

St. Johns County School District

Fruit Cove Middle School



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	3
School Information	4
Needs Assessment	6
Planning for Improvement	9
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	12

Fruit Cove Middle School

3180 RACE TRACK RD, Saint Johns, FL 32259

<http://www-fcs.stjohns.k12.fl.us/>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2017-18 Title I School	2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	10%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	28%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	A	A	A	A*

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 9/25/2018.

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.

Fruit Cove Middle School is committed to building positive student-teacher relationships, focusing on high academic standards and preparing students with 21st Century Skills.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Fruit Cove Middle School will inspire in all students a passion for lifelong learning, creating educated and caring contributors to the world.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title
Jacobson, Kelly	Principal
Lay, Joe	Assistant Principal
Gamble, Jennifer	Assistant Principal

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

Team members are:

Principal - Kelly Jacobson. The principal ensures that all staff comply with the district-wide school site standards.

Assistant Principal – Jennifer Gamble

Assistant Principal – Joe Lay

Instructional Literacy Coach – Lori Sisson

Math/Science Coach/Testing Coordinator- DNiessa Slocum

The team reviews school data and makes instructional decisions.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	31	40	0	0	0	0	85
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	25	27	0	0	0	0	62
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	14	7	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	40	34	0	0	0	0	92

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	25	18	0	0	0	0	47	

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	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Date this data was collected

Monday 7/23/2018

Year 2016-17 - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	19	32	0	0	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	43	35	0	0	0	0	87
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	13	21	0	0	0	0	53
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	13	0	0	0	0	26	

Year 2016-17 - 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		
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	19	32	0	0	0	0	63	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	43	35	0	0	0	0	87	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	7	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	13	21	0	0	0	0	53	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	13	0	0	0	0	26

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

ELA Lowest 25th Percentile performed the lowest at 48%. This is not a trend, but a significant decline in this component last year.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

ELA Lowest 25th Percentile showed the greatest decline from the prior year. The percentile for 2017 was 64% and dropped to 48% in 2018.

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

ELA Lowest 25% percentage of 48% is one point above the state average of 47%.

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

In the area of Social Studies Achievement students maintained a 96% proficiency rate.

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

Teachers collaborated in their PLC to plan instructional strategies, create formative assessments and review student data. The PLC utilized All in Learning to review student data by standard.

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	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	78%	69%	53%	84%	70%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	64%	57%	54%	71%	61%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	45%	47%	63%	51%	45%
Math Achievement	88%	76%	58%	90%	76%	55%
Math Learning Gains	72%	66%	57%	74%	68%	55%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	68%	58%	51%	67%	59%	47%
Science Achievement	82%	73%	52%	88%	74%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	96%	87%	72%	97%	88%	67%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Attendance below 90 percent	14 (12)	31 (19)	40 (32)	85 (63)
One or more suspensions	10 (9)	25 (43)	27 (35)	62 (87)
Course failure in ELA or Math	5 (2)	14 (3)	7 (2)	26 (7)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	18 (19)	40 (13)	34 (21)	92 (53)

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	2018	74%	71%	3%	52%	22%
	2017	82%	73%	9%	52%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2018	73%	70%	3%	51%	22%
	2017	83%	74%	9%	52%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
08	2018	85%	76%	9%	58%	27%
	2017	81%	74%	7%	55%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2018	78%	73%	5%	52%	26%
	2017	89%	73%	16%	51%	38%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2018	90%	80%	10%	54%	36%
	2017	88%	80%	8%	53%	35%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
08	2018	82%	73%	9%	45%	37%
	2017	91%	75%	16%	46%	45%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2018	81%	75%	6%	50%	31%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	95%	89%	6%	71%	24%
2017	95%	90%	5%	69%	26%
Compare		0%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	100%	79%	21%	62%	38%
2017	100%	78%	22%	60%	40%
Compare		0%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	100%	77%	23%	56%	44%
2017	100%	78%	22%	53%	47%
Compare		0%			

Subgroup Data

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	36	40	35	57	54	53	36	81	14		
ELL	25	36	30	58	62						

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
ASN	91	82		99	87		100	100	90		
BLK	69	61	50	74	66	58	73	83	18		
HSP	71	60	41	84	66	61	73	94	56		
MUL	68	57	25	77	72	70	77		73		
WHT	79	63	49	88	72	68	84	97	56		
FRL	65	55	43	76	61	57	67	89	42		

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	41	58	56	60	66	61	50	73	13		
ASN	91	71		96	84		86	100	78		
BLK	70	59	67	75	71	68	67	93	42		
HSP	79	65	47	89	87	82	75	96	53		
MUL	79	73		91	76	80	92	92	23		
WHT	83	69	66	93	79	77	83	95	53		
FRL	75	67	63	84	81	76	72	98	33		

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1	
Title	Increase the percentage of the lowest 25% making a learning gain. on 2019 ELA FSA.
Rationale	The percentage of students in the lowest 25% that made a learning gain from 2017 to 2018 dropped from 64% to 48%.
Intended Outcome	The percentage of students in the lowest 25% to increase from 48% to 60%.
Point Person	Kelly Jacobson (kelly.jacobson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Action Step	
Description	1.) All teachers will identify students in the lowest 25% in each class period. 2.) All teachers will create a plan of support for their students who are in the lowest 25%. 3.) All teachers will monitor their students' progress with checkpoints at interim and report cards. 4.) ELA and reading teachers will use iReady data to analyze learning gaps and areas of weakness.
Person Responsible	Kelly Jacobson (kelly.jacobson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Instructional coach will create instructional groups in iReady of the lowest 25% to easily monitor progress. Administration will attend CLT meetings when student data is being reviewed. Guidance counselors will monitor report cards and interim reports of the lowest 25%.
Person Responsible	Kelly Jacobson (kelly.jacobson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Activity #2	
Title	Increase the percentage of students making a learning gain on the 2019 Math FSA.
Rationale	The percentage of students that made a learning gain from 2017 to 2018 on FSA Math dropped from 79% to 72%.
Intended Outcome	The percentage of students making a learning gain on 2019 FSA Math will increase to 80%.
Point Person	Jennifer Gamble (jennifer.gamble@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Action Step	
Description	1.) Math teachers will know the points needed for each student to make a learning gain. 2.) Math teachers will identify students in the lowest 25% in each class period. 2.) Math teachers will create a plan of support for their students who are in the lowest 25%. 3.) Math teachers will monitor their students' progress with checkpoints at interim and report cards. 4.) Math teachers will use iReady data to analyze learning gaps and areas of weakness.
Person Responsible	Jennifer Gamble (jennifer.gamble@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	Instructional coach will create instructional groups in iReady of the lowest 25% to easily monitor progress. iReady data for all math students will be reviewed by instructional coach and shared with administration. Administration will attend CLT meetings when student data is being reviewed. Guidance counselors will monitor report cards and interim reports of the lowest 25% and students failing math.
Person Responsible	Jennifer Gamble (jennifer.gamble@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Activity #3	
Title	Character Counts Goal
Rationale	Decrease the number of students with one or more suspension days. Students lose instructional time when they are suspended. When students lose instructional time they struggle academically and socially. This is a cycle that repeats itself over and over throughout the school year for some of our most at-risk students. We want to turn change the cycle.
Intended Outcome	The number of students receiving one or more out of school suspensions will decrease to 4%.
Point Person	Joe Lay (joe.lay@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Action Step	
Description	<p>1.) We will expand character education programs such as W.E.B. (Where Everyone Belongs) and B6 (Be the Six Pillars of Character Counts!) to focus on character education and character development in all grade levels.</p> <p>2.) Students will lead character lessons in classrooms.</p> <p>3.) The Character CLT, comprised of club sponsors and key character education staff members, will involve school clubs in creating, supporting, and driving character education initiatives.</p> <p>4.) Club sponsors will actively encourage students to join clubs and after school activities to increase students' sense of belonging.</p> <p>5.) The dean will identify students with repeated discipline referrals and provide a weekly report for the MTSS team.</p> <p>6.) The dean and guidance counselors will mentor students with multiple referrals and speak with them on a weekly basis.</p> <p>7.) Teachers and staff will initiate a new school-wide behavior plan that focuses on progressive discipline and communication with parents and guardians.</p> <p>8.) The W.E.B. leaders will implement the No One Sits Alone initiative. During lunches, W.E.B. leaders will sit with various students in an effort to ensure that no student is eating alone and everyone has a friend to talk with.</p>
Person Responsible	Joe Lay (joe.lay@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
Description	<p>Administration will monitor the number of students participating in clubs.</p> <p>Administration will monitor how Character Counts initiatives are being implemented in clubs.</p> <p>The MTSS team will monitor the Early Warning System for students receiving suspensions.</p> <p>Administration will monitor guidance follow up on students who receive suspensions.</p>
Person Responsible	Joe Lay (joe.lay@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Part V: Budget

Total:	\$0.00
---------------	---------------