

Duval County Public Schools

Duncan U. Fletcher Middle School



2022-23 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	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	52%
2021-22 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	2021-22: A (64%) 2018-19: A (71%) 2017-18: A (69%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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	0

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) Middle School 6-8	2021-22 Title I School No	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) 52%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File) K-12 General Education	Charter School No	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) 38%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
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.

Duncan U. 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.

At Duncan U. Fletcher Middle School we focus on every child's success through Academics, Athletics, and the Arts.

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
McKenzie, Joseph	Principal	
Galvez, Mercedes	Assistant Principal	APC
Rowan, Tonya	Assistant Principal	
Gilyard, Jeanna	School Counselor	
Colado, Henry	Other	Athletic Director
Fretz, Scott	Teacher, Adult	Gifted Lead

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/6/2021, Joseph Mckenzie

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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

55

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,193

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

5

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

3

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	358	386	424	0	0	0	0	1168
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	78	88	0	0	0	0	209
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	44	54	0	0	0	0	159
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	54	76	0	0	0	0	168
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	2	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	54	76	0	0	0	0	168
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	52	65	74	0	0	0	0	191
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	53	30	34	0	0	0	0	117

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	48	40	76	0	0	0	0	164

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/11/2022

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	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	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	4	0	0	0	0	9

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	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	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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	61%	43%	50%				67%	43%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	48%						60%	49%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	33%						53%	45%	47%
Math Achievement	73%	35%	36%				80%	49%	58%
Math Learning Gains	59%						69%	50%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55%						61%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	71%	48%	53%				71%	44%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	81%	53%	58%				94%	68%	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	2022					
	2019	68%	47%	21%	54%	14%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	60%	44%	16%	52%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				
08	2022					
	2019	72%	49%	23%	56%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	85%	51%	34%	55%	30%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	70%	47%	23%	54%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				
08	2022					
	2019	44%	32%	12%	46%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	70%	40%	30%	48%	22%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	93%	69%	24%	71%	22%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	88%	57%	31%	61%	27%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	97%	61%	36%	57%	40%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	23	29	21	39	49	46	31	51	61		
ELL	30	37	29	54	53	40	50	64			
ASN	78	57		82	77		92	90			
BLK	40	44	36	52	56	54	66	71	90		
HSP	42	38	31	61	54	45	56	61	93		
MUL	48	36	13	75	59	53	63	68	100		
WHT	70	51	36	78	60	62	75	88	91		
FRL	47	43	31	59	57	50	60	69	87		
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		

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
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		
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		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	71
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	644
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	48
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	79
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	55
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	57
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	68
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	56
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

LPQ in ELA: students are not progressing/ showing gains overall across subgroups and demographics. 6th grade math students are struggling to show proficiency and gains overall across subgroups and demographics.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

FSA LPQ data from 2022

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

Use of tutoring could have been more widely used and pushed through ELA. Data-based decisions and DI were not mandated effectively which will need to change in the coming year.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Math proficiency, gain, LPQ gains and school acceleration were all areas of improvement that were noticeable through state assessments.

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

All math teachers participated in tutoring.
 All math teachers used targeted instruction based on data and differentiated lessons using groups.
 Bootcamps and other modes of learning were used to drive overall learning.

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

All content areas will need to buy in to the tutoring, DI, and bootcamp model to move all children. 4x4 schedule with 90 minute course will help with rotations and groups. The addition of a standards coach will also accelerate teacher capacity and filter down to student outcomes. In ELA the last 30 minutes will include specific targeted small group instruction.

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.

Teachers will have access to continuous coaching through our standards coach. Preplanning professional development and early release profession development will be aligned to needs assessments as informed by the walkthrough data. CLCs will focus on data collection and small group learning.

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

The addition of an instructional coach to assist in faculty development, professional learning communities, and the MTSS process.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. If teachers differentiate to deliver standards based instruction, then students who identify as lowest performing quartile in ELA will show improvement in proficiency in year 1 of the FAST assessment.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome. PM 1 and PM 2 growth
Achieve 3000 Literacy Data
EEA Style progress monitoring data showing growth

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. Administrative team will monitor together with AP Rowan as the point person to drive data based decision making within the department and the school-based literacy leadership team driving school-wide initiatives.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joseph McKenzie (mckenziej2@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. Data based student tracking
Student trackers which are managed by the students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy. Using data to track the progress of students as they navigate understanding of the standards is one thing however having teacher own that data tracking and furthermore, having students manage their data tracking will allow them to own their outcomes.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

CLC meetings twice monthly.

Person Responsible

Tonya Rowan (rowant@duvalschools.org)

Team data meetings with administrators post assessments to determine goals and action steps.

Person Responsible

Joseph McKenzie (mckenziej2@duvalschools.org)

#2. Transformational Leadership specifically relating to Leadership Development

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

We have developed and will implement an systematic leadership development model to engage all faculty in the leadership and ownership of the culture of the school. Teacher Leadership Teams, Grade Level Teams, Subject Area Champions and Admin Support will allow for a fully functioning decentralization of command model of institutional leadership.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Growth in the 5 Essentials metric measuring leadership and leadership opportunity/development.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

We will monitor the area of focus through the activity and response through the 5E process as the year progresses. We will also determine leadership growth through progression into department chair status, school committee chair status and school leadership status (admin, dean, etc.).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joseph McKenzie (mckenziej2@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

The leadership team will monitor the effectiveness of the process weekly through lead meetings and monthly through SDM meetings.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

We will use already embedded aspects of our school system of leadership to monitor new aspects/additions to the structure.

Action Steps to Implement
 List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to PBIS/ Proactive Teacher Development

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

The dean of students will engage in a systematic and proactive process of teacher development to enhance classroom management while utilizing school counselors, social workers, and peer mediation to prevent behaviors and promote proper decision making.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Decrease in class 1 referrals.
 Increase in student contact and support log entries by teachers.
 Increase in disciple walkthroughs and feedback.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The dean of students will report out weekly at leadership meetings showing discipline data (trends, walkthrough data, tiering of teachers by support needed, etc.).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Joseph McKenzie (mckenziej2@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

5E support metric. Teachers feeling supported and safe.
 Parents and students feeling safe.
 Weekly reports and coaching cycles.
 Discipline data/ comparative data.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

The number of level 1 infractions and the occurrences in which the teacher is calling for the dean are cases in which proper coaching and proactive processes and skills implementation can improve these outcomes and their frequency.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

N/A

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

N/A

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

N/A

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

McKenzie, Joseph, mckenziej2@duvalschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

N/A

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

N/A

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
-------------	-----------------------------------

N/A	McKenzie, Joseph, mckenziej2@duvalschools.org
-----	---

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Duncan U. Fletcher Middle School utilizes CHAMPS and Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports. During the first week of school teachers review the expectations of both CHAMPS and PBIS for our campus. During our Code of Conduct presentation for students the plans are also reviewed with students. Signage is posted throughout our campus and in classrooms as gentle reminders of expectations for campus behavior.

The Administrative Team along with teachers, parents, and students develop activities that promote a safe and healthy school environment.

In addition, we have added Teacher Leadership Teams (TLT) to help support culture throughout CORE curriculum, social and emotional behaviors, and activities for students and families on campus.

We also use our partnership with our PTSA to provide positive encounters for students, families and our communities. Through our SAC, we work to develop plans for student need and recognition.

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

Administration - Support provided to Dean and School Level Team through trend analysis of academic and discipline data.

Dean - Leader of PBIS Team at the School Level

PBIS School Team - plan and implement PBIS school wide and classroom activities.

Teachers / Guidance - provide lessons, implement strategies, communicate with parents

Students - receive tangible rewards through in school celebrations, awards, certificates and various activities throughout the campus.

PTSA- promoting positive school culture through student and parent sponsored activities. Connecting with our community to provide incentives and actions for our students.