# Duncan U. Fletcher Middle School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# 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: 7/1/2019

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Middle School<br>6-8 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | No |
| **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 52% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>English Language Learners*<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: A (71%)<br><br>2017-18: A (69%)<br><br>2016-17: A (67%)<br><br>2015-16: A (64%) |
| **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 is pending approval by the Duval 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

# Duncan U. Fletcher Middle School

## 2000 3RD ST N, Jacksonville Beach, FL 32250

### http://www.duvalschools.org/fms

## School Demographics

| **School Type and Grades Served** (per MSID File) | **2019-20 Title I School** | **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3) |
|---|---|---|
| Middle School 6-8 | No | 34% |

| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 34% |

## School Grades History

| Year | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | A | A | A | A |

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval 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.**

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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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 |
| Knowles, Megan | Teacher, K-12 | Literacy Lead. |
| Colado, Henry | Other | |
| Johnson, Victor | Teacher, ESE | |
| | Teacher, K-12 | Andrew Follensbee- Activities Chair |

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Monday 7/1/2019, Joseph Mckenzie

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
7

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
20

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**
65

**Demographic Data**

| | |
|---|---|
| **2020-21 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 |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | No |
| **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3) | 52% |
| **2019-20 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%) |
| **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](#).

## Early Warning Systems

### Current Year

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

| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 412 | 426 | 447 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1285 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 | 39 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 121 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 56 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 135 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | 49 | 75 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 160 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 | 37 | 43 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 111 |
| | 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 | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 132 | 179 | 204 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 515 |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Wednesday 7/1/2020

### Prior Year - As Reported

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

| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 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 | |

**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 | |
| 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 | |

## 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% |

| School Grade Component | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| 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 | |
| | (0) | (0) | (0) | 0 (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.**

| 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% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 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% |

| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 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 | | |
| 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 |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| 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% | 0 |
| **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% | 0 |
| **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% | 0 |
| **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% | 0 |
| **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% | 0 |
| **Hispanic Students** | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 64 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |

| Hispanic Students | |
|---|---|
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **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% | 0 |
| **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% | 0 |
| **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% | 0 |
| **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% | 0 |

## 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 (70% compared to 74% previous year; -4%). 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). We will have our first cohort of biology students (18) added this year. In addition 2 cohorts of our level 5 7th graders will take Com Sci 3 for the 20-21 school year.

**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 previous year). 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?**

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. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction** | |
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | According to our 19-20 SBWT data, our core contents averaged a 2.7/5 standards focus board and 2.3/5 aligned to FSA was our lowest score. Our students had limited opportunities released to them, to utilize the standard language or to have an FSA aligned experience. As a result, many high performing students proficiency levels decreased. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | By December, teachers will transition from low to high by improving our conceptual understanding of standards during PLC's, releasing lessons to students effectively and implementing more aligned experiences to the FSA. Based on our standards walk through data, we should see an increase in, " teacher use of the standard," "student use of the standard," "determine mastery," and "FSA alignment." |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Chelsea Matthews (matthewsc@duvalschools.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | What: Teachers and students will utilize standard language.<br>How: We will complete steps 1-4 of the learning arc together during PLC's (admin & teachers) to include student and teacher use of the standard during each lesson developed.Teachers will complete steps 5-7 together (peer to peer) utilizing paideia language as a tool to include discussion forums aligned to a specific standard or part of a standard that supports step 4 on the learning arc, breaking objectives into parts to teach the whole standard.<br>What: Teachers will develop FSA aligned learning tasks and assessments that include students use of the standard.<br>How: We will implement the opportunity myth during common planning to guide us in using bloom's taxonomy as a tool to script standard aligned, grade level questions. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | What:We are using PLC's to guide teachers in the learning arc process steps 1-4 because that is the foundation of filling in the gaps of the missing use of the standard language. Through this process we should be able to identify the areas where there isn't any use or time for student to utilize the language, and identify where students were not asked FSA aligned questions to have a FSA learning experience.<br><br>How: The tools we provide teachers to execute the lesson, ie. Blooms Taxonomy and Paideia language will provide resources teachers can use to release the lesson to students using the gradual release model to ask standard aligned questions on grade level (Blooms) or to ask standard aligned questions during a discussion that students lead (Paideia). |

**Action Steps to Implement**

Step 1: Review 19-20 SWT data with teachers and ask guiding questions for them to discover the gap in learning to be....student use of the standard....FSA aligned task/assessments. Review a series of strategies with teachers to choose 2 school wide strategies we can all execute together consistently during pre-planning that would provoke the release to students to be more FSA aligned. (Meeting held on 7.29.20) Teachers chose Bloom's Taxonomy and the Paideia Discussion Model to be tools to increase student use of standard language and to increase standard aligned questions on grade level.

| **Person Responsible** | Chelsea Matthews (matthewsc@duvalschools.org) |
|---|---|

Step 2: Connect the learning arc, school improvement plan and our work in PLC's to the big goal of increasing our student achievement levels across contents when sharing the vision for the 20-21 school year during pre-planning.

**Person Responsible** Chelsea Matthews (matthewsc@duvalschools.org)

Step 3: Complete 3 standard walks a day with administrative team; ensuring we complete 3/5 days of standards walks together.

**Person Responsible** Chelsea Matthews (matthewsc@duvalschools.org)

Step 4: Examine our PLC created learning arcs to determine if teachers are providing opportunities for students to articulate/use the standard. Ask guiding questions when creating the learning arc to observe the use of grade level scripted questions/FSA aligned assessments. Utilize student work protocol, analyzing students work and student discussion responses during common planning to guide lesson planning for the next lesson.

**Person Responsible** Chelsea Matthews (matthewsc@duvalschools.org)

Step 5: Provide resources, protocols and tools to teachers during PLC while unpacking steps 1-4 on the learning arc to support their understanding of standard aligned instruction using the strategies we are adopting.

**Person Responsible** Chelsea Matthews (matthewsc@duvalschools.org)

Step 6: Provide opportunities for teachers to complete focus walks to observe teachers effectively using the learning arc, Blooms Taxonomy and Paideia Discussion protocol effectively when delivering standard aligned instruction.

**Person Responsible** Chelsea Matthews (matthewsc@duvalschools.org)

Step 7: Provide voluntary weekly common planning sessions with administrative support to complete steps 5-7 on the learning arc. We will start off completing steps 1-4 together during our mandatory bi-weekly PLCs. The alternating week will be open session to complete steps 5-7 together. Teachers that choose not to come, will be responsible for completing steps 5-7 independently.

**Person Responsible** Chelsea Matthews (matthewsc@duvalschools.org)

| **#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports** | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | If teachers implement the school-wide PBIS plan, then the number of class one referrals will decrease. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | 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 Steps to Implement**

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.

| **Person Responsible** | Chelsea Matthews (matthewsc@duvalschools.org) |
|---|---|

Students participate in "calm classrooms" to deescalate conflicts.

| **Person Responsible** | Chelsea Matthews (matthewsc@duvalschools.org) |
|---|---|

Improve school culture and positive incentives (PBIS) through character cash, food trucks, student lounge.

| **Person Responsible** | Chelsea Matthews (matthewsc@duvalschools.org) |
|---|---|

Encourage staff celebrations, weekly healthy incentives.

| **Person Responsible** | Chelsea Matthews (matthewsc@duvalschools.org) |
|---|---|

Offer PD for MTSS and calm classrooms aimed to decrease class 1 referrals.

| **Person Responsible** | Chelsea Matthews (matthewsc@duvalschools.org) |
|---|---|

| #3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to School Safety | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | If all students and staff practice safety, the school will be better protected from outside threats. If we model for students the safety measures for COVID-19 and consistently set expectations, students will comply with our COVID-19 safety policies. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Emergency drills and policies practiced regularly according to district and JSO guidelines. We will continue to complete 1/1 of drills each month to practice safety to maintain 100% compliance. Teachers and students will wear and adhere to COVID-19 procedures and 100% of our staff will be protected during school hours. |
| **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. Remind teachers and students daily of the preventative COVID-19 procedures. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Practicing drills consistently will helps student remain calm and know what to do in a case of an emergency. Reminding teachers and students of the new procedures expectations will keep the expectations at the forefront of our minds as a crucially important priority. |

### Action Steps to Implement

Social distancing and systems to support social distancing (limited number of students allowed in the cafeteria at once, one way exits and entry points, temperatures taken before anyone enters campus, large clinic space to isolate potentially ill students, staggered dismissal)

| **Person Responsible** | Chelsea Matthews (matthewsc@duvalschools.org) |
|---|---|

Participate in consistent drills and safety nets. Model and Echo the expectations for social distancing often.

| **Person Responsible** | Chelsea Matthews (matthewsc@duvalschools.org) |
|---|---|

Early Release sessions for Hope for Healing, calm classrooms.

| **Person Responsible** | Chelsea Matthews (matthewsc@duvalschools.org) |
|---|---|

Practice cafeteria safety procedures.

| **Person Responsible** | Chelsea Matthews (matthewsc@duvalschools.org) |
|---|---|

All students, staff, and visitors wear IDs as well as masks.

| **Person Responsible** | Chelsea Matthews (matthewsc@duvalschools.org) |
|---|---|

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

**Instructional planning for standards based alignment: to improve instruction in ELA, Math, and Science classrooms, the school leadership team will focus more on standards (standards-based walk-throughs) and monitor instructional strategies along with data to refine lesson plans in PLC. This includes unpacking standards, to later build a lesson plan together during common planning, comparing assessments by standard and planning intervention groups based on student assessment data. Teachers will schedule TDE's once per quarter to prioritize standards for instruction.**

## Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

We have implemented a school-wide plan that creates a safe, secure and respectful school environment. CHAMPs lesson plans are taught to students multiple times throughout the school year. There is a school-wide PBIS plan (Positive Behavior Interventions & Support) to recognize, encourage, and reinforce achievement gains and positive behavior. Student Guidelines for Success are discussed daily on morning announcements and staff wears designated colors during the week to promote the Character traits and Guidelines for Success. Restorative Justice Practices are being implemented as a positive proactive and instructional way of dealing with misbehavior such as Support Circles and Restorative Practices.

We have adopted Calm classroom and The Permission to Feel as two resources we implement to decrease the amount of stress COVID-19 may bring to our students and staff. We are pairing every faculty member and student with someone to check in with consistently throughout the year.

The school builds and sustains partnerships with the local community for the purpose of securing and utilizing resources to support the school and student achievement through many avenues. The school's Action Team, Family and Community, plans community events with stakeholders. The PTSA helps raise money for student rewards and incentives. Local churches offer volunteers to help with pre-planning preparations to assist teachers. Parents and members of the community are welcomed to join SAC to have a voice and collaborate on school support. Events at our school such as Orientation, Open House, PTSA meetings, and various sporting events provide an opportunity for teachers, parents, and students to interact outside of the structured classroom. Additionally, school policy is in place to allow parents and/or teachers to request meetings to discuss a student and to build relationships.

**Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.