

Duval County Public Schools

Andrew Jackson 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	20
Budget to Support Goals	0

Andrew Jackson High School

3816 N MAIN ST, Jacksonville, FL 32206

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

Demographics

Principal: Truitte Moreland

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

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)	87%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: D (40%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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

Andrew Jackson High School

3816 N MAIN ST, Jacksonville, FL 32206

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

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	Yes	87%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	90%

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.

Our Mission is to provide educational excellence in every classroom, for every student, every day by ensuring all students graduate college and/or career ready.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Andrew Jackson High School will be a nationally recognized advanced technology high school known for an innovative environment, signature programs, and success of its students in college, 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
Moreland, Truitte	Principal	
Stuckey, James	Assistant Principal	
Stargill, Sabrina	School Counselor	
Townsend, Michael	Assistant Principal	
Ashley, Sharmariton	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Truitte Moreland

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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

47

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)	87%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: D (40%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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	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	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	
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

Tuesday 10/20/2020

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	0	300	285	141	75	801
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	44	25	21	111
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	55	18	7	127
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	17	10	20	122
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	106	52	20	258

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	73	75	48	18	214	

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	8	23	4	1	36
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	21	0	36

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	300	285	141	75	801
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	44	25	21	111
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	55	18	7	127
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	17	10	20	122
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	106	52	20	258

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	73	75	48	18	214

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	8	23	4	1	36
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	21	0	36

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	30%	47%	56%	20%	46%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	36%	48%	51%	33%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	42%	42%	29%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	51%	51%	51%	78%	59%	49%
Math Learning Gains	52%	52%	48%	69%	52%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	47%	45%	58%	45%	39%
Science Achievement	73%	65%	68%	57%	64%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	56%	70%	73%	34%	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	30%	48%	-18%	55%	-25%
	2018	30%	48%	-18%	53%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	29%	48%	-19%	53%	-24%
	2018	30%	49%	-19%	53%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

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	72%	67%	5%	67%	5%
2018	59%	63%	-4%	65%	-6%
Compare		13%			
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	56%	68%	-12%	70%	-14%
2018	44%	64%	-20%	68%	-24%
Compare		12%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	45%	57%	-12%	61%	-16%
2018	64%	61%	3%	62%	2%
Compare		-19%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	53%	61%	-8%	57%	-4%
2018	55%	57%	-2%	56%	-1%
Compare		-2%			

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	13	44	48	27	50		46	36		100	85
BLK	26	35	43	45	48	47	68	52		95	79
HSP	46	50									
MUL	47	13									
WHT	51	47		80	76		82				
FRL	22	35	41	48	54	52	67	55		91	76
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	15	48	40	24			17	20		100	53
BLK	22	43	41	55	67	76	49	42		87	63
WHT	60	65		86	91						
FRL	28	47	39	58	72	81	57	42		83	60
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	4	17	20				23	6		79	55
BLK	17	31	26	78	70	67	54	34		83	79
WHT	45										
FRL	19	31	28	77	67	53	54	30		83	77

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	559
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	54
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	48
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	30
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	67
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	54
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.

AJHS demonstrated a 19% drop in Algebra 1 proficiency overall. This was primarily due to a vacancy in the department and the promotion of a highly effective teacher out of the classroom. There is also a continued trend in ELA and Math Achievement between the proficiency of black students compared to white students. This gap in ELA proficiency is closing but still stood at approximately 25%, while the gap in Math proficiency actually increased to 35%.

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

AJHS demonstrated a 19% drop in Algebra 1 proficiency overall. This was primarily due to a vacancy in the department and the promotion of a highly effective teacher out of the classroom.

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.

AJHS's greatest gap is in ELA with the difference between proficiency for 9th grade being 18% and for 10th grade being 19%. This was true for both 2018 and 2019. This factor is primarily related to the incoming proficiency of our students.

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

Biology showed the most improvement year over year. The hire of a highly effective teacher, administrative support in planning and the classroom, standards-aligned instruction and using data to effectively schedule students resulted in this improvement.

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

There is also a continued trend in ELA and Math Achievement between the proficiency of black students compared to white students. This gap in ELA proficiency is closing but still stood at approximately 25%, while the gap in Math proficiency actually increased to 35%.

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

1. 9th Grade ELA proficiency/achievement
2. 10th Grade ELA proficiency/achievement
3. US History proficiency/achievement
4. Reduction in the achievement gap between black and white students in Math proficiency/achievement
5. Reduction in the achievement gap between black and white students in ELA proficiency/achievement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>Description: Planning will ensure that instructional delivery and assessment are aligned to the depth and complexity level of the standard.</p> <p>Through planning teachers will plan and deliver standards aligned tasks and assessments.</p> <p>Impact: Providing standards-aligned instruction improves the academic achievement of students on state assessments.</p> <p>Rationale: The standards based continuum designates 4 areas of focus (calibrated administration, collaborative administration, standards based planning, and aligned observations). Based on the analysis of last year's standards-based instruction observations, three subcategories have been identified as needing improvement. *50% of classrooms observed, students used the standard focus board to guide their learning *30% of classrooms observed, the task aligned to grade level standard *40% of classrooms observed, student assessment aligned to the learning arc</p>
Measurable Outcome:	<p>*Vast majority of classrooms observed, students used the standard focus board to guide their learning *Vast majority of classrooms observed, the task aligned to grade level standard or appropriate complexity level for the subject *Vast majority of classrooms observed, student assessment aligned to the learning arc</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	<p>Vast majority of teachers will have standards aligned task and assessments implemented as measured by the SWT.</p> <p>Truitte Moreland (morelandt@duvalschools.org)</p>
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Observe, evaluate, and plan next steps for teachers in three main areas for standards based instruction. The use of the Standards focus board, instructional delivery, and assessing student learning each have three sub categories. The planned next steps will be specific to the identified areas of weakness for each of the sub categories.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Implementing this strategy ensures that all aspects of standards based instruction are taking place in classrooms. The standards based walk through tool was utilized to evaluate the status of classroom instruction in 2020-2021. The tool was a resource and provided the criteria for three areas.</p>

Action Steps to Implement

1A. Teachers will participate in professional development for task alignment to the standard. The PD will prepare them to complete task alignment consistently when writing lesson plans (aligning student task to complexity level of the standard).

Person Responsible Sharmariton Ashley (ashleys@duvalschools.org)

Monthly, School Leadership team will tier teachers in three categories: Standard Focus Board, Instructional Delivery, and Assessment alignment to the standard. Initially teachers will self-reflect and tier themselves. This information will be used to discuss and write IPDP (individual professional development plans).

Person Responsible Michael Townsend (townsendm@duvalschools.org)

One ADPD per month will be dedicated to peer walk through using school rubric for standards based instructional delivery. Teachers will document their observations and the information will be shared during faculty meetings. This is calibration strategy for the entire school (department based). Start date TBD.

Person Responsible James Stuckey (stuckeyj@duvalschools.org)

One ADPD a month will be dedicated to review and analyze individual teacher progress for implementing standards based instruction. Teachers will prepare an action plan to address areas from the SWT that are not aligned appropriately.

Person Responsible Truitte Moreland (morelandt@duvalschools.org)

The teachers will work during common planning to create lessons (including aligned tasks and aligned assessment) that involve explicit instruction, modeling, and differentiated activities for stations/rotations. Lesson plan binders will be checked quarterly by administration and feedback provided to the teachers.

Person Responsible Sharmariton Ashley (ashleys@duvalschools.org)

1B. Teachers will participate in professional development for student use of the standard focus board.

Person Responsible Sharmariton Ashley (ashleys@duvalschools.org)

1C. Teachers will participate in professional development for aligning assessment to the learning ARC.

Person Responsible Sharmariton Ashley (ashleys@duvalschools.org)

Administration will walk classes and calibrate using the SWT. This will take place weeks 1-3 of school.

Person Responsible Truitte Moreland (morelandt@duvalschools.org)

Administration, academic coaches, and teacher leads will calibrate using the SWT. This will take place during weeks 2-5.

Person Responsible Truitte Moreland (morelandt@duvalschools.org)

Pre-Planning PD:

Teachers will attend PD explaining the differences between PLC & Common Planning.

Person Responsible Truitte Moreland (morelandt@duvalschools.org)

Pre-Planning PD:

Teachers will attend PD where they will practice the PLC process (steps 1-4) and the common planning process (steps 5-7) utilizing the school's 3 part standards alignment document.

Person Responsible James Stuckey (stuckeyj@duvalschools.org)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to School Safety

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>The focus will be of improving student and teacher confidence in the school being a safe environment.</p> <p>The 5 essentials survey identified safety as a major concern for students and teachers.</p>
Measurable Outcome:	Improve the rating on the 5 essentials survey.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michael Townsend (townsendm@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Survey stakeholders and determine what their specific areas of concern are in regards to safety then strategically address those areas.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Safety was identified as a concern by the stakeholders. We need to have additional conversation to understand exactly what their concerns were.
Action Steps to Implement	
Complete FSSAT Walk through and form.	
Person Responsible	James Stuckey (stuckeyj@duvalschools.org)
Survey returning students and staff regarding their safety concerns.	
Person Responsible	James Stuckey (stuckeyj@duvalschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Career & Technical Education**Description:**

Planning will ensure that over a 4 year course progression, students are equipped with the skills they need to be post-secondary ready (college and career).

Magnet teachers and academic content teachers will plan lessons that prepare students for post-secondary readiness.

Impact:

Aligning lessons for a 4 year course progression allows us to

Area of Focus**Description****and****Rationale:****Rationale:**

National Career Academy Coalition (NCAC) standards of practice define an academy as having a "well defined design within the high school, reflection its status as a small learning community (SLC)."

- Cross-grade articulation - an overall four-year experience
- A clear program of study with a definitive course sequence
- Cohort scheduling with at least 2 courses per grade level as a cohort with at least 80% of the enrollment in these courses academy students
- Academy design planning with ample opportunity for the academy staff, advisory board and academic content teachers to plan the academy together, ideally during the school day.

Measurable Outcome:

- * Well designed 4 year curriculum within magnet academy courses that includes industry content, industry certification and quarterly practice for interviews, resume and soft skills.
- * Monthly academy themed lessons with artifacts given in academic content courses (ELA, Math, Social Studies & Science)
- * Development of a 5-year Post-Secondary Plan by each student with at least an annual review by School Counselors

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Truitte Moreland (morelandt@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

All teachers will participate regularly within assigned learning communities that meet regularly to achieve measurable outcomes.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Learning communities ensure that students learn content that is aligned to established benchmarks and standards. They also help foster a culture of collaboration within an organization which leads to school improvement. Learning communities are an evidence based best-practice in teaching and learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Academic content teachers are organized into PLCs that meet weekly to plan. As they plan they will ensure that they are creating common monthly academy themed lessons in academic content courses (ELA, Math, Social Studies & Science)

Person Responsible

Truitte Moreland (morelandt@duvalschools.org)

All teachers will be organized into SLCs around either AFJROTC, Sports Medicine or IT. SLCs will meet to plan during Early Dismissal Days. They will meet for the purpose of academy design and development.

Person Responsible Truitte Moreland (morelandt@duvalschools.org)

Magnet teachers will help each student develop a 5-year Post-Secondary Plan with at least an annual review by School Counselors.

Person Responsible James Stuckey (stuckeyj@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Teachers: Title I Funds will be utilized to fund additional classroom teachers (Language Arts, Vocational and Math) to promote student achievement by providing smaller class sizes and more specialized support across subject areas.

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.

All aspects of school culture are shared during PTSA, SAC, and faculty meetings. All stakeholders are invited to participate in the SIP Development through the SIP Developmental meetings that are held throughout the summer.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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