Darnell Cookman Middle/ High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Darnell Cookman Middle/High School

1701 N DAVIS ST, Jacksonville, FL 32209

http://www.duvalschools.org/darnellcookman

Demographics

Principal: Paul Davis

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	75%
2019-20 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 (76%) 2017-18: A (77%) 2016-17: A (75%) 2015-16: A (75%)
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 is pending approval by the Duval County School Board.

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

Darnell Cookman Middle/High School

1701 N DAVIS ST, Jacksonville, FL 32209

http://www.duvalschools.org/darnellcookman

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 6-12	Yes	44%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	81%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval County School Board.

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 prepare students for collegiate success through a rigorous college preparatory curriculum integrated with professional medical standards, emphasizing integrity, the pursuit of excellence, and a passion for lifelong learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Fulfilling Excellence, Pursuing Greatness

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Zakaria, Osama	Assistant Principal	Works with curriculum and instruction, operations, scheduling, observations, monitoring of Social Studies and Advance Placement.
Holsey-Smiley, Angela	Assistant Principal	Works with curriculum and instruction, operations, scheduling, observations, monitoring of ELA and Electives.
Lyles, Tyrus	Principal	Works with curriculum and instruction, operations, scheduling, observations, monitoring of Math and Science.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2015, Paul Davis

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
56

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	75%
2019-20 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 (76%) 2017-18: A (77%) 2016-17: A (75%) 2015-16: A (75%)
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](#).	

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	301	290	232	106	101	74	71	1175
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	9	10	9	5	2	6	55
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	45	46	0	0	0	0	150
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	43	46	11	2	0	0	161
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	45	46	11	2	0	0	163
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	45	46	11	2	0	0	163
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	45	46	11	2	0	0	163

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	6	5	2	3	1	0	1	18

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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Saturday 6/27/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	301	290	232	106	101	74	71	1175
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	9	10	9	5	2	6	55
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	45	46	0	0	0	0	150
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	43	46	11	2	0	0	161
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	45	46	11	2	0	0	163

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	6	5	2	3	1	0	1	18

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	

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	301	290	232	106	101	74	71	1175
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	9	10	9	5	2	6	55
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	45	46	0	0	0	0	150
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	43	46	11	2	0	0	161
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	45	46	11	2	0	0	163

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	6	5	2	3	1	0	1	18

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	

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	82%	47%	56%	79%	46%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	66%	48%	51%	65%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	67%	42%	42%	64%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	78%	51%	51%	74%	59%	49%
Math Learning Gains	60%	52%	48%	61%	52%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	47%	45%	47%	45%	39%
Science Achievement	82%	65%	68%	86%	64%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	91%	70%	73%	94%	64%	70%

	EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**							**Total**
	6	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
	(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.

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	77%	47%	30%	54%	23%
	2018	74%	44%	30%	52%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	81%	44%	37%	52%	29%
	2018	83%	41%	42%	51%	32%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
08	2019	81%	49%	32%	56%	25%
	2018	89%	51%	38%	58%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
09	2019	88%	48%	40%	55%	33%
	2018	82%	48%	34%	53%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
10	2019	97%	48%	49%	53%	44%
	2018	96%	49%	47%	53%	43%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	63%	51%	12%	55%	8%
	2018	66%	42%	24%	52%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	81%	47%	34%	54%	27%
	2018	83%	50%	33%	54%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-83%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	75%	40%	35%	48%	27%
	2018	84%	44%	40%	50%	34%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	92%	67%	25%	67%	25%
2018	93%	63%	30%	65%	28%
Compare		-1%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	89%	69%	20%	71%	18%
2018	94%	84%	10%	71%	23%
Compare		-5%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	99%	68%	31%	70%	29%
2018	92%	64%	28%	68%	24%
Compare		7%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	83%	57%	26%	61%	22%
2018	81%	61%	20%	62%	19%
Compare		2%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	82%	61%	21%	57%	25%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	86%	57%	29%	56%	30%
	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	46	54	48	38	44	42	50	78			
ELL	72	63	68	63	41	38	57				
ASN	89	74	77	88	73	31	85	96	92	100	100
BLK	75	61	63	68	52	42	74	89	77	100	62
HSP	88	67	80	82	60	61	82	90	91		
MUL	85	70		81	62		83	86	86		
WHT	89	69	74	88	67	54	94	95	97		
FRL	75	64	61	71	53	43	72	86	81	100	71

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	57	62	50	53	29	30					
ELL	50	65	57	53	26			90			
ASN	88	73	63	93	77	73	93	97	97	100	71
BLK	78	63	61	70	53	48	87	92	75	100	66
HSP	87	71	76	82	49	56	89	97	95		
MUL	88	74		87	55		92	94	92		
WHT	87	71	70	84	59	60	90	97	83	100	67
FRL	80	66	65	74	54	50	86	93	79	100	58

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	57	57	50	37	46	27	55				
ELL	40	55	59	35	43	33					
ASN	91	75	75	91	76	56	91	95	97	100	69
BLK	68	59	61	63	52	43	81	89	75	100	62
HSP	78	61	57	69	63	58	88	100	86		
MUL	90	73	80	77	62		88	94	100		
WHT	88	68	73	84	65	61	94	100	89	100	75
FRL	70	58	57	65	50	40	79	90	77	100	56

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	76
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	73
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	909
Total Components for the Federal Index	12
Percent Tested	100%

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%	0
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%	0
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%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	82
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	78

Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	79
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	81
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	71
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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.

Students earning a 1 & 2 on state assessments
Teachers not teaching to the level the assessment.
Students having significant deficiencies in reading.
The data from 2018 to 2019 shows a decline in performance in the Lowest 25% in Math.

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

Students earning a 1 & 2 on state assessments
Teachers not teaching to the level the assessment.
Students having significant deficiencies in reading.

The data from 2018 to 2019 shows a decline in performance in the Lowest 25% in Math. 2018- 54% to 2019-44%

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.

African American students show a significant gap in achievement.
The population of African American students is higher than any other sub-groups. The higher number of African American will show a gap in performance and early warning indicators when compared to all other sub groups.

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

Number of Students Retained
Teachers work collaboratively to ensure the success of each student. Additionally, we monitor student achievement once per month each grade level during the Academic Review meetings.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Students earning a 1 or 2 on state assessments
Reading/ELA achievement
Math Lowest 25%

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

1. Students earning a 1 on state assessments
2. Reading/ELA achievement
3. Students not achieving 90% attendance rate.
4. Number of students receiving OSS/ISS
5. Two or more early warning indicators,

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The students in the lowest 25% in math traditionally have not performed at the best. With tutorials and a focus on these students we are not able to raise the achievement level of these students.
Measurable Outcome:	The students will increase their performance level from 44% to 58.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tyrus Lyles (lylest@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Monitor and track student performance by ensuring the standards and ALD's mastered. Teachers must teach the standards and differentiate instruction to address the needs of these students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teaching the standard, using the ALD's and monitoring student performance is a best practice used the increase student performance.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Increase teacher's knowledge and capacity for standards based instruction
2. Monitor student performance
3. Observe teachers and provide feedback on instructional practices
4. Track data on each student and have data chats
5. Ensure teachers are using the ALD's for each standards assessed.
6. Purchased math, social studies, and science to increase the proficiency across subject areas.
7. Tutorial sessions across subject areas to increase proficiency in all subject areas.
8. Additional instructional supplies to support the instructional programs.

Person Responsible	Tyrus Lyles (lylest@duvalschools.org)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Student-Teacher Trust
Measurable Outcome:	Increase student trust in teachers to reduce student stress and improve communication between students and teachers to create a trust between the two.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Osama Zakaria (zakariao@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Growth Mindset
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The Growth Mindset defines student trust as a perception that the instructor understands the challenges facing students and accepts students for who they are, and cares about the educational welfare of students.

Action Steps to Implement	
Create lessons that are engaging where teacher interactions are positive and promote a culture of shared responsibility for learning.	
Person Responsible	Osama Zakaria (zakariao@duvalschools.org)
Positive reinforcement or praise when students are struggling with understanding content.	
Person Responsible	Osama Zakaria (zakariao@duvalschools.org)
Provide feedback in a timely manner for classwork and/or homework assignments.	
Person Responsible	Osama Zakaria (zakariao@duvalschools.org)
Enter grades in a timely manner.	
Person Responsible	Osama Zakaria (zakariao@duvalschools.org)

#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	

Action Steps to Implement
No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Ensure that all students at Darnell Cookman School of the Medical Arts are offered the equivalent experience that they will see in the assessments at the end of the year. The majority of classroom grades and scores on summative and/or end of year assessments have limited correlation.
Measurable Outcome:	The vast majority of our current teachers will implement classroom assessments that are aligned to the complexity of the standards as measured by the standards walk-through document.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tyrus Lyles (lylest@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	To facilitate PLC and common planning to create equivalent experiences aligned to assessments would ensure ALL students develop the capacity to understand content that is complex and challenging.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students that develop the capacity to understand content that is complex and challenging, will directly impact performance on assessments.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers collaborate to identify targeted content aligned to the standards.

Person Responsible	Tyrus Lyles (lylest@duvalschools.org)

Teachers review the data on a regular basis to identify students needing extended remediation of the standards not mastered.

Person Responsible	Tyrus Lyles (lylest@duvalschools.org)

Teachers and admin to continuously review the district assessment data to improve students' achievement of rigorous standards-based instruction tested.

Person Responsible	Tyrus Lyles (lylest@duvalschools.org)

Teachers and admin participate in district provided Professional Development to identify effective instructional strategies for low performing students and how to scaffold their learning

Person Responsible	Tyrus Lyles (lylest@duvalschools.org)

Admin to conduct frequent Standards-Based Instructional walk-throughs to observe the aligned instruction.

Person Responsible	Tyrus Lyles (lylest@duvalschools.org)

Teachers analyze tests results to diagnose student learning, improve assessments and instruction, and modify their instructional strategy to re-teach the rigorous content.

Person Responsible	Tyrus Lyles (lylest@duvalschools.org)

Teachers collaboratively analyze and revise assignments and assessments to increase the cognitive complexity and alignment to standards.

Person Responsible   Tyrus Lyles (lylest@duvalschools.org)

Teachers create blended learning opportunities that challenge students to perform at higher levels of learning from a variety of sources.

Person Responsible   Tyrus Lyles (lylest@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

**• Use standards based tracking forms and interventions twice per week using Math XL and other resources to
re mediate the standards for lowest 25% in 7th grade math students that scored 1's & 2's on the FSA 18-19.**

**• Small group interventions in each class period on standards students scored poorly- Exit tickets or quizzes
as form of assessment to assess the standards.**

• Review 9-weeks assessment data to provide Tier 1, 2, & 3 interventions.

**• Provide targeted tutoring opportunities for the lowest 25% in 7th grade math students using SAI and Title
funds. Students will have access to content area teachers and the National Honor Society peer tutorial
program.**
• Additional materials and supplies to supplement the interventions listed above.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

• Provide a stakeholder suggestion box to hear the issues that stakeholders face and provide additional supports as need.
• Continue with my open-door policy for stakeholders to meet with me and discuss any problems they may have and prioritize to build trust. I am here to address issues they have in a non-judgmental forum.
• Continue attending the PTSA & SAC meetings to hear stakeholders concerns and work as a team to develop solutions to the concerns.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:	$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**