

Duval County Public Schools

First Coast High School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	0

First Coast High School

590 DUVAL STATION RD, Jacksonville, FL 32218

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

Demographics

Principal: Justin Fluent

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	79%
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: B (56%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: C (45%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

First Coast High School

590 DUVAL STATION RD, Jacksonville, FL 32218

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">High School 9-12</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">75%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">73%</p>

School Grades History

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

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every student is inspired and prepared for success in college or a career, and life.

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
Fluent, Justin	Principal	
Hackman, Jovana	Assistant Principal	
Emery, Roger	Assistant Principal	
Kimbrough, Reina	Instructional Coach	
Strong, Latroy	Dean	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/29/2020, Justin Fluent

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

101

Demographic Data

2020-21 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

2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	79%
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: B (56%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: C (45%)
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	6
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4

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	5	5

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	35	63	28	6	132
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	72	38	48	233

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/10/2020

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	0	0	0	585	611	510	445	2151
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	339	334	406	0	1079
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	375	380	305	121	1181

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	281	106	172	31	590

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	7	10	2	1	20
Students retained two or more times	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0
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	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	36%	47%	56%	38%	46%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	42%	48%	51%	44%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	42%	42%	38%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	53%	51%	51%	55%	59%	49%
Math Learning Gains	57%	52%	48%	53%	52%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	47%	45%	48%	45%	39%
Science Achievement	59%	65%	68%	54%	64%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	67%	70%	73%	62%	64%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(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
09	2019	36%	48%	-12%	55%	-19%
	2018	36%	48%	-12%	53%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	34%	48%	-14%	53%	-19%
	2018	44%	49%	-5%	53%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

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	58%	67%	-9%	67%	-9%
2018	60%	63%	-3%	65%	-5%
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	65%	68%	-3%	70%	-5%
2018	60%	64%	-4%	68%	-8%
Compare		5%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	44%	57%	-13%	61%	-17%
2018	47%	61%	-14%	62%	-15%
Compare		-3%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	61%	61%	0%	57%	4%
2018	44%	57%	-13%	56%	-12%
Compare		17%			

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	15	34	31	34	59		42	36		79	55
ELL	21	38	30	67							
ASN	65	47		54			80	67			
BLK	29	39	36	43	47	34	43	60		92	71
HSP	46	39	18	67	81		63	73		96	87
MUL	26	39		41			70	58		92	58
WHT	48	46	40	70	66	73	80	82		92	79
FRL	29	40	40	48	49	41	49	56		91	69

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	18	35	32	24	35		50	13		80	55
ELL	8	31		18						100	75
ASN	40	57		40						94	88
BLK	29	45	43	38	48	40	48	53		96	68
HSP	51	57	30	53	39		83	54		91	80
MUL	23	42		46				75		93	85
WHT	62	62	58	70	64	77	84	83		86	72
FRL	35	47	42	41	50	39	56	56		91	66

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	7	26	29	35	36	36	24	38		90	42
ELL	10	55									
ASN	22	33								88	93
BLK	29	41	36	49	51	45	45	55		92	67
HSP	49	43		60	64		73	63		92	83
MUL	41	60		75	60		60	75			
WHT	54	50	43	63	51	50	69	72		89	72
FRL	30	40	37	53	55	50	51	56		88	67

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	56
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	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	616
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
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	42
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	63
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	49
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	63
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	55
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	68
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	51
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.

ELA proficiency showed the lowest performance with 36%. Contributing factors include 4 novice teachers in ELA accountability areas, and student learning activities not fully aligned to the standard.

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

LPQ gains in ELA had a 10% decline from 46% to 36%. Factors that contributed were: 1. scheduling support facilitation, 2. school and target tutoring attendance.

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.

9th grade ELA proficiency was 36% compared to 55% at the state. Factors that contributed were: 1. scheduling of support, 2. novice teachers, 3. targeted small group instruction, 4. learning tasks aligned to standards.

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

Mathematics showed the most improvement with 6% increase from 47% to 53%. New actions include: 1. double-blocking all algebra 1 classes, 2. target tutoring, 3. specialist push-in support.

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

1. Number of retained students
2. Student attendnace

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

1. ELA Proficiency
2. Math Proficiency
3. LPQ Gains
4. Number of retained students
5. OSS occurrences

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Standards Based Planning Focus: Ensuring that lesson delivery, materials, tasks, and assessments are fully aligned to grade level standards. A slight majority of core content teachers exhibit fully aligned lessons and tasks.

Measurable Outcome: The vast majority of our current core content teachers will engage in successful standards-based instruction planning procedures.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Justin Fluent (fluentj@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Facilitate and monitor PLC and common planning sessions that result in instructional delivery that ensures students are exposed to standards aligned instruction, tasks, and assessments.
 In order to adequately prepare students to achieve mastery on the state assessments, schools need to ensure that students are receiving standard-aligned instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The Reading Coach and Math Coach will assist in designing, monitoring, and assessing reading and math achievement progress and provide professional development and coaching for teachers focused on standard alignment. The Graduation Coach will assist in monitoring at-risk seniors to ensure they are progress on standards necessary to exhibit mastery on the state assessments required for graduation. Standard aligned assessments allow for accurate monitoring of student progress of assessed standards. Tier 2 and 3 instruction. Funding of additional teachers in ELA, Math, and Science will assure that class sizes are appropriate for core content areas. Instructional supplies and technology purchased from Title I will ensure that students are exposed to double-blocked mathematics courses in Algebra and Geometry for additional instructional support, resulting in maximized instructional opportunities.

Action Steps to Implement

Train school leadership team and teachers on the relationship between the SIP and the standards based initiative requirement in addition to Florida Standards and item specifications

Person Responsible Justin Fluent (fluentj@duvalschools.org)

Facilitate meaningful professional development with leadership team on the Standards Based Instructional Review process and the Learning Arc Document.

Person Responsible Justin Fluent (fluentj@duvalschools.org)

Administrators and Coaches will engage in PLC and Common Planning to support and provide Professional Development to teachers with a focus on Alignment to Standards utilizing the learning arc document. Teachers will implement PD to create standard aligned lessons, activities, and assessments through common planning.

Person Responsible Reina Kimbrough (kimbroughr@duvalschools.org)

Utilize Title 1 funds to hire a Reading Coach, Math Coach, and additional teachers in ELA, Math, and Science, additional classroom supplies and computer technology to support the execution of our focus area.

Person Responsible Justin Fluent (fluentj@duvalschools.org)

Through the use of the Standards Walkthrough Tool, our leadership team will measure classrooms that have aligned standards and experiences in all core classes

Person Responsible Justin Fluent (fluentj@duvalschools.org)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The area of focus is to implement and coordinate PBIS (noncognitive) expectations school wide in order to create a positive climate and culture at First Coast High School.

Measurable Outcome: By successfully implementing PBIS systems at First Coast High School, we will see a 10% decrease in incidence of student tardiness to class as well as a 10% decrease in Out of School Suspensions. Additionally, the implementation of PBIS will result in a 15% decrease in inappropriate language used toward school board employees.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: By incorporating PBIS expectations into our daily instructional practices, we will both directly and indirectly expose students and faculty to the 5 Social Emotional Competencies, i.e., Teaching Self-Awareness, Responsible Decision Making Skills, Relationship Skills, and Social Awareness Skills.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: According to the Collaborative for Academic, Social and Emotional Learning (CASEL), "Social and emotional learning (SEL) enhances students' capacity to integrate skills, attitudes, and behavior to deal effectively and ethically with daily tasks and challenges. CASEL's integrated framework promotes intrapersonal, interpersonal and cognitive competence."

Action Steps to Implement

PBIS taskforce established which includes teachers, administrators, Dean of Students, and a school secretay to assist in the development of PBIS orientation activities and school-wide PBIS activities.

Person Responsible Latroy Strong (strongl2@duvalschools.org)

PBIS Taskforce worked collaboratively to create expectations for the school with the acronym - ANCHORED: Accountable, Navigate, Compassionate, Honorable, Optimistic, Respectful, Elevated, Determined. This will be posted throughout the school and a flipbook is provided to each faculty member for reference in teaching each key area.

Person Responsible Latroy Strong (strongl2@duvalschools.org)

Each academic department will discuss and align at least one school wide PBIS expectation into their biweekly PLC meetings

Person Responsible Justin Fluent (fluentj@duvalschools.org)

PBIS handbook with PBIS lesson plans, classroom management resources, positive teacher recognition, Behavior flowchart, PBIS matrix for the classroom, cafeteria & duvalhomeroom, and providing tips and strategies teachers can use when communicating with parents.

Person Responsible Latroy Strong (strongl2@duvalschools.org)

Grade level administrators will acknowledge students by posting student accolades in the office area.

Person Responsible Justin Fluent (fluentj@duvalschools.org)

Posting signage around the school to promote our theme, "Anchored in Excellence!"

Person Responsible Latroy Strong (strongl2@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

N/A

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.

First Coast High School will continue to include parents in academic decisions for their children by holding quarterly meetings to share results of academic testing, grading, acceleration, opportunities, and college and career opportunities. The school will utilize newsletters, parent call-outs, social media and the marquee to inform parents of engagement opportunities, in addition, the leadership team has an open door policy for parents and is available to address constituent concerns.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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