

Duval County Public Schools

Atlantic Coast 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	11
Planning for Improvement	21
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	0

Atlantic Coast High School

9735 R G SKINNER PKWY, Jacksonville, FL 32256

www.duvalschools.org/achs

Demographics

Principal: Michael George

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 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	57%
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 (65%) 2017-18: A (62%) 2016-17: B (54%)
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	11
Planning for Improvement	21
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Atlantic Coast High School

9735 R G SKINNER PKWY, Jacksonville, FL 32256

www.duvalschools.org/achs

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 9-12	No	34%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	64%

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.

Our Mission is to provide educational excellence in every school, in every classroom, for every student, every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our Vision 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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Spaulding, Zeina	Principal	<p>Vision/Mission Ambassador</p> <p>Monitors Growth and Implementation of all classes</p> <p>Monitor Administrative and Instructional Personal</p> <p>Continuous Data Analysis and Improvement</p> <p>Teacher Leader Development</p> <p>All duties as outlined per the Florida Principal Leadership Standards</p>
Smith, Michael	Assistant Principal	<p>Vision/Mission Ambassador</p> <p>Principal Designee</p> <p>Monitors Growth and Implementation of all classes (Content Focus is Mathematics)</p> <p>Monitor Administrative and Instructional Personal</p> <p>Continuous Data Analysis and Improvement</p> <p>Teacher Leader Development</p> <p>All duties as outlined per the Florida Principal Leadership Standards and the Principal</p> <p>Monitor Discipline and Attendance through PBIS</p> <p>AP Honors/Capstone</p>
McMahon, Emily	Assistant Principal	<p>Vision/Mission Ambassador</p> <p>Assistant Principal</p> <p>Monitors Growth and Implementation of all classes (Content Focus is Social Studies)</p> <p>CTE and Elective Administrator</p> <p>Monitor Administrative and Instructional Personal</p> <p>Continuous Data Analysis and Improvement</p> <p>Teacher Leader Development</p> <p>All duties as outlined per the Florida Principal Leadership Standards and the Principal</p> <p>Monitor Discipline and Attendance through PBIS</p> <p>Graduation Rate Monitor</p> <p>Staff Communication Lead</p>
Prier, Aleya	Assistant Principal	<p>Vision/Mission Ambassador</p> <p>SIP Lead</p> <p>ESOL Administrator</p> <p>Monitors Growth and Implementation of all classes (Content Focus is ESE & 504)</p> <p>Monitor Administrative and Instructional Personal</p> <p>Continuous Data Analysis and Improvement</p> <p>Teacher Leader Development</p> <p>All duties as outlined per the Florida Principal Leadership Standards and the Principal</p> <p>Lead PBIS - Monitor Discipline and Attendance through PBIS</p>
Nolan, Blair	Assistant Principal	<p>Assistant Principal of Curriculum (FTE, Master Scheduling, Counselors, Enrollment and Academic Progress)</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>Vision/Mission Ambassador</p> <p>Monitors Growth and Implementation of all classes (Content Focus is ELA/ Reading)</p> <p>Monitor Instructional Personal Including Promotion and Retention</p> <p>Continuous Data Analysis and Improvement</p> <p>Teacher Leader Development</p> <p>All duties as outlined per the Florida Principal Leadership Standards and the Principal</p> <p>Lead - Student Recognition and Honor Roll</p>

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Michael George

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.*

29

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.*

88

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

127

Total number of students enrolled at the school

2,295

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

127

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

25

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	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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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

Tuesday 7/20/2021

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	0	0	0	651	645	537	473	2306
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	144	141	73	44	402
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	136	140	103	89	468
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	81	43	35	178
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150	128	0	0	278
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97	21	0	0	118

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	151	119	46	38	354	

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	47	116	90	253	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	17	30	

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	0	0	0	0	651	645	537	473	2306
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	144	141	73	44	402
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	136	140	103	89	468
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	81	43	35	178
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150	128	0	0	278
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97	21	0	0	118

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	151	119	46	38	354	

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	47	116	90	253
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	17	30

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				52%	47%	56%	52%	47%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				53%	48%	51%	49%	49%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45%	42%	42%	29%	42%	44%
Math Achievement				56%	51%	51%	53%	51%	51%
Math Learning Gains				69%	52%	48%	64%	55%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54%	47%	45%	59%	50%	45%
Science Achievement				74%	65%	68%	70%	61%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				75%	70%	73%	73%	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
09	2021					
	2019	50%	48%	2%	55%	-5%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	49%	48%	1%	53%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

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
2021					
2019	70%	67%	3%	67%	3%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	72%	68%	4%	70%	2%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	47%	57%	-10%	61%	-14%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	58%	61%	-3%	57%	1%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

PMA
Teacher Created Assessments
EEA

Grade 9				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 10				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

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

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	24	34	28	31	35	33	38	54		99	40
ELL	16	51	58	23	30	57	38	27		98	89
ASN	58	57	80	53	29		61	90		100	88
BLK	35	43	35	28	34	36	38	57		98	65
HSP	41	51	57	30	28	38	57	55		98	88

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	58	46	18	43	46		59	78		89	88
WHT	62	57	39	49	31	34	72	84		98	83
FRL	39	42	39	35	29	32	46	61		95	71
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	35	45	44	44	55	40	57	34		85	48
ELL	22	46	45	47	73	71	50	58		81	86
ASN	81	66		71	70		84	83		98	96
BLK	36	46	38	41	56	37	62	64		95	77
HSP	41	41	41	55	73	58	69	73		95	82
MUL	56	49	31	64	80		86	81		94	94
WHT	64	62	64	68	74	66	81	81		90	81
FRL	39	46	45	46	67	56	62	70		91	74
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	28	38	24	44	56	46	35	58		81	39
ELL	25	43	38	36	58		42	43		81	86
ASN	74	58	36	71	72		88	81		97	81
BLK	33	37	21	40	48	37	43	63		86	69
HSP	49	53	41	49	61	73	69	64		88	80
MUL	51	40	17	47	44		80	78		88	76
WHT	64	57	35	64	74	69	83	80		94	78
FRL	42	42	25	46	54	54	60	62		86	67

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	55
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	54
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	605
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	94%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	42
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
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	68
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	47
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	55
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	58
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	61
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	51
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?

The ELA Lowest 25 Percentile showed the lowest performance. The contributing factor to last year's performance was students needed more instructional time mastering the standards in their English classroom.

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

Math Lowest 25 Percentile showed the least amount of growth from the prior year. Unfortunately, we have math teacher turnover in the building. The Math PLC is at the beginning stages of learning the standards and the task demands. As a result, there was not much time cultivating lessons for differentiated instruction on a consistent basis.

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

Contributing factors are:

Continued and/or New Actions:

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

The content area that showed the greatest improvement was

The data component that showed the most improvement was Math Learning Gains. During PLCs, the team focused on unwrapping standards and ensuring tasks were aligned to the standard.

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

The contributing factor was the monitoring of the district's Learning Arc where teachers were planning lessons that were aligned to the standard, tasks created matched the lesson objective and the assessment opportunities were generated per the standard item specifications.

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

To continue to the work with use of drilling down activities per the Learning Arc model. Plan per the standard, Instruct per the standard with true experiences that align to the standard and finally assess the standard per the expectation of the standard and item specification.

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.

PD for the 21-22 School Year will be:
Learning Arc Focused Lesson - PLC's and Common Planning
Standard Based Activities Review - Equip Protocol
Study Island Implementation

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

Progress Monitoring for LAP Meetings will be held with ESE and Gen Ed Teachers on a 3 week rotation. Doing so may result in students with specific needs receiving interventions prior to being identified as failing on progress reports and/or report cards.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The slight majority of the classrooms at Atlantic Coast High School show standards aligned instruction, tasks and/or assessments. When students and teachers were asked about the rigor experienced in the classroom per the Five Essential Survey, most replied the rigor was still adequate. However, most indicated that that the experience was negative especially with many teachers needing additional assistance with monitoring Lack of adequate progress.
Measurable Outcome:	The vast majority of our current core content teachers will engage in successful standards-based instruction lesson planning procedures using the Standards Walk-Through form.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored through the Standards Walk-Through Tool. Data collected will determine next steps for additional PD for learning leaders or interventions for students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
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, with tasks that are aligned to the standard and assessments are aligned to the standard and test specifications.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In order for students to be effective and adequately prepared for state assessments, students must be consistently provided instruction, tasks and assessments that are aligned. More specifically, students must have multiple opportunities to practice the tasks and assess with reflective task demands that will foster the type of execution needed on district state assessments.

Action Steps to Implement

Facilitate PLC's that promote instructional conversations around standards based instruction.

Person Responsible Zeina Spaulding (khanachetz@duvalschools.org)

Instructional Leaders, teachers and support staff will engage in common planning to ensure tasks and assessments are aligned and appropriate per item specifications. The Learning Arc components are accurate and students have equivalent assessment experiences pertinent to FSA and/or EOC assessments.

Person Responsible Michael Smith (smithm6@duvalschools.org)

Administration will meet weekly on Tuesdays to discuss their instructional review walks for the week. Set weekly goals for the prior week. During these meetings, the admin team will focus on classrooms that did not have instruction or tasks that were appropriately aligned to the standard. The team will create weekly actionable steps based on needs in the building.

Person Responsible Emily McMahon (yarsoe@duvalschools.org)

ESE Lead and Admin Support will monitor students in danger of failing on a three week cycle. Doing so will allow Gen Ed and ESE teachers to collaborate and provide real time interventions necessary to assist the students from needing a LAP Meeting thus decreasing potential failures.

Person Responsible Aleya Prier (wilcoxa@duvalschools.org)

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.

The school leadership team will address the remaining school wide priorities through facilitating PLC's, Common Planning. Also, the leadership team will meet on a weekly basis to analyze standard walk throughs to determine areas of growth within these priorities. Once Identified, professional development will be implemented to meet the needs of the learning leaders with the emphasis ensuring we are meeting the needs of students per their data.

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.

The Positive Behavior Interventions and Support model will continue to be implemented at Atlantic Coast High School for the 2021-2022 school year. It is a planned approach for school behavior that emphasis: prevention of problem behaviors through proactive instruction of desired behavior; regular reinforcement of appropriate behavior; monitoring and correction of problem behavior; application of more intensive and individualized behavior support for students who do not respond to prevention effort.

Furthermore, the leadership team will build positive school culture by rewarding students for the academic and social behavior. For example, students who earn A/B Honor will receive an incentive each quarter such as an ice cream party as well as public recognition through our school newsletter. For students that do not receive a behavior referral, will be allowed to participate in school wide social events. Stakeholders such as the PTSA and SAC will be involved with planning the PBIS events as well as requesting donations from business partners.

Faculty will also be rewarded during their weekly PLC meetings for outstanding performances per admin walk-through and other observations.

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

The SAC and PTSA play a vital role in the culture of Atlantic Coast. From providing breakfast and lunch to our teachers and incentives for our students, their approach to ensuring that all members of the AC Family are treated like family. Both groups work collaboratively with the school's principal to establish opportunities of encouragement for students and teachers. Our school communication includes the SAC and PTSA

activities through out the year so that our families are always engaged in the school. From parent nights to informational sessions, our school community is well attended and those organizations assist with business partners and other resources for the school and especially the students.