

Duval County Public Schools

Springfield Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	17

Springfield Middle School

2034 HUBBARD ST, Jacksonville, FL 32206

www.duvalschools.org/springfield

Demographics

Principal: Deshune Bush

Start Date for this Principal: 10/19/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	79%
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 (63%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: A (66%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

Springfield Middle School

2034 HUBBARD ST, Jacksonville, FL 32206

www.duvalschools.org/springfield

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	72%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	80%

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.

Kirby-Smith Middle School's mission is to provide educational excellence in every school, in every classroom, for every student, every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Kirby-Smith Middle School's vision is to ensure that every student is inspired and prepared for success in college or career, and life.

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
Bush, De Shune	Principal	
	Teacher, ESE	
Stinson, Katrina	School Counselor	
Sims, Monica	Dean	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 10/19/2020, Deshune Bush

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

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)	79%
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 (63%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: A (69%) 2015-16: A (66%)
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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	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	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 10/19/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2	
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	1	2	0	0	0	0	3

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	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	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
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	1	2	0	0	0	0	3

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	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	64%	43%	54%	67%	41%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	49%	54%	63%	48%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	45%	47%	49%	43%	44%
Math Achievement	73%	49%	58%	76%	44%	56%
Math Learning Gains	53%	50%	57%	57%	49%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	47%	51%	52%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	68%	44%	51%	76%	45%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	70%	68%	72%	88%	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	60%	47%	13%	54%	6%
	2018	58%	44%	14%	52%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	59%	44%	15%	52%	7%
	2018	63%	41%	22%	51%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
08	2019	72%	49%	23%	56%	16%
	2018	67%	51%	16%	58%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	71%	51%	20%	55%	16%
	2018	45%	42%	3%	52%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		26%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	55%	47%	8%	54%	1%
	2018	74%	50%	24%	54%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-19%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
08	2019	71%	32%	39%	46%	25%
	2018	51%	31%	20%	45%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	49%	40%	9%	48%	1%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	70%	44%	26%	50%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-21%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	99%	67%	32%	67%	32%
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	70%	69%	1%	71%	-1%
2018	91%	84%	7%	71%	20%
Compare		-21%			
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	83%	57%	26%	61%	22%
2018	78%	61%	17%	62%	16%
Compare		5%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	88%	61%	27%	57%	31%
2018	92%	57%	35%	56%	36%
Compare		-4%			

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	34	36	36	61	52	46	31	61	67		
ASN	100	78		89	44				100		

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
BLK	52	49	47	63	51	51	53	64	75		
HSP	84	73		90	47		80	58	100		
MUL	74	50		76	56	64	82		94		
WHT	80	62	64	90	60	71	91	88	94		
FRL	50	46	42	65	53	51	52	59	81		
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	37	51	50	53	49	44	63	78	83		
ASN	75	71		89	75		79	100	100		
BLK	51	46	42	57	44	45	58	87	68		
HSP	75	70	80	89	55		100	96	100		
MUL	70	70		75	58		67	95	91		
WHT	82	61	50	90	65	64	89	96	92		
FRL	53	49	46	60	45	46	58	89	73		
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	42	58	60	57	49	43	53	76	69		
ASN	85	73		91	70		100	100	100		
BLK	54	58	50	64	52	52	63	84	85		
HSP	82	64	45	88	60		82	93	92		
MUL	79	52		79	57	40		79	94		
WHT	84	71	60	92	64	64	91	93	93		
FRL	58	59	44	67	52	50	65	81	85		

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	63
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	570
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
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%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	82
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	56
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	76
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	71
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	78
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	55
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.

Needs to be completed

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

-

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.

-

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

-

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

-

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

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: _____ teachers implement lessons and provide learning tasks and assessments that are aligned to the the standards. Use of the Standards Walk-Through Tool revealed that most student learning tasks were not aligned to the standard and/or did not determine mastery of standards.

Measurable Outcome: 90% of Kirby-Smith core teachers will collaboratively plan to provide standards aligned student learning tasks that determine student mastery of standards.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: De Shune Bush (stroyd@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

Provide teacher training on standards aligned instruction, learning tasks and assessments.

Person Responsible De Shune Bush (stroyd@duvalschools.org)

Establish protocols for Common Planning that ensure discussion around the standard, the tasks and assessments for the week's instruction.

Person Responsible De Shune Bush (stroyd@duvalschools.org)

Create a schedule for daily Standards Walk-throughs by administrative team

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Create a schedule for collaborative team walk-throughs allowing teachers to provide feedback to colleagues on standards aligned instruction and learning tasks.

Person Responsible De Shune Bush (stroyd@duvalschools.org)

#2. -- Select below -- specifically relating to**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:****Measurable Outcome:****Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:****Action Steps to Implement***No action steps were entered for this area of focus***Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

na

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.

Needs to be completed

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00