

Duval County Public Schools

Duncan U. Fletcher Middle School



2021-22 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	18
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	21

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: 7/6/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	52%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

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)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	31%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	36%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
McKenzie, Joseph	Principal	
Stansel, Elizabeth	Assistant Principal	
Galvez, Mercedes	Assistant Principal	
Fretz, Scott	Instructional Coach	
Davis, Ronda	School Counselor	
Busch, Erin	Teacher, K-12	
McGiveron, Mark	Teacher, K-12	
Colado, Henry	Other	
Johnson, Victor	Teacher, ESE	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/6/2021, 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

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,214

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems****2021-22****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	390	422	434	0	0	0	0	1246
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	49	75	0	0	0	0	160
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	37	43	0	0	0	0	111
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	132	179	204	0	0	0	0	515

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	3	2	4	0	0	0	0	9

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/20/2021

2020-21 - 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	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	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	132	179	204	0	0	0	0	515	

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	3	2	4	0	0	0	0	9

2020-21 - 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	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	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	132	179	204	0	0	0	0	515	

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	3	2	4	0	0	0	0	9

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				67%	43%	54%	63%	42%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				60%	49%	54%	54%	47%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	45%	47%	40%	44%	47%
Math Achievement				80%	49%	58%	75%	46%	58%
Math Learning Gains				69%	50%	57%	64%	50%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				61%	47%	51%	57%	47%	51%
Science Achievement				71%	44%	51%	76%	45%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				94%	68%	72%	99%	82%	72%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	68%	47%	21%	54%	14%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	60%	44%	16%	52%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
08	2021					
	2019	72%	49%	23%	56%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	85%	51%	34%	55%	30%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	70%	47%	23%	54%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				
08	2021					
	2019	44%	32%	12%	46%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	70%	40%	30%	48%	22%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	93%	69%	24%	71%	22%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	88%	57%	31%	61%	27%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	97%	61%	36%	57%	40%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

PMA 1-3
 Achieve 3000
 iReady
 Math Nation
 HMH

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	26	34	26	39	26	27	31	53	53		
ELL	33	44	36	41	32	26	24	52	45		
ASN	71	67		79	52						
BLK	35	29	18	41	28	32	33	63	55		
HSP	52	54	37	57	25	28	58	64	78		
MUL	63	47	35	68	42	47	64	74	79		
PAC	90										
WHT	71	61	33	76	47	43	80	85	85		
FRL	49	46	29	56	32	31	57	66	73		
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		

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
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		

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	601
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	40
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	37
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	52
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	58
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	90
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	50
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

All but one data point decreased from the prior year.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

8th Grade Math went down from the prior year 21 points (from 44-23).

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

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. Students fully present face-to-face will increase ability to remediate and properly assess performance.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Geometry remained the same. There were no improvements across the board.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The small number within the course created an ideal learning environment.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

More consistent and accurate progress monitoring.
More aggressive and creative implementation of safety nets.
More specifically prescribed next steps to increase proficiency.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

ESE and MTSS training to ensure all students have an equitable chance to succeed.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Use of ESSER 2 funding to provide resources tat enable student engagement and growth.

Use of CORE departmental TDE planning days to align lessons and assessments to standards.

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 prior year 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 continue to transition to higher levels of standards based tasks 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."
Monitoring:	Principal will monitor the quality and number of SBWTs and focus on actionable feedback that relays clear next steps to move the tasks and the aligned experiences to better alignment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Joseph McKenzie (mckenziej2@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>What: Teachers and students will utilize standard language.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>What: Teachers will develop FSA aligned learning tasks and assessments that include students use of the standard.</p> <p>How: We will implement the opportunity myth during common planning to guide us in using Bloom's taxonomy and Webb's Depth of Knowledge as a tool to script standard aligned, grade level questions.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>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.</p> <p>How: The tools we provide teachers to execute the lesson, ie. Blooms Taxonomy and the Hess Matrix 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 and include depth of knowledge by combining both Bloom and Webb through the Hess Matrix.</p>

Action Steps to Implement

Step 1: Review 20-21 SWT data with teachers through PLCs 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 8.6.21) Teachers chose Bloom's Taxonomy and the Hess Matrix Discussion Model to be tools to increase student use of standard language and to increase standard aligned questions on grade level.

Person Responsible Joseph McKenzie (mckenziej2@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 21-22 school year during pre-planning.

Person Responsible Joseph McKenzie (mckenziej2@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: Continue the decline in Level 1 referrals by 10%.

Monitoring: The leadership team will work more closely with the Dean of Discipline to create a more connected and clear routine for teacher and parent involvement in the the discipline process.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Mercedes Galvez (galvezm@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

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Primary area of concern: Multiple entry and exit points on campus.

Secondary area of concern: School wide communication during and after an emergency (infrastructure).

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.

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.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

PTSA - Parents, teachers and students are all working to support the school and its academic and cultural initiatives through celebrations, encouragement, finances, etc.

SAC

Faith-based Partners

Community Business Partners

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: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00