Duval County Public Schools

Kernan Middle School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Kernan Middle School

2271 KERNAN BLVD S, Jacksonville, FL 32276

http://www.duvalschools.org/kms

Demographics

Principal: Christine Bicksler Akande

Start Date for this Principal: 7/31/2019

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	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	76%
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: B (60%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (52%) 2014-15: B (58%)
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

Kernan Middle School

2271 KERNAN BLVD S, Jacksonville, FL 32276

http://www.duvalschools.org/kms

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	Yes	68%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	56%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	B	B	C

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.

To build competent and confident students accomplished through standard based instruction, objective and data driven lesson planning, and empowering students through social and emotional development.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Ensure every child is prepared for high school, without having to remediate what they should have learned in middle school. Students will grow in their confidence and their ability to make a positive impact on their own lives, their school, their community and their 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
Hemphill, Julie	Principal	
Predieri, Kelley	Teacher, K-12	ELA Department Chair
Swank, Shelia	Teacher, K-12	
Woods, Linda	Administrative Support	
Bass, Dana	Teacher, K-12	

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	409	416	371	0	0	0	0	1196
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	46	48	0	0	0	0	143
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	46	40	0	0	0	0	106
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	222	198	226	0	0	0	0	646

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	131	145	122	0	0	0	0	398

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

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

68

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/22/2019

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	57%	43%	54%	51%	41%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	49%	54%	53%	48%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	45%	47%	43%	43%	44%
Math Achievement	60%	49%	58%	50%	44%	56%
Math Learning Gains	52%	50%	57%	47%	49%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	47%	51%	43%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	56%	44%	51%	58%	45%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	82%	68%	72%	72%	65%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	409 (0)	416 (0)	371 (0)	1196 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	49 ()	46 ()	48 ()	143 (0)
One or more suspensions	20 (0)	46 (0)	40 (0)	106 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	2 (0)	1 (0)	3 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	222 (0)	198 (0)	226 (0)	646 (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	59%	47%	12%	54%	5%
	2018	56%	44%	12%	52%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	52%	44%	8%	52%	0%
	2018	41%	41%	0%	51%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
08	2019	51%	49%	2%	56%	-5%
	2018	55%	51%	4%	58%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	58%	51%	7%	55%	3%
	2018	50%	42%	8%	52%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	54%	47%	7%	54%	0%
	2018	46%	50%	-4%	54%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
08	2019	29%	32%	-3%	46%	-17%
	2018	19%	31%	-12%	45%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-17%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	52%	40%	12%	48%	4%
	2018	50%	44%	6%	50%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
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	78%	69%	9%	71%	7%
2018	97%	84%	13%	71%	26%
Compare		-19%			
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	85%	57%	28%	61%	24%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	82%	61%	21%	62%	20%
Compare		3%			
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	36	46	40	41	48	47	49	61	54		
ELL	31	51	45	54	54	60	39	84			
ASN	67	55	32	80	55		74	86	95		
BLK	42	47	42	42	45	42	38	78	73		
HSP	51	54	37	55	49	53	53	80	87		
MUL	60	55	41	61	59	70	71	90	93		
WHT	66	64	55	68	56	46	62	83	87		
FRL	50	54	49	51	50	48	47	79	84		
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	32	43	36	38	41	29	36	74	73		
ELL	25	48	39	32	43	56	33				
ASN	62	61	41	65	58	50	52	95	94		
BLK	41	50	49	40	44	37	36	87	73		
HSP	47	50	43	45	47	40	32	94	83		
MUL	57	51	36	60	51	25	70	94	76		
WHT	58	53	36	58	51	32	66	95	82		
FRL	46	51	41	43	45	33	41	92	80		
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	23	45	46	27	44	35	33	45	69		
ELL	21	41	43	24	46	48	18	35			
ASN	62	55	31	67	53		72	86	79		
BLK	31	43	40	31	44	40	36	62	57		
HSP	46	56	48	39	42	38	55	54	70		
MUL	64	61	62	63	52	40	71	82	73		
WHT	58	55	43	56	49	49	65	78	70		

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	41	48	43	38	42	38	52	64	66		

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	60
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	54
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	597
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%

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	52
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	67
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	50
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	56
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	67
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	65
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	57
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 data component that showed the lowest performance was the ELA lowest 25 percentile. The contributing factors were lack of differentiated instruction focused on reading skills and strategies

meeting students needs on their individual levels. Behavior and attendance issues were also increased from the previous year, especially in regard to 8th grade LPQ students.

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

The data component showing the greatest decline from the prior year was in Social Studies. The factor contributing to this decline was due to the change of progression, previously only the students in the highest level lexiles were enrolled in Civics; however in the 2018-2019 school year, 8th grade students who had not previously met the lexile requirements for Civics had to be enrolled despite their performance level.

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.

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was in Math Learning Gains. An existing trend is that incoming sixth grader scores see a decline due to the increased difficulty of the math FSA and rigor of the standards.

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

The data component showing the most improvement was the Math Lowest 25th Percentile. The teachers had become masters of the curriculum due to the fact that this was the 3rd year utilizing Eureka Math. Teachers also used data driven instruction to differentiate lessons and alleviate misconceptions. The schools lowest performing students were double blocked using IReady Math for additional support.

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

The two most concerning indicators from the EWS data are the number of students in attendance below 90% and the number of students performing at a level 1 on the statewide assessment. Out of 1196 students, 143 have low attendance and 646 perform below a level 1.

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

1. ELA LPQ
2. Close gap between LPQ Gains and the rest of the school
3. 6th grade Math Learning Gains
4. 8th Grade Science Achievement
5. ELA Overall Achievement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Novice Teacher Support
Rationale	In order to ensure student achievement, the school must hire, retain, and support the new teacher population.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our school plans for novice teacher support is to maintain our new teacher population by 100% in their first three years.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Julie Hemphill (jhemphill@gocacademy.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	Supporting new teachers through Professional Development, PLC's and mentoring.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The support of new teachers should be provided through professional development within their content area and teaching practices. This would allow teachers to understand their content and curriculum on a greater scale in order to provide effective instruction. Supporting new teachers through their Professional Learning Communities will enable them access to materials, guidance, and resources for classroom instruction. Finally, new teachers will be appointed a mentor within their first two weeks at Kernan, which will provide novice teachers with one-on-one assistance.

Action Step	
Description	1. New Teacher Monthly Meetings 2. Co Teaching with Veteran Teachers 3. Microsoft Teams Kernan Hacks 4. Mentoring 5. Teacher Development Support requirements on District Level
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#2	
Title	Behavioral
Rationale	If we support students social-emotional development, then we will see an increased positive behaviors school wide.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Discipline Data Student Survey Parent Survey
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	John Dale (dalej@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Explicitly teach students Calm Classroom techniques as well as social-emotional tools through Amazing Osprey lessons.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	While there was a significant reduction in lower level confrontations in 1819, there was a small increase in threats at the school.
Action Step	
Description	1. Amazing Osprey's lessons on social skills, goal setting. 2. Calm Classroom Lessons during Amazing Osprey time to create a positive environment 3. Visual reminders on bulletin boards that are visual reminders of the behavioral goals for the entire school 4. Implement a system of rewards for positive behaviors and accomplishment of academic goals. 5. Implement mentoring groups to focus on individual student needs.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#3	
Title	Lowest Performing Quartile in ELA
Rationale	Students in the lowest performing quartile (LPQ)are vulnerable to staying below grade level in reading. Focus on the lowest quartile will close the gap.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Students in the LPQ will achieve 49% on the Reading FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Julie Hemphill (jhemphill@gocacademy.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	If all teachers implement the district curriculum guides, as well as utilize prescribed reading strategies, develop well paced lessons via regular PLC meetings, differentiate based on student needs, and stay on schedule, then there will be an increase in proficiency and gains on district and state assessments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	These strategies allow for consistent instruction across classrooms and professional collaboration. The PLC meetings allow teachers to unpack standards/benchmarks, analyze student work, and plan effective and differentiated lessons. *District Specialists *Curriculum Guides (CGs) available on district website * Professional Development * Administrative Support * Common Planning in professional learning communities * Diagnostic Assessments

Action Step	
Description	1. Data will be utilized to drive instruction 2. Small group instruction 3. Corrective Reading Program 4. Achieve 3000 5. Collaborate in all subject areas to promote reading strategies across content
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#4	
Title	Lowest Performing Quartile in Math
Rationale	Students in the lowest performing quartile (LPQ)are vulnerable to staying below grade level in math. Focus on the lowest quartile will close the gap.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Students in the LPQ will achieve 52% on the Reading FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Julie Hemphill (jhemphill@gocacademy.com)
Evidence-based Strategy	Students are double blocked for math using the Math 180 curriculum for one period and on-grade-level curriculum for the second period. If all teachers implement the district curriculum guides, as well as utilize prescribed math strategies, develop well paced lessons via regular PLC meetings, differentiate based on student needs, and stay on schedule, then there will be an increase in proficiency and gains on district and state assessments.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	These strategies allow for consistent instruction across classrooms and professional collaboration. The PLC meetings allow teachers to unpack standards/benchmarks, analyze student work, and plan effective and differentiated lessons. *Math 180 - differentiated for specific math needs *District Specialists *Curriculum Guides (CGs) available on district website * Professional Development * Administrative Support * Common Planning in professional learning communities * Diagnostic Assessments

Action Step	
Description	1. Data will be utilized to drive instruction 2. Small group instruction 3. Math 180 4. Double blocked instruction 5. Blended Learning online resources
Person Responsible	Julie Hemphill (jhemphill@gocacademy.com)

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).