

Duval County Public Schools

Darnell Cookman Middle/High School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	16
Budget to Support Goals	17

Darnell Cookman Middle/High School

1701 N DAVIS ST, Jacksonville, FL 32209

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

Demographics

Principal: Tyrus Lyles

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	45%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
School Grades History	2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: A (77%) 2016-17: A (75%) 2015-16: A (75%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
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.

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	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Zakaria, Osama	Assistant Principal	Works with curriculum and instruction, operations, scheduling, observations, monitoring of Social Studies and Advance Placement.
Holley-Smiley, Angela	Assistant Principal	Works with curriculum and instruction, operations, scheduling, observations, monitoring of ELA and Electives.
Lyles, Tyrus	Principal	Works with curriculum and instruction, operations, scheduling, observations, monitoring of Math and Science.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2015, Tyrus Lyles

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.*

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

56

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	45%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: A (77%) 2016-17: A (75%) 2015-16: A (75%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	
* 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	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	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Saturday 6/27/2020

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	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 or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	43	46	11	2	0	0	161
Level 1 on statewide 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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	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 or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	43	46	11	2	0	0	161
Level 1 on statewide 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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	82%	47%	56%	83%	47%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	66%	48%	51%	68%	49%	53%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
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%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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
06	2019	77%	47%	30%	54%	23%
	2018	74%	44%	30%	52%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	81%	44%	37%	52%	29%
	2018	83%	41%	42%	51%	32%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
08	2019	81%	49%	32%	56%	25%
	2018	89%	51%	38%	58%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
09	2019	88%	48%	40%	55%	33%
	2018	82%	48%	34%	53%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
10	2019	97%	48%	49%	53%	44%
	2018	96%	49%	47%	53%	43%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	63%	51%	12%	55%	8%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	66%	42%	24%	52%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	81%	47%	34%	54%	27%
	2018	83%	50%	33%	54%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-83%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	75%	40%	35%	48%	27%
	2018	84%	44%	40%	50%	34%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	92%	67%	25%	67%	25%
2018	93%	63%	30%	65%	28%
Compare		-1%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	89%	69%	20%	71%	18%
2018	94%	84%	10%	71%	23%
Compare		-5%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	99%	68%	31%	70%	29%
2018	92%	64%	28%	68%	24%
Compare		7%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	83%	57%	26%	61%	22%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	81%	61%	20%	62%	19%
Compare		2%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	82%	61%	21%	57%	25%
2018	86%	57%	29%	56%	30%
Compare		-4%			

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
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

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	76
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	73
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	909
Total Components for the Federal Index	12
Percent Tested	100%

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	59
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
-----------------------	--

Federal Index - Asian Students	82
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	69
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	78
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	79
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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
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	81
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	71
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

Students earning a 1 & 2 on state assessments
 Teachers not teaching to the level the assessment.
 Students having significant deficiencies in reading.
 The data from 2018 to 2019 shows a decline in performance in the Lowest 25% in Math.

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

Students earning a 1 & 2 on state assessments
 Teachers not teaching to the level the assessment.
 Students having significant deficiencies in reading.
 The data from 2018 to 2019 shows a decline in performance in the Lowest 25% in Math.
 2018- 54% to 2019-44%

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

African American students show a significant gap in achievement. The population of African American students is higher than any other sub-groups. The higher number of African American will show a gap in performance and early warning indicators when compared to all other sub groups.

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

Number of Students Retained

Teachers work collaboratively to ensure the success of each student. Additionally, we monitor student achievement once per month each grade level during the Academic Review meetings.

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

Students earning a 1 or 2 on state assessments
Reading/ELA achievement
Math Lowest 25%

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

1. Students earning a 1 on state assessments
2. Reading/ELA achievement
3. Students not achieving 90% attendance rate.
4. Number of students receiving OSS/ISS
5. Two or more early warning indicators,

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The students in the lowest 25% in math traditionally have not performed at the best. With tutorials and a focus on these students we are not able to raise the achievement level of these students.

Measureable Outcome: The students will increase their performance level from 44% to 58.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tyrus Lyles (lylest@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Monitor and track student performance by ensuring the standards and ALD's mastered. Teachers must teach the standards and differentiate instruction to address the needs of these students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teaching the standard, using the ALD's and monitoring student performance is a best practice used the increase student performance.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Increase teacher's knowledge and capacity for standards based instruction
2. Monitor student performance
3. Observe teachers and provide feedback on instructional practices
4. Track data on each student and have data chats
5. Ensure teachers are using the ALD's for each standards assessed.
6. Purchased math, social studies, and science to increase the proficiency across subject areas.
7. Tutorial sessions across subject areas to increase proficiency in all subject areas.
8. Additional instructional supplies to support the instructional programs.

Person Responsible Tyrus Lyles (lylest@duvalschools.org)

#2. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measureable Outcome:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

- **Use standards based tracking forms and interventions twice per week using Math XL and other resources to re mediate the standards for lowest 25% in 7th grade math students that scored 1's & 2's on the FSA 18-19.**
- **Small group interventions in each class period on standards students scored poorly- Exit tickets or quizzes as form of assessment to assess the standards.**
- **Review 9-weeks assessment data to provide Tier 1, 2, & 3 interventions.**
- **Provide targeted tutoring opportunities for the lowest 25% in 7th grade math students using SAI and Title funds. Students will have access to content area teachers and the National Honor Society peer tutorial program.**
- **Additional materials and supplies to supplement the interventions listed above.**

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.

- Provide a stakeholder suggestion box to hear the issues that stakeholders face and provide additional supports as need.
- Continue with my open-door policy for stakeholders to meet with me and discuss any problems they may have and prioritize to build trust. I am here to address issues they have in a non-judgmental forum.
- Continue attending the PTSA & SAC meetings to hear stakeholders concerns and work as a team to develop solutions to the concerns.

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			
1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00