

St. Johns County School District

Fruit Cove Middle School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Fruit Cove Middle School

3180 RACE TRACK RD, Saint Johns, FL 32259

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

Demographics

Principal: Kelly Jacobson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	8%
2018-19 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 (72%) 2017-18: A (73%) 2016-17: A (77%) 2015-16: A (77%) 2014-15: A (88%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 10/1/2019.

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	8
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 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	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 10/1/2019.

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	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Jacobson, Kelly	Principal	
Gamble, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	
Lynn, Erin	Assistant Principal	
Sisson, Lori	Instructional Coach	

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	404	437	459	0	0	0	0	1300	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	25	20	0	0	0	0	58	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	24	24	0	0	0	0	52	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	8	0	0	0	0	21	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	24	42	0	0	0	0	86	

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	9	12	0	0	0	0	27

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	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/26/2019

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	
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 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	4	25	18	0	0	0	0	47

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	
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 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	4	25	18	0	0	0	0	47

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	78%	68%	54%	82%	69%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	68%	59%	54%	69%	61%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	48%	47%	64%	50%	44%
Math Achievement	85%	77%	58%	92%	76%	56%
Math Learning Gains	70%	68%	57%	79%	65%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	60%	51%	76%	55%	50%
Science Achievement	79%	70%	51%	83%	69%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	97%	88%	72%	96%	87%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	404 (0)	437 (0)	459 (0)	1300 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	13 (14)	25 (31)	20 (40)	58 (85)
One or more suspensions	4 (10)	24 (25)	24 (27)	52 (62)
Course failure in ELA or Math	8 (5)	5 (14)	8 (7)	21 (26)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	20 (18)	24 (40)	42 (34)	86 (92)

Grade Level Data

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

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	81%	74%	7%	54%	27%
	2018	74%	71%	3%	52%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	77%	72%	5%	52%	25%
	2018	73%	70%	3%	51%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
08	2019	76%	71%	5%	56%	20%
	2018	85%	76%	9%	58%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	80%	74%	6%	55%	25%
	2018	78%	73%	5%	52%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	85%	80%	5%	54%	31%
	2018	90%	80%	10%	54%	36%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
08	2019	78%	78%	0%	46%	32%
	2018	82%	73%	9%	45%	37%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	78%	72%	6%	48%	30%
	2018	81%	75%	6%	50%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	97%	90%	7%	71%	26%
2018	95%	89%	6%	71%	24%
Compare		2%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	79%	21%	61%	39%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	100%	79%	21%	62%	38%
Compare		0%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	98%	81%	17%	57%	41%
2018	100%	77%	23%	56%	44%
Compare		-2%			

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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	32	47	42	56	55	52	44	85	13		
ELL	36	67	69	67	63	64					
ASN	93	76	64	97	83		93	97	85		
BLK	69	84	71	65	63	45	50	88	54		
HSP	70	60	45	81	65	51	80	93	50		
MUL	61	53	69	76	58	50		94			
WHT	80	68	52	86	70	58	80	98	57		
FRL	60	62	51	69	53	50	68	86	29		
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						
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		

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	72
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	647
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	47
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	61
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	86
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	65
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	66
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	66
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	72
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	59
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

The lowest performing component is ELA learning gains in the lowest quartile, at 54%. This was an increase of 6%, from 48% the prior year. Last year's focus was on supporting the reading teacher and the programs in place to increase the reading levels of the lowest quartile, we continue to work on this area and explore strategies that will continue to increase the learning proficiency in the lowest quartile of readers.

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

The math learning gains for the lowest quartile dropped 12 points, the greatest decline of all components. The greatest deficit was in 8th grade math. We also noticed that overall proficiency, of all learners, the only grade that did not show a decline in proficiency was 6th grade.

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.

Overall, FCMS outperformed state in all areas. We see a closing gap in the lowest quartile performance in reading. Math shows only 56% learning gains, the state is at a 51% average, only a 5% gap. ELA shows only a 54% learning gains, the state is at a 47% average, only a 7% gap.

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

ELA lowest quartile had the greatest increase, 6%, from 48% to 54%. The school had a department focus on supporting the lowest quartile by implementing incentives for students reaching their performance goals on progress monitoring. The ILC provided hands on support which focused on the needs of individual students and instructing them in the reading classroom based on their present reading levels.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

EWS indicators show no significant decline in any area. The only area that may show concern is the amount of level one students. The number of 8th grade students went up from 34 to 42, other grades saw a decrease in level one achievement numbers.

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

1. Lowest quartile learning gains for math
2. Lowest quartile learning gains for ELA
3. Overall proficiency in math
4. Math learning gains overall
5. Overall proficiency in ELA

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increase the percentage of the lowest 25% making a learning gain on the 2020 ELA FSA.
Rationale	The percentage of students in the lowest 25% that made a learning gain from 2018 to 2019 increased from 48% to 54%; however, there is still a large discrepancy between this groups performance in comparison to the rest of the school. Overall learning gains were 68% for the school in comparison to 54% for the lowest 25%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains will increase from 54% to 59%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kelly Jacobson (kelly.jacobson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Reading classes have been differentiated based on state test score performance. Evidenced-based interventions, such as scaffolding and explicit instruction, are used within the different reading classes to meet the individual needs of the struggling students. We are monitoring growth using iReady and through the use of ongoing formative assessments. Administrators actively participate in CLT meetings where student data and performance on formative and summative assessments are reviewed by the CLT team.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Scaffolding instruction (Hattie Effect Size .82) helps teachers meet the individual needs of students. Our teachers also use several explicit teaching strategies (Hattie .57 Effect Size) (ex. small group instruction, technology, differentiated reading programs, small group instruction) to meet the needs of all their students. When teachers use frequent progress monitoring and adjust instruction, they are better able to determine student needs and make instructional adjustments to promote student growth.
Action Step	
Description	<p>1.) All teachers will identify and create a plan of support for their students who are in the lowest 25%.</p> <p>2.) All teachers will monitor their students' progress in the lowest 25% by reviewing data with their CLT on all formative, and summative assessments.</p> <p>3.) ELA and reading teachers will use iReady data to analyze learning gaps and areas of weakness. ELA and reading teachers will work together to provide focused small group instruction based on student needs.</p> <p>4.) Incentive rewards and goal setting initiatives will be created to motivate students to reach their academic goals.</p>
Person Responsible	Kelly Jacobson (kelly.jacobson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Increase the percentage of the lowest 25% making a learning gain on the 2020 Math FSA.
Rationale	The percentage of students in the lowest 25% that made a learning gain from 2018 to 2019 on FSA Math dropped from 68% to 56% which was a 12 point decline. In addition to the previous year, this same group dropped from 76% to 68% which was a 8 point drop. Since 2017 there has been a 20 point decline in learning gains for this group.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains will increase from 56% to 61%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Erin Lynn (erin.lynn@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Using formative data to track student progress and collaborating on improvement strategies within the grade level PLC.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The math team has focused their deliberate practice (Hattie .82 Effect Size) in the area of increasing achievement through the use of formative assessments and collaboration through the PLC process. Each PLC will have a focus on tracking students' performance in the lower 25% and differentiated interventions based on assessment data.
Action Step	
Description	<p>1.) All teachers will identify and create a plan of support for their students who are in the lowest 25%.</p> <p>2.) All teachers will monitor their students' progress in the lowest 25% by reviewing data with their CLT on all formative, and summative assessments.</p> <p>3.) Math teachers will use iReady data and formative data to analyze learning gaps and areas of weakness. Intensive Math teachers will work together to provide focused small group instruction based on student needs.</p> <p>4.) Incentive rewards and goal setting initiatives will be created to motivate students to reach their academic goals.</p>
Person Responsible	Kelly Jacobson (kelly.jacobson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Decrease the number of students suspended one or more times.
Rationale	When students are not in school they are missing instruction. Students who miss instruction struggle in school.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We will decrease the number of students suspended one or more times from 4.4% to 3%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Alexis Zamparelli (alexis.zamparelli@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Collective teacher efficacy
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Collective teacher efficacy: the collective belief of teachers in their ability to positively affect students. With an effect size of $d=1.57$ Collective Teacher Efficacy is strongly correlated with student achievement.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Focused Positive Mentorship of students struggling with behavior concerns. 2. New school-wide implementation of clear discipline plan that focuses on being proactive. 3. New strategies for recognizing and affirming students exhibiting Character Counts focus. 4. Increasing the variety of after school clubs and activities .
Person Responsible	Alexis Zamparelli (alexis.zamparelli@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).