Fort Clarke Middle School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Fort Clarke Middle School

9301 NW 23RD AVE, Gainesville, FL 32606

https://www.sbac.edu/fortclarke

Demographics

Principal: Jared Taber   Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

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)	55%
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 (58%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: B (59%) 2014-15: A (68%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Alachua County School Board.

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

Fort Clarke Middle School

9301 NW 23RD AVE, Gainesville, FL 32606

https://www.sbac.edu/fortclarke

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	64%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	59%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Alachua County School Board.

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.

Fort Clarke Middle School welcomes students and families of all backgrounds and will provide the educational supports needed for every child to meet and exceed grade level proficiency.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To become an "A" school through continuous progress monitoring and feedback supports of all school-wide data.

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
Taber, Jared	Principal	Oversee and direct all aspects of school operation.
Brown, Jr.	Assistant Principal	Student Services, Facilities
Mead, Jessica	Assistant Principal	Curriculum and ESE
Fairchild, Jeff	Dean	Assists APSS, behavior data
Greenaway, Darlene	Dean	Assist APSS, track behavior data
Hebert, Judi	Instructional Technology	Site tech, research instructional materials
Wykoff, Laura	Teacher, K-12	Team Leader
Parker, Trish	Teacher, ESE	Team Leader
Rollins, Tameka	Administrative Support	Behavioral specialist

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	329	348	317	0	0	0	0	994
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	43	32	0	0	0	0	118
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	29	22	0	0	0	0	58
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	7	11	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	115	98	0	0	0	0	285

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	33	40	34	0	0	0	0	107

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	42	39	56	0	0	0	0	137
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	6

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
58

Date this data was collected or last updated
Saturday 9/14/2019

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	35	35	43	0	0	0	0	113
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	27	22	0	0	0	0	55
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	23	23	0	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	90	90	0	0	0	0	263

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	28	38	41	0	0	0	0	107

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%	59%	54%	62%	60%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	56%	54%	62%	59%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	41%	47%	35%	40%	44%
Math Achievement	60%	60%	58%	61%	60%	56%
Math Learning Gains	53%	56%	57%	58%	62%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	46%	51%	38%	47%	50%
Science Achievement	61%	53%	51%	60%	57%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	68%	73%	72%	80%	72%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	329 (0)	348 (0)	317 (0)	994 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	43 ()	43 ()	32 ()	118 (0)
One or more suspensions	7 (0)	29 (0)	22 (0)	58 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	22 (0)	7 (0)	11 (0)	40 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	72 (0)	115 (0)	98 (0)	285 (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	45%	53%	-8%	54%	-9%
	2018	54%	55%	-1%	52%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	57%	54%	3%	52%	5%
	2018	59%	55%	4%	51%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
08	2019	62%	61%	1%	56%	6%
	2018	68%	61%	7%	58%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	51%	52%	-1%	55%	-4%
	2018	48%	53%	-5%	52%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	58%	59%	-1%	54%	4%
	2018	64%	58%	6%	54%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
08	2019	34%	27%	7%	46%	-12%
	2018	25%	24%	1%	45%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		-30%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	59%	54%	5%	48%	11%
	2018	56%	53%	3%	50%	6%
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	67%	69%	-2%	71%	-4%
2018	73%	69%	4%	71%	2%
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	87%	56%	31%	61%	26%
2018	93%	60%	33%	62%	31%
Compare		-6%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	48%	-48%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	63%	-63%	56%	-56%
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	15	43	40	18	38	31	14	25			
ELL	42	52		48	45						
ASN	89	85		93	73		89	93	90		
BLK	28	43	47	30	40	34	31	49	60		
HSP	54	58	55	63	53	44	59	61	83		
MUL	65	60	35	56	49	40	62	71	69		
WHT	73	63	58	78	61	52	79	78	80		
FRL	31	45	46	35	40	38	34	49	56		

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	18	35	31	16	31	26	19	24			
ELL	53	58		56	56						
ASN	91	67		86	74		76	100	94		
BLK	28	40	36	25	38	34	16	44	65		
HSP	61	59	35	61	63	33	55	71	70		

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	63	54	42	53	55	28	58	73	90		
WHT	76	60	47	75	62	29	76	88	77		
FRL	41	46	39	38	46	32	36	55	61		
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	10	27	25	21	38	27	8	39			
ELL	27	54		27	43						
ASN	80	77		73	64		67	89	92		
BLK	33	45	29	32	41	33	30	63	62		
HSP	62	69	42	64	60	36	63	74	64		
MUL	53	65	63	55	57	35	35	64	50		
WHT	78	67	39	76	67	50	77	89	75		
FRL	43	49	29	40	45	33	34	64	51		

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	581
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	49
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	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	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	59
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	56
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	69
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	42
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.

Data reflecting SWD is very low, has been for the past 2 years. Although our LRE is well above the State requirement, our students with disabilities are not demonstrating academic proficiency.

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

Social studies acheivement dropped 4 percentage points. Factors attributed to teacher turnover in subject area and lack of progress monitoring through county initiatives. Department also acknowleges a higher need of standards based instruction that mirrors FSA level questioning.

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.

Math LQ data was 9% lower than the state average. Factors that contribute to this include lack of progress monitoring of LQ throughout the year, minimal remedial opportunities provided for these students outside of traditional classroom setting.

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

ELA LQ data increased 11% points. ELA and Reading departments increased the level of rigor and standards based instruction, in addition to regular progress monitoring with feedback to other content areas. ELA and Reading teachers participated in collborative efforts with the District and shared with other departments twice a month.

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

28% of students earned a level 1 on a ELA or MA exam.
11% of students have less than a 90% attendance rate.

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

1. Increase the learning gains of the LQ in ELA and Math.
2. Raise African American achievement to meet or exceed federal standard of 41%, also lowering the achievement gap.
3. Raise SWD achievement data to meet or exceed federal standard of 41%.
4. Decrease the number of OSS for African Americans and SWD by 15%.

5. Increase data component goals for all subject areas, either 3% or 1% more than highest of last 3 years.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title	Increase SWD Achievement
Rationale	FCMS does not meet the ESSA SWD achievement baseline of 41%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase the SWD ESSA achievement rate to meet or exceed 41% in all tested subject areas.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jessica Mead (meadjf@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy	Continue to increase LRE in ELA and MA. Provide additional training for co-teach, support facilitation teachers. UDL training for 3 general education teachers. MTSS trainings for couselors, 1 admin. to share with ESE department.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Despite our low LRE rate, many of our teachers are within 1-3 years of the profession and/or are alternative certfication. They need additional foundational teaching practices for SWD.

Action Step

Description	1. Identify target population 2. Provides needs assessment. 3. Identify best practices. 4. Provide additional training opportunities. 5. Monitor progress, remediate as needed from data.
Person Responsible	Jessica Mead (meadjf@gm.sbac.edu)

#2	
Title	Increase African Amerian Achievement
Rationale	AA student acheivement is below the Federal ESSA requirement and is consistently lower than other peer groups.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	African American student acheivement will meet or exceed the federal benchmark of 41% in all tested subject areas.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lawson Brown, Jr. (brownl@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy	Provided culturally relevent instruction and training to teachers. Provide access to advanced course options. Provide academic interventions and parent workshops to increase engagement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Evidence supports that culturally relevent lessons allow students to connect background knowledge to new material. Parent involvement is also linked to higher student achievement. We will focus on using the District Equity plan as a resource.

Action Step	
Description	1. Identify students 2. Identify areas of improvement 3. Select best practices 4. communicate with stakeholders 5. evaulate progress monitoring, remediate as needed
Person Responsible	Lawson Brown, Jr. (brownl@gm.sbac.edu)

#3	
Title	Increase learning gains of the LQ in ELA
Rationale	Despite gains from last year, our LQ students are below the achievement levels of other peer groups. This student population also contributes to our school grade significantly.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	LQ ELA students will meet the goal of 52% passing FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jared Taber (taberjc@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy	Increase co-teach classes, UDL trainings, AIMS data monitoring with feedback to students and teachers. Remediation based on data monitoring. Use of i-Ready reading curriculum.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	This will allow staff to identify strategies that will have the highest impact on student learning. Will also allow for data chats among across departments for additional remediation efforts.
Action Step	
Description	1. identify target population 2. communicate with stakeholders 3. identify best practices 4. monitor assessment data 5. provide remediation based on data results
Person Responsible	Jared Taber (taberjc@gm.sbac.edu)

#4	
Title	Increase learning gains of the LQ in MA
Rationale	LQ gains are below achievement levels of other peer groups, also below the State and District averages.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Math LQ will meet or exceed 43% achievement rate.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jared Taber (taberjc@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy	Increase co-teach sections and UDL designs. Provide online textbook training, teachers and students. Ensure alignment of lesson planning to FSA standards. Use of IXL for specific standard remediation.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	This will allow teachers to add to their tool-kits when identifying students that do not meet proficiency on AIMS assessment. Wil also allow for targeted feedback and remediation.
Action Step	
Description	1. identify target population 2. select best practices 3. collborative planning, FSA alignment 4. differentiate instruction 5. assess, remediate based on target areas
Person Responsible	Jared Taber (taberjc@gm.sbac.edu)

#5	
Title	Decrease African American OSS rate
Rationale	AA OSS rates are higher than other peer groups. This is also a focus that aligns with the District Equity plan.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	AA OSS will decrease by 15% or more, goal of 97.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lawson Brown, Jr. (brownl@gm.sbac.edu)
Evidence-based Strategy	Will utilize alternatives to suspensions, PBIS, restorative practices. Hosting In Lieu of Meetings at FCMS twice a month. Weekly monitoring of AA suspensions, compared to overall goal. OSS wall chart. Mentoring as needed with behavior para.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	These approaches will allow students to increase time spent in the academic setting and expose them to the positive redirection efforts as provided by our PBIS/restorative support system. We expect to see a higher likelihood of academic success due to more time in the academic setting.

Action Step	
Description	1. Create school-wide PBIS plan 2. Share best practices with teachers 3. Provide training opportunities 4. Monitor progress weekly 5. Provide feedback
Person Responsible	Lawson Brown, Jr. (brownl@gm.sbac.edu)

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).