

Duval County Public Schools

James Weldon Johnson College Preparatory Middle



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	16
Budget to Support Goals	17

James Weldon Johnson College Preparatory Middle School

3276 NORMAN E THAGARD BLVD, Jacksonville, FL 32254

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

Demographics

Principal: James Stuckey

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

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)	47%
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 (78%) 2017-18: A (80%) 2016-17: A (80%) 2015-16: A (77%) 2014-15: A (86%)
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	8
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	16
Budget to Support Goals	17

James Weldon Johnson College Preparatory Middle School

3276 NORMAN E THAGARD BLVD, Jacksonville, FL 32254

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

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	25%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	68%

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.

The mission of James Weldon Johnson College Prep is to provide educational excellence in every classroom, for every student, every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At James Weldon Johnson College Prep, we are empowering students to contribute to a global society by fostering a rich academic experience, a gratefulness for history, a heart for community, and an appreciation for a diverse culture.

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
Feagins, Tamara	Principal	
Prendergast, Mark	Assistant Principal	
Chambers, Michelle	Assistant Principal	

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	352	340	304	0	0	0	0	996	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	9	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	13	10	0	0	0	0	35	

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	3	4	2	0	0	0	0	9

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	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	5

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

44

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/29/2019

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	5	2	6	0	0	0	0	13
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	42	16	0	0	0	0	92
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	23	10	0	0	0	0	52

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	8	11	6	0	0	0	0	25

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	84%	43%	54%	84%	41%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	68%	49%	54%	70%	48%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	62%	45%	47%	64%	43%	44%
Math Achievement	89%	49%	58%	91%	44%	56%
Math Learning Gains	66%	50%	57%	69%	49%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	47%	51%	68%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	86%	44%	51%	86%	45%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	92%	68%	72%	96%	65%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	352 (0)	340 (0)	304 (0)	996 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	3 ()	3 ()	3 ()	9 (0)
One or more suspensions	1 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)	3 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	12 (0)	13 (0)	10 (0)	35 (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	83%	47%	36%	54%	29%
	2018	80%	44%	36%	52%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	83%	44%	39%	52%	31%
	2018	81%	41%	40%	51%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
08	2019	87%	49%	38%	56%	31%
	2018	91%	51%	40%	58%	33%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	88%	51%	37%	55%	33%
	2018	79%	42%	37%	52%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	87%	47%	40%	54%	33%
	2018	95%	50%	45%	54%	41%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
08	2019	0%	32%	-32%	46%	-46%
	2018	100%	31%	69%	45%	55%
Same Grade Comparison		-100%				
Cohort Comparison		-95%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	61%	40%	21%	48%	13%
	2018	85%	44%	41%	50%	35%
Same Grade Comparison		-24%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	96%	67%	29%	67%	29%
2018	96%	63%	33%	65%	31%
Compare		0%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	92%	69%	23%	71%	21%
2018	96%	84%	12%	71%	25%
Compare		-4%			
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	89%	57%	32%	61%	28%
2018	91%	61%	30%	62%	29%
Compare		-2%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	61%	39%	57%	43%
2018	100%	57%	43%	56%	44%
Compare		0%			

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	56	55	47	64	67	52	64	76	75		
ELL	71	78		88	72			100			
ASN	94	78	73	98	82	69	97	96	97		
BLK	71	59	59	79	57	56	71	86	85		
HSP	85	61	55	92	64		94	95	95		
MUL	93	74		95	79		82	96	94		
WHT	92	71	60	93	65	63	94	96	93		
FRL	71	62	54	80	61	61	78	84	87		
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	78	58		74	54	60					
ELL	67	50		92	83						
ASN	93	78	62	98	83	79	94	100	97		
BLK	71	59	57	80	64	62	75	92	85		
HSP	90	73	82	94	69	62	88	100	95		
MUL	91	70		93	75		100	92	100		
WHT	91	70	69	96	76	81	90	97	98		
FRL	73	60	56	83	65	65	80	93	89		
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	76	65		90	55				100		
ASN	96	82	77	96	84	71	94	98	98		
BLK	70	61	61	82	60	66	73	94	83		
HSP	86	57	50	96	66	62	87	93	96		
MUL	95	78		92	68		100		100		
WHT	89	70	66	96	69	77	91	95	96		

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
FRL	70	56	59	84	59	63	73	92	87		

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	78
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	699
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	62
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	82
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	87
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	69
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	80
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	88
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	81
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	71
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.

Grade 8 Science showed the lowest performance at sixty-one percent. This was a huge loss from the previous years proficiency of eighty-five percent; a twenty-four point loss. Mainly students who were less than proficient in Ela to the 8th-grade science exam.

Math Learning Gains and Bottom Quartile Gains, as a whole, showed the lowest performance. Math Learning Gains decreased from seventy-three percent to sixty-six percent with a seven point loss from the previous year. Math Bottom Quartile Gains decreased from sixty-eight percent to sixty percent with an eight point loss from the previous year.

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

Grade 8 science showed the greatest decline from the prior year. This decline was due to mainly students weh were not proficient in Language Arts taking the exam. These students were taught by a less than satisfactory teacher providing instruction.

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.

We are above the state and district average in all areas.

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

Grade 6 ELA improved from the previous year with a gain of three percentage points. Grade 7 ELA improved from the previous year with a gain of two percentage points. .

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

One area concern is students attendance decreasing which will impact their academic progress towards mastery of standards and proficiency on state assessments.

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

1. Standards Based Instruction
2. Teacher Collaboration
3. Behavior
4. Professional Development
5. Data Analysis

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Academics - Standards Based Instruction Student learning gains and lowest performing quartile are our highest-priority need in Language Arts and Math.
Rationale	If all teachers develop and provide standards based lessons for all students then student achievement will increase in all subgroups.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Standards based instruction will be implement within in all classrooms and student achievement will increase in all subgroups.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tamara Feagins (feaginst1@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Professional Learning Communities will be implemented weekly. All teachers will participate in their subject area PLC. During this time, teachers will discuss standards and teaching practices, develop lessons, student activities, and assessments aligned to the state standards, and analyze student data. Professional Learning Communities, or PLC, is a group of educators that meets regularly, shares expertise, and works collaboratively to improve teaching skills and the academic performance of students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	CAST observations; student data on class, district, and state assessments; professional learning provided to teachers to best meet the needs of gifted and academically talented students.
Action Step	
Description	1. Teachers will participate in Professional Learning Communities. 2. Administrators will conduct Standards Based Walks weekly. 3. Administrators will observe teachers using CAST observations. 4. Teachers will engage in Professional Development around standards based instruction. 5. Teachers and Administrators will analyze student data to drive instruction.
Person Responsible	Tamara Feagins (feaginst1@duvalschools.org)

#2	
Title	Behavior - Social and Emotional
Rationale	Class 1 infractions for the 2018-2019 school year was 243. 6th Grade 76 7th Grade 100 8th Grade 67
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If all teachers employ schoolwide PBIS strategies then we will decrease the amount of level one infractions by 20%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy	PBIS Positive Behavior Intervention System
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Teaching behavioral expectations and rewarding students for following them is a much more positive approach than waiting for misbehavior to occur before responding. The purpose of schoolwide PBIS is to establish a climate in which appropriate behavior is the norm.
Action Step	
Description	1. Administration and Teachers will engage in professional development. 2. Dean will support mindfulness initiative through behavior and discipline supports. 3. Teachers will implement mindfulness practices within the classroom and school community.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

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 - Standards Based Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Behavior - Social and Emotional	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00