

Duval County Public Schools

Darnell Cookman Middle/ High School



2021-22 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	22
Positive Culture & Environment	24
Budget to Support Goals	25

Darnell Cookman Middle/High School

1701 N DAVIS ST, Jacksonville, FL 32209

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

Demographics

Principal: Paul Davis

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	75%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: A (77%) 2016-17: A (75%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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	22
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	25

Darnell Cookman Middle/High School

1701 N DAVIS ST, Jacksonville, FL 32209

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 6-12	Yes	45%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	84%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	A

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

Fulfilling Excellence, Pursuing Greatness

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Zakaria, Osama	Assistant Principal	Management and supervision of a middle/high school magnet, comprehensive, urban school, and its programs
Holsey-Smiley, Angela	Assistant Principal	Management and supervision of a middle/high school magnet, comprehensive, urban school, and its programs
Lyles, Tyrus	Principal	Management and supervision of a middle/high school magnet, comprehensive, urban school, and its program

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Paul Davis

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

4

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

59

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,175

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

2

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

5

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems****2021-22****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	305	262	240	89	94	83	66	1139	
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	10	4	1	0	0	0	0	15	
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	15	7	2	2	0	0	44	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	11	4	1	2	0	0	40	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	22	10	0	0	0	0	45	

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

Tuesday 6/15/2021

2020-21 - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	301	290	232	106	101	74	71	1175	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	9	10	9	5	2	6	55	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	45	46	0	0	0	0	150	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	43	46	11	2	0	0	161	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	45	46	11	2	0	0	163	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	45	46	11	2	0	0	163	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	45	46	11	2	0	0	163	

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	2	3	1	0	1	18	

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

2020-21 - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	301	290	232	106	101	74	71	1175	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	9	10	9	5	2	6	55	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	45	46	0	0	0	0	150	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	43	46	11	2	0	0	161	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	45	46	11	2	0	0	163	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	45	46	11	2	0	0	163	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	45	46	11	2	0	0	163	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	5	2	3	1	0	1	18

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
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 Review**

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				82%	47%	56%	83%	47%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				66%	48%	51%	68%	49%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				67%	42%	42%	65%	42%	44%
Math Achievement				78%	51%	51%	80%	51%	51%
Math Learning Gains				60%	52%	48%	59%	55%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				44%	47%	45%	54%	50%	45%
Science Achievement				82%	65%	68%	89%	61%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				91%	70%	73%	94%	67%	71%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	77%	47%	30%	54%	23%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	81%	44%	37%	52%	29%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				
08	2021					
	2019	81%	49%	32%	56%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				
09	2021					
	2019	88%	48%	40%	55%	33%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				
10	2021					
	2019	97%	48%	49%	53%	44%
Cohort Comparison		-88%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	63%	51%	12%	55%	8%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	81%	47%	34%	54%	27%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
08	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-81%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	75%	40%	35%	48%	27%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	92%	67%	25%	67%	25%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	89%	69%	20%	71%	18%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	99%	68%	31%	70%	29%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	83%	57%	26%	61%	22%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	82%	61%	21%	57%	25%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

PMA I, II, & III

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	60	64	76
	Economically Disadvantaged	63	64	67
	Students With Disabilities	20	20	40
	English Language Learners	25	25	43
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	39	40	36
	Economically Disadvantaged	35	40	51
	Students With Disabilities	33	33	33
	English Language Learners	25	14	0

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	66	74	77
	Economically Disadvantaged	74	64	74
	Students With Disabilities	33	46	42
	English Language Learners	33	46	42
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	67	61	66
	Economically Disadvantaged	59	53	61
	Students With Disabilities	33	56	33
	English Language Learners	50	50	67
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	55	67	72
	Economically Disadvantaged	51	56	67
	Students With Disabilities	50	33	33
	English Language Learners	100	75	100

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	78	82	52
	Economically Disadvantaged	63	64	67
	Students With Disabilities	25	25	43
	English Language Learners	20	20	40
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	55	44	61
	Economically Disadvantaged	43	35	51
	Students With Disabilities	13	22	.13
	English Language Learners	0	50	50
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	72	75	82
	Economically Disadvantaged	67	67	75
	Students With Disabilities	33	22	75
	English Language Learners	67	0	100

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	53	73	86
	Economically Disadvantaged	58	73	87
	Students With Disabilities	100	100	100
	English Language Learners	0	50	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	59	46	55
	Economically Disadvantaged	57	43	49
	Students With Disabilities	67	33	17
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	68	69	75
	Economically Disadvantaged	67	61	73
	Students With Disabilities	83	100	100
	English Language Learners	0	50	0
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	65	84	81
	Economically Disadvantaged	68	84	73
	Students With Disabilities	25	50	50
	English Language Learners	0	100	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
Biology	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	52	45	67
	Economically Disadvantaged	43	34	67
US History	Students With Disabilities	20	20	25
	English Language Learners	0	100	0

Grade 12				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
Biology	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
US History	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	28	38	27	26	19	16	54	50	40		
ELL	64	61	52	66	34	25	75	82	80		
ASN	82	67	37	76	28	18	87	94	84		
BLK	64	53	40	45	20	17	66	75	61	100	97
HSP	62	58	50	62	25	29	57	71	67		

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
MUL	68	56		55	18		77	80	59		
WHT	83	63	68	70	33	30	83	90	72	100	100
FRL	62	50	41	46	20	16	66	71	60	100	96
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	46	54	48	38	44	42	50	78			
ELL	72	63	68	63	41	38	57				
ASN	89	74	77	88	73	31	85	96	92	100	100
BLK	75	61	63	68	52	42	74	89	77	100	62
HSP	88	67	80	82	60	61	82	90	91		
MUL	85	70		81	62		83	86	86		
WHT	89	69	74	88	67	54	94	95	97		
FRL	75	64	61	71	53	43	72	86	81	100	71
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	57	62	50	53	29	30					
ELL	50	65	57	53	26			90			
ASN	88	73	63	93	77	73	93	97	97	100	71
BLK	78	63	61	70	53	48	87	92	75	100	66
HSP	87	71	76	82	49	56	89	97	95		
MUL	88	74		87	55		92	94	92		
WHT	87	71	70	84	59	60	90	97	83	100	67
FRL	80	66	65	74	54	50	86	93	79	100	58

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64
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	79
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	770
Total Components for the Federal Index	12
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	62
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	64
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	58
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	59
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	72
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	57
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

ELA

ELA maintains higher level of achievement throughout 6th – 10th.

6th Grade: Increases at all levels.

7th Grade: Maintains high levels achievement across all students and subgroups. Fall to Winter show major growth in SWD & ELL.

8th Grade: Constant growth from Fall to Spring in all subgroups. In the spring, all students decreased. The challenges of face-to-face instruction versus DHR instruction may account for the decrease.

9th Grade: Consistent increases Fall to the Spring, but a slight drop in ELL.

10th Grade: Consistent increases in all groups especially during Winter.

Math

Math 6 shows increases and decreases during each administration of the PMA SWD & ELL shows small decreases in each PMA session.

Math 7 shows increase in SWD & ELL. SWD decreased by 26 points from Winter to Spring.

Algebra shows steady increases in the All Students category. SWD shows a 9-point decrease from Winter to the Spring.

Geometry shows a decline in the All Students category Fall to Winter, 13 points. SWD decreased 50 points Fall to Spring.

Science

8th Grade Science and Biology shows consistent increases Fall to Spring in all subgroups.

8th Grade Science

ED-8 points

SWD- 23 points

Biology

ED 12 points

SWD 17 points

Social Studies

Civics-Constant increases for all subgroups. The only dip in performance occurred in SWD, Fall to

Winter= 27 points

US History shows increases and decreases in subgroups. The data is not consistent nor specific

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Based on the data from the PMA's, Math 6 has the greatest need for improvement.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Deficiencies in math skills from incoming 6th graders, dual learning model of face-to-face and remote instruction. The Dual Learning model will not occur the 2021-22 school year. Starting off with skills-based intro lessons will help to improve the overall performance in Math 6.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Math showed the most improvement from the 2019 State Assessments to the 2021 Progress Monitoring Assessments.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Deficiencies in math skills from incoming 6th graders, dual learning model of face-to-face and remote instruction. The Dual Learning model will not occur the 2021-22 school year. Starting off with skills-based intro lessons will help to improve the overall performance in Math 6.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Constant monitoring of the data based on in-class assessments

Develop data charts to show class progress

Continue to review and improve basic skills for the bottom 25%

Continue to teach to the level of the standard

Continue to touch on the math skill deficiencies throughout the year and do not water down the level of instruction. Higher-level instruction with activities, small groups, data chats, and different assessment forms will accelerate learning.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

We will work with the Math Department and the District Math Specialist to design professional development sessions focusing on the strategies listed above. The Math Department will have the opportunity to help develop the sessions for total buy in of these sessions.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Developing professional development sessions for the staff can be beneficial. The sessions will help support the math department to make the learning process full circle. Many of the subjects taught in schools have some level of math embedded in the curriculum. Teachers not comfortable with math will not be required to join this initiative, but many others can assist by meeting with their grade level team and developing review plans for these students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:**#1. Other specifically relating to Teachers**

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The following positions are funded through Title One Karrie Richardson-Middle School Math Megan Matson- Social Studies High School Jeri Johnson-Middle School Science Multiple Teachers tutoring all content areas to improve student achievement.
Measurable Outcome:	We want to increase proficiency in all content areas. The teachers and tutors will use standards based instruction to improve student proficiency on the FSA and EOC assessments.
Monitoring:	We will use the Progress Monitoring Assessments to measure student proficiency and make adjustments as needed per the data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tyrus Lyles (lylest@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards-based instruction will assist our students with post-secondary readiness.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards based instruction is proven to improve outcomes for student success. Standards based instruction is the district's strategy to improve instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

We will use the following products funded by Title One to support Standards based instruction:

- Classroom Supplies (paper, pens, pencils, markers, folders, etc.)
- Carolina Biological Lab & Specimen Supplies
- Carolina Biological Digital Scales (5)
- Toner (Print Release)
- Lexmark CX522ADE Printers (5)
- Lexmark CX522ADE (Color Toner)
- Flash Drives
- Headphones

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Discipline Rates

2014- DC 4.2 - State 3.2= DC 1.0 over state's average

2015- DC 0.9 - State 3.1= DC -3.01 under state's average

2016- DC 3.4 - State 2.9= DC -.5 over state's average

2017-DC 1.2 - State 3.2= DC 1.0 under state's average

2018-DC 1.3 - State 4.5= DC -3.2 under state's average

2019-DC 3.0 - State 2.0= DC -1.3 under state's average

Analysis-Four out of the five years listed shows that Darnell Cookman was under the states average. Some factors for these low rates are the following:

- 1. Change in student population**
- 2. Student buy in of the discipline policy**
- 3. Dean's of Students offering incentives for positive behavior**
- 4. Dean's of Students track discipline trends and develop strategies to reduce these trends**
- 5. Professional develop sessions for staff to address any classroom discipline issues that can be handled by teachers or staff members versus the Dean's of Students**

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.

1. Discipline Assemblies to discuss the Code of Conduct and expectations of students' behavior.
2. Fun Fridays-Student get a chance to play and participate dance competitions. The Dean of Students volunteer to be the DJ which helps to save funding for the school.
3. Cupcakes for straight A's and A & B honor roll students.
4. Principal's trivia about the school
5. Pep Rally for students to show school spirit
6. Movie Night
7. Multi-Cultural Extravaganza
8. Miss Darnell Cookman
9. College Visits
10. Student Clubs for extracurricular participation

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Principal-Supervise and suggest programs to promote positive culture

Asst. Principals- Supervise and suggest programs to promote a positive culture

Guidance Counselors- Provide counseling with positive supports for academics and mental health

Sports Coaches-Provides outlets for students to work in teams and socialize as needed

Dean's of Students- Watch discipline data trends and develop positive behavior programs for students

Teachers-Provide strong instructional practices and incentives to keep students working for content mastery

Parents- Support the mission and vision of the school.

Business Partners-Expose students to careers and avenues for job placement post-secondary school

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Teachers	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00