

Magnet Long Range Plan; Preliminary Goals/Strategies/Objectives related to the sample strategies provided

Working Group Input as of Thursday May 28, 2009

Magnet Programs overarching Strategies (strategies which apply to Goals A-D)

TABLE 3&9

Strategy:

STRATEGY #2 AS IS

Objectives:

- a. As IS
- b. Annually ensure full funding for complete implementation of the magnet program.
- c. Review marketing material annually and modify as needed to ensure each magnet program is accurately described.

TABLE 5

STRATEGY 3 – Goal as written.

TABLE 6

Strategy:

Promote all four Goals of Magnet Programs through the use of a lottery selection process and lottery priorities.

Objectives:

- a. Lottery priorities will help achieve the overall objectives set forth in School Board Policy Goals A,B,C & D.
- b. Recommend timing is acceptable provided material (catalogue etc..) is available early.

Strategy:

Review all Magnet Programs on a defined, periodic basis to assess each program's progress towards the School Board Policy Goals A,B,C & D.

Objectives:

- a. Annual review should include SAC members
- b. Committee review should be every 3 years
- c. Programs not meeting the minimum acceptable score against the rubric should be recommended for termination or change program theme.

Change to “on a rolling 3-year” basis

Strategy:

Transportation zones will be assessed and modified to achieve overall goals of the Magnet Programs, while minimizing incremental costs to the district.

Objectives:

- a. Within the next 12 months, all current transportation zones will be evaluated at the ES, MS and HS level to determine if the addition or modification of zones could reduce transportation costs while maintaining the School Board Policy Goals A, B, C & D.

TABLE 7

Strategy:

Review school-by-school academic performance and determine if the academic performance of students aligns with the spirit and definition of district strategic plan.

Objectives:

- a. Academic achievement will be measured by performance standards that do not rely solely on FCAT.
- b. Self assessment annually

TABLE 8

Strategy:

Promote all four Goals of Magnet Programs through the use of a lottery selection process and lottery priorities.

Objectives:

- a. Magnet program will be measured by a rubric every five years to see if they are offering a unique or specialized curriculum that demonstrates a uniqueness not found in a neighborhood school.
- b. Include tiered continuity beginning with 2010-11 school year.
- c. Students already in magnet track should get priority

TABLE 12

Strategy:

Strategy #1: AS IS

Objectives:

CHANGE OBJECTIVE C to: The lottery will be evaluated to determine that the set of priorities are meeting the overall strategy....

TACTIC: Add back to priorities Tiered Continuity

Magnet Program Goal A- Promote and Maintain Diversity

TABLE 4

Strategy:

Strategy #4

Objectives:

- a. Same as listed
- b. All non-dedicated magnet schools will increase diversity by 2% as a result of their magnet programs, or remain within diversity objectives.

Strategy:

Strategy #5

Objectives:

- a. By no later than the 2013/14 school year, magnet programs that exist in schools that would otherwise meet the definition of diverse and would be within the utilization objective of minimum 85% and maximum 105% will be either modified, phased out, eliminated or relocated to an underutilized an non-diverse school.

TABLE 5

Strategy

Strategy 4 – Design a targeted recruiting strategies (Diversity)

Objectives:

Over utilizing schools partner with under utilizing schools to help recruiting efforts.

Strategy 5 - Add provision to move the magnet program to another school if the diversity still met without the magnet students? On and annual basis?

Strategy 6 – Good as written.

TABLE 6

Strategy:

Promote diversity through targeted recruitment of magnet students.

Objectives:

- a. All Dedicated Magnet schools will be diverse within 5 years from opening

- b. All non-Dedicated Magnet schools will be more diverse as a result of their magnet programs, or remain within diversity objectives.
- c. Dedicated magnets that do not meet or maintain diversity will undergo program revision.
- d. Expand the definition of diversity to include represent SES and racial groups represented within Duval County.

Strategy:

Evaluate magnet programs that are in schools that are diverse and over 105% capacity.

Objectives:

- a. By the school year 2013/14 (or sooner) magnet programs that exist in schools that would otherwise meet the definition of diverse and would still be within the utilization objective of min. 85% and max. 105% will be modified, phased out or eliminated.

TABLE 7

Strategy:

Evaluate academic performance of magnet schools annually.

Objectives:

Strategy:

Transportation zones will be assessed and modified to achieve overall goals of the magnet programs while minimizing incremental costs to the District.

Objectives:

- a. By 2011/12 transportation zones will serve equally DCPS students.
- b. Within the next twelve (12) months, assess transportation zones to determine need of modification at all es/ms/hs levels.

TABLE 8

Strategy:

Promote diversity through targeted recruitment of magnet students.

Objectives:

- a. Promote magnet programs to all students throughout the county as opposed to selectively recruiting for a specific population for a specific school. (i.e. misnomer: your child is getting an equal lottery opportunity to get into your magnet choice)

Strategy:

Select and approve only those new magnet programs that can potentially diversify in the in the target magnet school....

Objectives:

- a. Any school should have the opportunity to create a magnet if they are able to demonstrate full faculty and neighborhood support and can show that they can sustain the program.

TABLE 10

Strategy:

Strategy #6: IS TOO NARROW- ONLY FOCUSES ON ONE OF THE FOUR GOALS

Objectives:

TABLE 11

Strategy:

Strategy #6: Issue is not clear enough to agree or disagree – how to identify sending school.

TABLE 12

Strategy:

Strategy 5: Needs to be rewritten to include Goals A & B

Objectives:

Strategy:

Strategy # 6: Remove the word “ONLY” from this strategy.

Objectives:

Magnet Program Goal B- Provide Unique and Innovative Programs

TABLE 1

Concern about the definition of “Unique”

TABLE 3&9

Strategy:

Strategy #7: Conduct external comparisons....EVERY THREE YEARS (rather than annually)

Objectives:

Strategy #9- GROUP FEELS IS UNNECESSARY

TABLE 4

Strategy:

Strategy #7 as is

Objectives:

- a. Network with other school districts and states to evaluate unique program availability.

Tactic 1: Have DCPS personnel attend at least one national conference to efficiently access information from multiple districts as to unique or innovative programs.

Tactic 2: Investigate availability of websites and we conferences to access additional unique and innovative programs.

TABLE 5

Strategy

Strategy 7 – Design a rubric to assist in the comparison to provide consistent criteria. (Tactic)

Strategy 9 – Consider career academy fallback before modifying.

Reward to put “eliminate” following modification and review – also question the concept of “unique” or “non-unique”, especially if they are replicated.

Objective

- a. Consider the variable of economic growth and stability of the regions workforce measurable criteria exists to report these factors – state provided.

TABLE 6

Strategy:

Strategy #9: **EMPHASIZE MODIFY/CONSOLIDATE**

TABLE 7

Strategy:

Eliminate or modify programs that are evaluated and assessed as non-unique.

Objectives:

By 2012 create a workable uniform definition of what is unique.

TABLE 10

Strategy:

Strategy #8: Who conducts the benchmark? What type of benchmarks are they? How does this impact teacher/staff workload?

Objectives:

Strategy:

Strategy #9: Change “non-unique” to “non-successful”

Objectives:

TABLE 12

Strategy:

Conduct annual external comparisons of existing DCPS Magnet Programs vs. similar programs in other school districts; to assess if changes could enhance DCPS Programs.

Objectives:

- a. Every program will be benchmarked against similar programs in other school districts on a rolling 5 year basis.
- b. Benchmarking reports will be held centrally in the School Choice Office.
- c. Team for benchmarking should consist of Teacher, Administrator, and community advisor who is a field expert.

Strategy:

Conduct an annual benchmarking effort to assess if additional unique or innovative programs could be beneficially offered in Duval County.

Objectives:

- a. Attend at least 1 national conference and other resources annually to efficiently access information from multiple districts and determine if other programs should be considered.
- b. Benchmarking reports will be held centrally in the School Choice Office.

Strategy:

Eliminate or modify magnet programs that are evaluated and assessed as “non-unique”.

Objectives:

- a. Create a standard program assessment rubric.
- b. By 2014/15 programs that are rated below a minimum acceptable score for uniqueness on the standard program assessment rubric will be modified or eliminated.

Magnet Program Goal C- Increase Academic Achievement

TABLE 4

Strategy:

Review school –by-school academic performance and determine if the academic performance of students align with the spirit and definition of District Strategic Plan objectives.

Objectives:

- a. Academic achievement will be measured by year over year growth as measured by FCAT performance and students will improve by a % growth amount as defined in the Strategic Plan.
- b. Provide access to additional safety nets for at-risk magnet school students such as Saturday School and alternate curriculum tracks.

TABLE 5

Strategy

Strategy 10 – Is the increase measured by the magnet students or all students at the school?

Consider implementing magnet themes to all students at a particular elementary school.

Strategy 12 - Suggest this is a tactic as written to provide solution to strategy 2 or 5, and as written does not define what “manage” means.

TABLE 6

Strategy:

Strategy 11 AS IS

Objectives:

- a. A school grade should not be the only defining factor.
- b. Define appropriate measures based on the magnet theme

Strategy:

Strategy 12 AS IS

Objectives:

- a. Programs requiring higher utilization to support its goals will be individually evaluated.

TABLE 8

Strategy:

Evaluate academic performance based on State of Florida grading system

Objectives:

- a. Schools should not be graded solely on State of Florida grading systems.
- b. Other criteria should be developed to determine success of the school and students.

TABLE 10

Strategy:

Strategy #10- How do you measure “spirit as it related to academic performance?”

Objectives:

Strategy:

Strategy #11- The State of Florida grading system should not be the only way the academic performance is evaluated.

Objectives:

TABLE 11

Strategy:

Evaluate magnet programs at all schools for effectiveness.

Objectives:

- a. After 3 years of continued under-performance, the magnet program needs to be closed.
- b. Needs assessment within the community to identify potential programs for underutilized schools.
- c. Staff underperforming magnet schools with the highest quality teachers & administration.

TABLE 12

Strategy:

Strategy #11: AS IS

Objectives:

Strike out Objective A

Strategy:

Strategy #12: Strike the word “Dedicated” from the strategy

Objectives:

Objective a: strike the word “dedicated” and “or sooner”

Magnet Program Goal D- Balance the utilization of School Buildings

TABLE 4

Strategy:

Neighborhood schools will be examined to determine if any schools are “sending” more than 15% of students from within their boundary to magnet programs. Action plans will be developed specifically for these schools if their resulting utilization is below 85%.

Objectives:

- a. Any school below 85% utilization and which “sends” more than 15% of its student population to magnet programs will have an action plan in place for addressing this concern by the start of school year 2010-11.
- b. Encourage neighborhood schools below 85% utilization to participate in Magnet Mania and list school strengths and programs in District’s magnet school guide.
- c. Allow neighborhood underutilized schools that are negatively impacted by the magnet program to share District Magnet advertising budget to recruit and promote neighborhood school programs and strengths.

TABLE 5

Strategy:

Strategy 13 – Agree – but should be part of both #2 and #5 – and factored into what should be done for #12.

Strategy 14 – Another “tactic” to provide a solution toward the effective utilization goal.

TABLE 6

Strategy:

Strategy #14

Objectives:

MAKE SURE THE MAGENT IS IMPACTING ENROLLMENT VERSUS NCLB

TABLE 11

Strategy:

Re-evaluate current lottery priorities to ensure private school students are not given priority over public school students.

Objectives:

- a. Previous year public school students receive magnet priority over previous year private school students.

TABLE 12

Strategy:

Strategy #14: Remove this strategy all together.

Objectives:

Addendum

TABLE 2

Strategy:

Strategy 1

Objectives:

- b. Disagree; add reinstate tiered continuity for children in DCPS for at least one year.

Strategy 5

Objectives:

- a. Disagree – worded correctly?
- b. Evaluate programs in schools that are not diverse.

Strategy 7 – Agree if funded by non-district funds.

Strategy 8 – Agree if funded by non-district funds.

Strategy 9 – Disagree – define “non-unique”. Gifted is unique per the percent of the population tested

Strategy 10 – Tactic – Cohort scheduling will be monitored with Career Academies. If Level 1 in intensive Reading & FCAT scores don’t improve, assess these programs for effectiveness of Read 180, IR, or other ramp-up programs for effectiveness. Students are being over tested.

Strategy 11

Objectives:

- b ... will the lower level scores by 5% or 15% of the gap.

For consideration - No Action Taken by Table 2 - Submitted by Table 2

Strategy: Increase performance levels by increasing competition and limiting automatic program continuity by providing access for those who earn it, year after year.

Objectives – Metrics – Options

- a. The bottom 25%, for example (%TBD), of any magnet program may be removed from that specific program and replaced by students who earned a higher composite score based upon grades, FCAT, and county exams. (Details to be worked out).

- b. Any student qualifying as a replacement student would be selected for the specific magnet program per the priority system for the entire magnet program and would have been denied access to or removed from the program previously.

(Supposition – Historically, competition improves performance more than any other incentive and upward mobility encourages hard work and dedication.)

Strategy: Align the goals and experiences of the direct customers (parents & students) of the magnet program with the Magnet Program Goals.

Objectives – Metrics – Options

- a. Each application for a magnet program must state, in a force ranked manner of the Magnet Program Goals + a category of “Other”, why the customer (parent &/or student) wants to be in that program. Compile the results by school, by school level (elementary, middle, high school), district, and by program theme.
- b. Each customer (parent &/or student) in a magnet program will be required to force rank each year the Magnet Program Goals + a category of “Other” as to why they want to remain in or drop out of the program. Each customer will also state their degree of satisfaction with the program they were in. Compile the results by school, by school level (elementary, middle, high school), district, and by program theme.
- c. Prioritize the Magnet Program Goals per the voice of the customer results.
- d. Promote and expand programs that support the customers’ goals.

(Supposition – By meeting the needs of your customers, you are achieving your true goal.)

Strategy: Evaluate dedicated versus non-dedicated magnet programs to determine if performance is enhanced by either system.

Objectives – Metrics – Options

- a. Create a composite score from grades, FCAT, county exams, and other meaningful standards to determine if students in one type of program are regularly achieving greater year over year progress.
- b. If one version consistently generates better results, expand that type of program.
- c. If a dedicated magnet school were made from a non-dedicated school, would resources be earned, lost, or become available for another school, particularly for an underperforming school?
- d. If a non-dedicated magnet school were made from a dedicated school, would resources be earned, lost, or become available for another school, particularly for an underperforming school?

(Supposition – A committed program always out performs a program that has too many goals to focus on and by blending programs, qualification for resources may be lost.)

Strategy: Perform computer based business intelligence and analytics for each magnet school and school level (elementary, middle, high school) to determine the geographic and transportation resource parameters for students attending magnet schools.

Objectives – Metrics – Options

- e. What is the average distance traveled by each magnet student by school and school level? Provide greatest distance traveled, shortest distance traveled, standard deviations for distances traveled, trends, etc.
- f. How many magnet students ride each bus from each school and at each school level? Provide average number per day, average number each morning, average number each afternoon, standard deviations, trends throughout the school year, etc.
- g. From the results, determine the prime locations for magnet programs with respect to the Magnet Program Goals (original programs, duplicate programs, relocation of programs, new programs).

(Supposition – Though parents are willing to do what is best for their child, they are less willing to tolerate and endure distance and transportation issues at elementary ages than they are at high school ages. Geography plays a role in the willingness of people to participate in programs.)

Strategy: Evaluate the impact of each lottery priority on each of the Magnet Program Goals (A,B,C,D) and consider refinements with computer modeling to improve results.

Objectives – Metrics – Options

- h. Generate an annual baseline assessment for each school. (What would the school look like without the Magnet Program with respect to each of the Magnet Program Goals? If there are multiple programs at a school, they need to be broken out, compared, and evaluated separately and as a whole.
- i. Generate an annual impact report of the magnet program for each school with respect to each of the Magnet Program Goals.
- j. Generate an annual report showing which lottery priorities earned students admission, which ones did not earn student admission, and which ones did not come into play for each school, each school level (elementary, middle, high school), and for the district.
- k. Perform computer modeling to determine if different priorities would align better with Magnet Program Goals. Implement refinements that are forecasted to have a positive impact on the Magnet Program Goals, but prior to implementation, communicate and document numerically the forecasted impact.
- l. Review the impact of the priority change annually.
- m. Eliminate the priorities that do not contribute to the Magnet Program Goals.

(Supposition – the existing priority scheme may be detrimental to the Magnet Program Goals.)

Strategy: Examine the lottery mechanism and determine if a different type of lottery would produce results that align better with the Magnet Program Goals. Run computer models of a weighted lottery that aligns priority preferences with numerical chances of selection versus the existing priority

preference system (lottery) to determine if a different lottery mechanism would generate results that meet the Magnet Program Goals more fully.

Objectives – Metrics – Options

- n. The existing “lottery” is not a true lottery, but a selection by priority system.
- o. Create a real lottery that takes priorities into consideration by weighting them. This will give the greatest likelihood of admittance to the targeted groups. But give long shots a chance that they do not have now.
- p. Test different lottery mechanisms via computer modeling and determine if adjusting the lottery produces results that are in line with the Magnet Program Goals.
- q. If a different lottery mechanism makes sense, communicate the change, enact the change, and document the results.

(Supposition – the existing lottery scheme may be detrimental to the Magnet Program Goals.)

Strategy: Compare Duval County demographics by County and by neighborhoods with the demographics for each magnet and non-magnet school, school level (elementary, middle, high school), and the district to assess if fresh and different perspectives reveal different diversity results.

Objectives – Metrics – Options

- r. Execute the comparison per the Court’s Unitary Standard (Black and Non-Black)
- s. Execute the comparison per multiple classifications (White, Black, Asian, Indian, Hispanic, European, etc) (Requires refinement of classifications for proper assessment.)
- t. Execute the comparison with a “mixed” category for anyone who is less than 75% of any one classification.
- u. Execute the comparison per other major categories on a “this” versus “that” criteria as deemed necessary.

(Supposition – The world today is different. The makeup of the population is different. This requires forward thinking people to meet diversity challenges per the composition of the populous of today and tomorrow instead of that of the past.)

Table 2

Strategy: The yearly numerical data indicates that the Magnet Program Goals are being fairly well met by the existing magnet program, but that better results are desired. In order to protect the gains achieved and realizing that details determine destiny, all program modifications must go through a specific vetting process. (Language could be better)

Objectives & Metrics

- 1. The point person for the program change must clearly state the change, state numerically the forecasted impact of the change on each of the Magnet Program Goals, and sign off on the change.

2. The proposed magnet program change must be communicated to the parents and students of the program.
 - a. If the change occurs after the magnet lottery process, the impacted parents and students must be granted entry to any magnet program of their choice. (This forces the change champions to plan ahead and to avoid off the cuff reactions.)
3. The proposed change must be communicated to the entire DCPS community and the school funding community (property tax payers, primarily).
4. Once implemented, an annual report must be generated to illustrate the level of success or failure of the change as compared to the forecasted impact. This information must be shared with the parents, students, School Board, and community.
5. Review the change and decide whether to keep it, expand it to other programs, or to rescind it. Any change that positively improves 75% of the Magnet Program Goal categories is deemed a resounding success.

(No real decision. 4 yes on strategy, 2 abstaining)

Strategy: Procure historical data documenting the movement of students into different performance levels in each school, each magnet school, in Duval County, in Florida, and in the U.S. If movement between performance levels is miniscule (less than 5%) per year, create performance level classes in the magnet schools to stimulate academic commitment.

1. Students of like ability will encourage continued engagement in learning.
2. Students likely to be top performers in their class will push a bit harder to reach that level.
3. Concentrate teaching to accelerate performance level jumping.

(For long duration. No real support at Table 2)

Strategy: Review utilization records for all schools and for any school with historical and projected utilization of under 50% plan to transform those facilities into dedicated magnet schools that duplicate any oversubscribed magnet program

Objectives & Metrics

1. Identify schools that are underutilized historically.
2. Identify schools that have projected under utilization rates for the future.
3. Identify magnet programs that are oversubscribed.
4. Schools with low utilization are typically in areas where a magnet program can create a school that meets all of the Magnet Program Goals (A,B,C,D).

(5 yes & 1 no.)