Stanton College Preparatory

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Stanton College Preparatory

1149 W 13TH ST, Jacksonville, FL 32209

http://www.duvalschools.org/stanton

Demographics

Principal: Nongongoma Majova

Start Date for this Principal: 7/31/2020

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	27%
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 (84%) 2017-18: A (85%) 2016-17: A (86%) 2015-16: A (80%)
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

Stanton College Preparatory

1149 W 13TH ST, Jacksonville, FL 32209

http://www.duvalschools.org/stanton

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	17%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	65%

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.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Stanton College Preparatory School is to ensure every student is inspired and prepared for success in college or a career and life.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Majova Seane, Nongongoma	Principal	
Hemphill, Matthew	Assistant Principal	
Kerr, Michael	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 7/31/2020, Nongongoma Majova

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

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	27%
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 (84%) 2017-18: A (85%) 2016-17: A (86%) 2015-16: A (80%)
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	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	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	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	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	

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	465	397	364	354	1580
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	8	14	32
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4	0	13
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	21	16	73
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	1	0	0	24

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	3	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	465	397	364	354	1580
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	8	14	32
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	5	4	0	13
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	21	16	73
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	1	0	0	24

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	3	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	95%	47%	56%	98%	46%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	73%	48%	51%	79%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	73%	42%	42%	78%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	84%	51%	51%	86%	59%	49%
Math Learning Gains	61%	52%	48%	67%	52%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	62%	47%	45%	62%	45%	39%
Science Achievement	95%	65%	68%	95%	64%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	97%	70%	73%	98%	64%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**				**Total**
	9	**10**	**11**	**12**	
	(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	94%	48%	46%	55%	39%
	2018	96%	48%	48%	53%	43%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	96%	48%	48%	53%	43%
	2018	97%	49%	48%	53%	44%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	95%	67%	28%	67%	28%
2018	96%	63%	33%	65%	31%
Compare		-1%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	97%	68%	29%	70%	27%
2018	97%	64%	33%	68%	29%
Compare		0%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	14%	57%	-43%	61%	-47%
2018					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	84%	61%	23%	57%	27%
2018	90%	57%	33%	56%	34%
Compare		-6%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	92	77									
ELL	81	79	85	73	64		69				
ASN	95	72	70	94	63		97	96		100	100
BLK	88	66	69	67	55	68	87	93		100	100
HSP	99	81	91	78	63		95	93		100	100
MUL	95	68	50	93	67		100	90		100	100
WHT	96	76	76	89	61	36	96	100		99	100
FRL	93	70	76	69	52	57	89	93		100	100
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	100	54									
ASN	97	77	71	94	56	73	98	97		100	99
BLK	89	73	74	76	65	63	85	92		100	97
HSP	97	57	71	89	57		97	100		100	100
MUL	97	84		75	70		95			100	94
WHT	98	73	69	98	59	82	99	99		100	99
FRL	93	63	66	86	61	71	92	92		100	100
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	92	75		100	70						

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

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	84
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	840
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	85
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	75
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	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	87
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	79
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	89
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	85
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	83
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	80
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.

All questions need to be completed

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

-

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.

-

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

-

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

-

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

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	As indicated by the 5essentials survey, less than 75% of our teachers support the notion of collective responsibility that is fostered through collaboration in PLC and common planning, and this clearly indicates that our students are negatively impacted as it relates to the Opportunity Myth.
Measurable Outcome:	At least 90% of our teachers will engage in meaningful standards-based instruction planning that will boost instructional practices as observed via walkthrough protocols
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nongongoma Majova Seane (majovan@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Common planning and professional learning communities will be monitored to ensure that the standard, aligned tasks and assessments are the responsibility of all teachers in each unit.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	To ensure that instruction, tasks, and assessments are congruent to set standards to make certain that students maintain the entry proficiency level or show growth beyond that proficiency level.

Action Steps to Implement

1) Workshop the monitoring team on the Standards Based Instruction Continuum and SIP

Person Responsible	Nongongoma Majova Seane (majovan@duvalschools.org)

2) Workshop the Leadership Team on the Standards Based Instruction and SIP

Person Responsible	Michael Kerr (kerrm@duvalschools.org)

3) Workshop the teachers on the Standards Based Instruction and SIP

Person Responsible	Matthew Hemphill (scpibcoordinator@gmail.com)

4) Workshop SAC on the Standards Based Instruction and SIP

Person Responsible	Nongongoma Majova Seane (majovan@duvalschools.org)

5) Revisit the 2018-2019 FSA data with teachers while noting the indicated trend data as it relates to proficiency levels

Person Responsible	Nongongoma Majova Seane (majovan@duvalschools.org)

6) Conduct Professional Development to ensure there is a deeper understanding as it relates to Common Planning and Professional Learning Communities

Person Responsible	Nongongoma Majova Seane (majovan@duvalschools.org)

7) Conduct a workshop and construct protocols for Common Planning and PLC for the monitoring team

Person Responsible	Nongongoma Majova Seane (majovan@duvalschools.org)

8) Conduct a workshop and construct protocols for Common Planning and PLC for Department Heads and teachers

Person Responsible	Nongongoma Majova Seane (majovan@duvalschools.org)

9) Conduct Walkthroughs with the monitoring team to calibrate the work

Person Responsible	Nongongoma Majova Seane (majovan@duvalschools.org)

10) Conduct Checkpoints to ensure that we are implementing SIP strategies and modify/extend as needed

Person Responsible	Nongongoma Majova Seane (majovan@duvalschools.org)

#2. -- 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 description entered

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	1. As indicated by the 5 essentials survey under Supportive Environment, 69% of our students doubted their dependence on some teachers.
Measurable Outcome:	2. In believing that the focus probably stemmed from issues relating to grades, particularly inputting them in the system on time, all our teachers will be encouraged to input grades in a timely manner.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	3. Along with perusing the lesson plans, the monitoring team will monitor the grade books to ensure that grades are in the system in a timely manner.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	4. To ensure that grades are in the system in a timely manner so that students can monitor their progress.

Action Steps to Implement

Workshop teachers using the 5essentials survey professional development handouts called 'avoiding power struggles' and 'cultivating caring learning communities.'

Person Responsible	Nongongoma Majova Seane (majovan@duvalschools.org)

2. Workshop teachers on the clause from the district Student Progression Plan clause relating to the timeline for inputting grades in the system.

Person Responsible	Nongongoma Majova Seane (majovan@duvalschools.org)

3. Conduct the Quarterly Curriculum Reviews.

Person Responsible	Nongongoma Majova Seane (majovan@duvalschools.org)

4. Conduct mini sessions during planning to determine if teachers are adhering to the SPP clause.

Person Responsible	Nongongoma Majova Seane (majovan@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

na

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.

Needs to be completed

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: -- Select below --:	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00