33%	68%	29%
Compare		0%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	14%	57%	-43%	61%	-47%
2018					

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	84%	61%	23%	57%	27%
2018	90%	57%	33%	56%	34%
Compare		-6%			

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	92	77									
ELL	81	79	85	73	64		69				
ASN	95	72	70	94	63		97	96		100	100
BLK	88	66	69	67	55	68	87	93		100	100
HSP	99	81	91	78	63		95	93		100	100

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
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
MUL	95	68	50	93	67		100	90		100	100
WHT	96	76	76	89	61	36	96	100		99	100
FRL	93	70	76	69	52	57	89	93		100	100

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	100	54									
ASN	97	77	71	94	56	73	98	97		100	99
BLK	89	73	74	76	65	63	85	92		100	97
HSP	97	57	71	89	57		97	100		100	100
MUL	97	84		75	70		95			100	94
WHT	98	73	69	98	59	82	99	99		100	99
FRL	93	63	66	86	61	71	92	92		100	100

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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	92	75		100	70						
ASN	98	79	71	92	77	73	96	100		100	100
BLK	95	72	74	72	56	56	85	95		100	96
HSP	97	81	87	83	63	57	90	100		100	100
MUL	100	81		86	71			100			
WHT	99	81	83	88	65	63	97	98		100	100
FRL	94	74	72	75	55	49	88	96		100	100

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

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	84
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	840
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	85
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	75
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	87
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	79
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	89
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	85
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	83
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	80
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 lowest performing accountability area is Math (Geometry) Learning Gains at 61%. When we analyzed our data at the beginning of last school year, we noticed the trend that many students had scored lower on their prior assessments. some of the students did not pass their Algebra I EOC.

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

The greatest decline occurred in the Math (Geometry) achievement with a six percentage point drop. Low attendance to the math remediation lab and extra tutoring that was offered.

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.

We did not have a component where there was a negative gap between the school and state average. We average a 25 percentage point positive increase over the state average in the eight school grade components.

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

The component that showed the most improvement was in the ELA Lowest 25th Percentile which increased by two percentage points. The school took a whole school approach in supporting the reading and writing of students across the curriculum. All of the departments identified the lowest performing students in reading and incorporated instructional strategies and supported whole school initiatives like Achieve 3000 in order to support student achievement. Students participated in after-school remediation labs held by the intensive reading teacher.

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

Reflecting on our Early Warning Systems data, we will focus on our course failure in ELA or Math. The majority of our course failure occurs in mathematics and we will work with all stakeholders to

support student achievement in these areas. We have a total of 73 students who failed one of those courses.

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

1. Ninth Grade Reading Proficiency
2. 10th grade Reading Proficiency
3. LPQ gains for Reading Overall
4. Overall Gains for Reading
5. Math (Geometry) Proficiency

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Overall Reading Proficiency
Rationale	The goal is that all students are reading on grade level or higher. Last year, the overall proficiency dropped for ninth and tenth grade students by two percentage points from 97% to 95%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The measurable outcome is for 97% of the ninth and tenth grade students to demonstrate proficiency on the 2020 Florida Standards Assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Nongongoma Majova Seane (majovan@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Completion of Student Progress Monitoring Plan
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Data will be analyzed to identify standards/strands where students are performing below their intended goal. This data will be used to differentiate small group/teacher led instructional practices where best practices will be utilized. Progress Monitoring Plans will be developed outlining the student's deficiencies and the instructional and remediation strategies that will be used to assist students in demonstrating proficiency.
Action Step	
Description	1. Mini-Assessments to monitor student achievement 2. Use of Achieve 3000 to monitor student reading lexile growth 3. PMP Completion with Tier II/Tier III instructional strategies 4. Guidance & Academic Review Committee meeting with students/parents
Person Responsible	Nongongoma Majova Seane (majovan@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).

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.

N/A

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.

N/A

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

N/A

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.

N/A

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

N/A

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Overall Reading Proficiency	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00