

Duval County Public Schools

# Duncan U. Fletcher High School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>20</b>

# 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: 7/1/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	41%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: C (53%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>20</b>

## 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)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 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	31%

### School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	A	A	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 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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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, School Counselors, Language Arts
Hayes, Mary	Assistant Principal	Facilities, Biology, PBIS, Discipline
Brown, Mary	School Counselor	Lead Counselor
Stcherbinine, Angela	Assistant Principal	Social Sciences

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Dean Ledford

**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.*

57

**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.*

39

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

95

#### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	41%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: C (53%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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	606	577	529	401	2113
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	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	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math 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		

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Friday 7/31/2020

**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	538	641	495	423	2097	
Attendance below 90 percent	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	1	0	0	1	
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	

**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	0	0	0	538	641	495	423	2097
Attendance below 90 percent	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	36	22	12	8	78
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	

**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	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	
	(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	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
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%	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	73
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	51
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	66
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	66
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	71
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	58
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 Bottom Quartile showed the lowest performance at 44% making a year's growth. As this was our lowest performing area, it also showed one of the largest gains at 11%. We factor this to using specific classes with specific designed strategies to meet the needs of those students. We will continue implementing specific scheduling criteria for those students.

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

We did not show a decline in any of the 10 components.

**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 are ahead of the state average in all areas except one, which is Math Bottom Quartile. We are even with the state average at 45% of our students showing a year's growth. We have had teacher turnover in our math department over the last 3 years. We have also failed to meet the specific needs of our students through our preparatory mathematics classes that assist students in preparing for the state assessments.

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

Our overall learning gains and bottom quartile learning gains both increased 11% moving from 44% to 55% and 33% to 44% respectively. We contribute this to using specific classes with specific designed strategies to meet the needs of those students. We will continue implementing specific scheduling criteria for those students.

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

Needs to be completed

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

1. Overall Learning Gains in Mathematics
2. Bottom Quartile Learning Gains in Mathematics
3. Acceleration - keeping our current average among scheduling changes
4. Collective Responsibility and Building Teacher Influence among staff members
5. Overall Safety Procedures with different scheduling procedures and COVID Concerns

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Fletcher's core content classes averaged 2.4 out of 5 when observing Assessing Student Learning. Students were not given a chance to determine mastery of standards. Most of the lesson were not aligned to the learning arc and many task were not aligned to FSA standards. This indicates most of our students are not given a chance to perform at grade level.

**Measurable Outcome:** Fletcher's core content classes will average a rating of 4 out of 5 around Assessment of Student Learning.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** James Dean Ledford (ledfordj@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.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Fletcher should ensure students are getting the opportunity to show mastery of the standard. Students task should be on the appropriate level of the learning arc and task should be aligned to the standard. This will provide students with success when faced with the assessments designed by the state, along with the following year's progression of standards.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Train assistant principals on the standard walkthrough form - specifically in the assessing student learning category.

**Person Responsible** James Dean Ledford (ledfordj@duvalschools.org)

Conduct school improvement rounds with high school cluster focusing on assessing student learning.

**Person Responsible** James Dean Ledford (ledfordj@duvalschools.org)

Train teachers to use common planning procedures that enable teachers to build lessons and create tasks that are aligned to the standards.

**Person Responsible** James Dean Ledford (ledfordj@duvalschools.org)

Provide training for teachers during PLCs that allow them to obtain information needed to produce a product during common planning.

**Person Responsible** James Dean Ledford (ledfordj@duvalschools.org)

Teachers will collaborate and work with each other during common planning lead by the following individuals;

Ms. Murrell  
Ms. Taber  
Ms. Vanlue  
Ms. Singleton



**Person Responsible** James Dean Ledford (ledfordj@duvalschools.org)

Administrators will meet regularly on Mondays to discuss their instructional review walks for the week. During these meetings, the admin team will focus on classrooms that did not have instruction or tasks that were aligned to the standard. The team will create action steps based on the needs of the building.

**Person Responsible** James Dean Ledford (ledfordj@duvalschools.org)

**#2. Leadership specifically relating to Leadership Development**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Our next area of focus is around building teacher influence and taking a collective responsibility among staff members. We believe this will improve through leadership development. Every student will benefit across all curriculum as the faculty influences each other in a positive manner to improve their overall instructional deliveries. Building leadership among the faculty will allow them to take more of a collective responsibility of the overall environment and academic needs of the school. These needs were identified through our 5Essential Survey data. These were the areas that were listed as the biggest need according to the data presentation.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	We would like to show a 5% increase in the following areas on our 5Essential Survey Building Teacher Influence Collective Responsibility
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	James Dean Ledford (ledfordj@duvalschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Using department heads more around decision making that affects specific departments. Ensuring Professional Learning Communities are being utilized in all areas. Identifying teachers that can lead Professional Development sessions during common planning times
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Using department heads as leaders will help provide examples of teachers working with administration to improve specific areas of their departments. Department heads are specifically picked for their leadership displayed when observing classrooms and during data chats. Ensuring professional learning communities are being utilized in all areas will give all subject areas the tools to assist each other and grow as educators. During common planning is when teachers have the most influence on each other. Identifying teachers that can lead professional development will bring more collective responsibility as teachers will buy-in more learning from colleagues.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Set up schedule for department meetings throughout the year. Create agendas and submit them to the administration prior to the meetings.

**Person Responsible** Ashley Snell (bowleya@duvalschools.org)

Ensure all teachers have common planning among specific courses. Set up norms for each professional learning community that will enable them to create a positive and productive common planning meetings.

**Person Responsible** James Dean Ledford (ledfordj@duvalschools.org)

Monitor lesson deliveries through all subject areas and speak with teachers regarding presenting best practices.

**Person Responsible** Kristen Archon (archonk1@duvalschools.org)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**\*Maintaining our Acceleration Rate for Graduating Seniors - We will continue to utilize our Dual Enrollment courses to provide an accelerated opportunity. We will also emphasize our CET courses for students to earn accelerated credits through specific assessments.**

**\*Overall School Safety - We will be putting several safety procedures in place that will help ensure we following the CDC guidelines as closely as possible.**

## 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.

Below are some action steps and programs we use to ensure student receive support as well as activities they can use to become involved thus ensuring a positive school culture.

- \* Athletic Programs, Performing and Visual Arts programs.
- \* Over 40 different clubs
- \* Push-ins with other various school personnel
- \* Math and Science Tutoring 2 times a week
- \* English and Social Studies Tutoring 2 times a week
- \* Mu Alpha Theta, Math tutoring Monday
- \* French Honor Society help after school everyday
- \* National Honor Society Help Monday through Thursday
- \* Statistics Monday and Thursday after school
- \* Geometry Help Monday through Thursday
- \* PERT Tutoring sessions
- \* ACT/SAT boot camps
- \* ACT/SAT boot camps coordinated with UNF

Reaching out to our parents and using our active clubs is another attempt to bring parents in we use on a consistent basis. Below are a few actions steps we have begun.

- \* Tuesday tours throughout the year for incoming families
- \* PTSA Beautification day - around outside of campus
- \* PTSA Honor roll luncheon
- \* Interact – Canines for warriors project
- \* Homecoming activities – “snarl” - community pep-rally
- \* Fletcher Basketball with local elementary school
- \* Best buddies with local special needs schools
- \* Paws for a cause club – fundraiser for local shelter

\* Fletcher Goes Green – Campus beautification

Our PTSA plays an active role in our school - below are a few activities they have coordinated throughout the year.

- \* PTSA Honor Roll Luncheon
- \* PTSA Beautification
- \* Pre-planning Luncheon for teachers
- \* Homecoming Dance
- \* Pre-planning assistance - Moving furniture and assisting teachers
- \* Increase safety around Fletcher High School – working with local government to install crosswalks on the perimeter of the campus.
- \* Working with the city of Jacksonville Beach around a Mental Health Night at Fletcher

Our School Advisory Council also assists in various areas of our school.

- \* Fletcher's SAC has given ideas about Homecoming Dates, strategies to enhance student learning.
- \* Fletcher's SAC has worked with Fletcher and Mayport MS to enhance safety around campus
- \* Fletcher's SAC has given ideas about how and what to educate parents around involving current events.
- \* Fletcher's SAC has provided guidance around bringing a college going atmosphere to all students at Fletcher.
- \* Fletcher's SAC has offered ideas on strategies to increase overall student performance.

### 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: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Leadership: Leadership Development	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00