

Duval County Public Schools

Duncan U. Fletcher 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	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Duncan U. Fletcher Middle School

2000 3RD ST N, Jacksonville Beach, FL 32250

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

Demographics

Principal: Joseph Mckenzie

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2019

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)	52%
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 (71%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (67%) 2015-16: A (64%) 2014-15: A (71%)
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 Duval 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	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Duncan U. Fletcher Middle School

2000 3RD ST N, Jacksonville Beach, FL 32250

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Middle School 6-8</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>36%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>34%</p>

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 Duval 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.

Fletcher Middle School is a standards based community where performance standards are used to help all learners understand the real life applications of basic skills and concepts. Teachers use diagnostic assessment tools to develop a plan of instruction that meets learner's academic needs.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Focusing on every child's success through Academics, Athletics, and the Arts.

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
Wiggins, Sarah	Assistant Principal	
Matthews, Chelsea	Principal	
Stansel, Elizabeth	Assistant Principal	
Fretz, Scott	Instructional Coach	Gifted Lead
Davis, Ronda	School Counselor	Guidance support
Busch, Erin	Teacher, K-12	Science Department Head
McGiveron, Mark	Teacher, K-12	Math Department Head
Brauer, Mary	Teacher, ESE	ESE teacher and PDF.
Knowles, Megan	Teacher, K-12	Literacy Lead.
Colado, Henry	Other	
	Other	Drew Follensbee- Activites Chair

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	411	449	439	0	0	0	0	1299
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	29	43	40	0	0	0	0	112
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	5	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	60	80	0	0	0	0	186

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	56	71	88	0	0	0	0	215

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

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

56

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/20/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

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	71	82	99	0	0	0	0	252
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	42	49	0	0	0	0	127
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	41	48	61	0	0	0	0	150
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	166	196	177	0	0	0	0	539

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	83	100	112	0	0	0	0	295

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	67%	43%	54%	66%	41%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	49%	54%	58%	48%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	45%	47%	44%	43%	44%
Math Achievement	80%	49%	58%	72%	44%	56%
Math Learning Gains	69%	50%	57%	62%	49%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	47%	51%	53%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	71%	44%	51%	74%	45%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	94%	68%	72%	83%	65%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	411 (0)	449 (0)	439 (0)	1299 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	29 ()	43 ()	40 ()	112 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	1 (0)	5 (0)	5 (0)	11 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	46 (0)	60 (0)	80 (0)	186 (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.

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	68%	47%	21%	54%	14%
	2018	56%	44%	12%	52%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	60%	44%	16%	52%	8%
	2018	58%	41%	17%	51%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
08	2019	72%	49%	23%	56%	16%
	2018	71%	51%	20%	58%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	85%	51%	34%	55%	30%
	2018	72%	42%	30%	52%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	70%	47%	23%	54%	16%
	2018	73%	50%	23%	54%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
08	2019	44%	32%	12%	46%	-2%
	2018	38%	31%	7%	45%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-29%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	70%	40%	30%	48%	22%
	2018	74%	44%	30%	50%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
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	93%	69%	24%	71%	22%
2018	99%	84%	15%	71%	28%
Compare		-6%			
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	88%	57%	31%	61%	27%
2018	90%	61%	29%	62%	28%
Compare		-2%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	97%	61%	36%	57%	40%
2018	100%	57%	43%	56%	44%
Compare		-3%			

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	28	45	43	49	55	45	33	74	57		
ELL	31	49	45	56	65	64	17	68			
ASN	69	57		83	86						
BLK	37	57	49	53	54	44	47	92	83		
HSP	53	51	44	70	68	65	54	82	77		
MUL	60	45	53	73	69	65	75	96	75		
WHT	76	63	58	86	71	65	79	96	88		
FRL	54	59	51	69	64	56	54	91	76		
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	21	31	28	33	44	49	37	93	76		
ELL	15	32	33	40	39	30	18				
ASN	86	64		82	54		77		86		
BLK	38	45	37	49	57	54	50	90	85		
HSP	47	47	35	64	56	52	58	100	92		

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
MUL	55	44	26	70	61	56	82	100	80		
WHT	70	57	46	82	67	61	84	100	90		
FRL	48	46	38	61	59	54	64	98	86		
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	24	40	38	28	41	34	32	54	82		
ELL	28	54	52	28	46	48	40	17			
ASN	86	66		83	59		90	82	100		
BLK	38	40	38	42	44	43	45	69	69		
HSP	53	57	52	56	60	61	54	69	84		
MUL	66	61	45	71	53	57	75	89	94		
WHT	73	61	45	79	65	53	80	87	89		
FRL	47	50	45	54	51	47	55	71	75		

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	75
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	716
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	48
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	52
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	74
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	57
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	64
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	68
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	76
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	64
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.

8th grade Math (44%); up 6% from previous year. Since all Level 3 and above proficient students are put in Algebra, only non-proficient students are left to take 8th grade pre-Algebra. This would lead to a lower performance than in other subject areas in which all proficiency levels are enrolled in the subject.

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

Science Achievement (76% compared to 71% last year; -6%). Teachers did not have district Science support personnel last year. Some teachers lacked execution of instructional fidelity. To improve instruction the school will focus more on standards (standards-based walk-throughs).

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.

8th grade Math 44% (compared to 46% state; -3%). Not all level 3s are placed in Alg I in other counties. This would cause a gap in school's proficiency when comparing pre-Algebra to other counties in which higher proficiency students are enrolled.

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

ELA Lowest 25th Percentile (53% compared to 40% in 2018). Implemented literacy strategies in all content areas and monitoring the strategies along with the data to refine lesson plans in PLC.

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

Course failures in ELA or Math (150 in all grade levels); Level 1 on statewide assessments (539 in all grade levels).

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

1. Increase 8th grade Math scores; decrease the gap compared to state average
2. Stop the decline in Science achievement
3. Continue success improving ELA Lowest 25th Percentile
4. Minimize course failures in ELA and Math
5. Decrease Level 1 scores on statewide assessments

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Academics
Rationale	If teachers differentiate to deliver standards based instruction, then students' proficiency in literacy will increase.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	50% of Lower Quartile students will make gains in Reading. 75% of Level 5 will maintain their achievement level of 5 in Reading. 50% decrease in D's and F's.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Chelsea Matthews (matthewsc@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Have each academic and elective department choose two specific literacy strategies to use throughout the year. This will increase literacy skills, critical thinking skills, increase the rigor, complexity and analysis of content.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	All students are not meeting the Florida Language Arts standards, which require students to read more complex texts and complete more rigorous writing responses.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Through PLC's analyze literacy data and beginning of the year literacy data; monitoring use of strategies. 2. MTSS implementation to monitor grade and attendance concerns, utilize school communication logs. 3. Ensure lessons are aligned incorporating literacy strategies that their department self-selected. 4. Utilize student work protocol, analyzing students work. 5. Promote 10,000 Book Challenge. 6. Implement One degree challenge, giving students access to computers after school for tutoring and homework completion.
Person Responsible	Chelsea Matthews (matthewsc@duvalschools.org)

#2	
Title	Behavior
Rationale	If teachers implement the school-wide PBIS plan, then the number of class one referrals will decrease.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	10% decrease in Level one referrals.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Chelsea Matthews (matthewsc@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Implement school wide rituals and routines using the new Code of Student Conduct, use Multi-tiered Systems of Support (MTSS), and gear school policies towards preventing student misbehavior. Improve the school culture by offering incentives for positive behavior.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	This will be determined by teacher observations as well as discipline data, students exhibiting an understanding of school wide policies/procedures and how they'll be rewarded/given consequences.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implement MTSS-- increase parent communication, document in school log, work with support personnel and stakeholders to gather data and analyze the gaps to identify and solve the issue. 2. 3rd period students participate in "calm classrooms" to deescalate conflicts. 3. Improve school culture and positive incentives (PBIS) through character cash, food trucks, student lounge. 4. Encourage staff celebrations, weekly healthy incentives. 5. Offer PD for MTSS and calm classrooms aimed to decrease class 1 referrals.
Person Responsible	Chelsea Matthews (matthewsc@duvalschools.org)

#3	
Title	Safety
Rationale	If all students and staff practice safety, the school will be better protected from outside threats.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Emergency drills and policies practiced regularly according to district and JSO guidelines.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Chelsea Matthews (matthewsc@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Practice school wide drills and routines according to school-board and JSO guidelines to provide a safe and secure campus. Consistent drills of "Lock Down, Lock Out," fire drills, and evacuations will be conducted throughout the year.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Practicing drills consistently will helps student remain calm and know what to do in a case of an emergency.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Participate in consistent drills and safety nets. 2. Early Release sessions for Hope for Healing, calm classrooms. 3. Practice cafeteria safety procedures. 4. All students, staff, and visitors wear IDs. 5. Organize students before school in holding areas to encourage safety.
Person Responsible	Sarah Wiggins (stevensons2@duvalschools.org)

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).

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
 This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

N/A

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

N/A

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

N/A

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

N/A

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Academics	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Behavior	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Safety	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00