James Weldon Johnson College Preparatory Middle School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

James Weldon Johnson College Preparatory Middle School

3276 NORMAN E THAGARD BLVD, Jacksonville, FL 32254

http://www.duvalschools.org/jwjohnson

Demographics

Principal: James Stuckey   Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

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)	47%
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 (72%) 2018-19: A (78%) 2017-18: A (80%)
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

James Weldon Johnson College Preparatory Middle School

3276 NORMAN E THAGARD BLVD, Jacksonville, FL 32254

http://www.duvalschools.org/jwjohnson

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	47%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	68%

School Grades History

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

The mission of James Weldon Johnson College Prep is to provide educational excellence in every classroom, for every student, every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At James Weldon Johnson College Prep, we are empowering students to contribute to a global society by fostering a rich academic experience, a gratefulness for history, a heart for community, and an appreciation for a diverse culture.

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
Stuckey, James	Principal	
Chambers, Michelle	Assistant Principal	
Brown, Denetra	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Student Services

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/1/2021, James Stuckey

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.*
2

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.*
17

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
47

Total number of students enrolled at the school
991

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
8

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
7

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	342	311	338	0	0	0	0	991
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	15	18	0	0	0	0	80
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	21	29	0	0	0	0	60
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	16	22	0	0	0	0	55
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	14	17	0	0	0	0	48
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	11	13	11	0	0	0	0	35

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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
Sunday 8/28/2022

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	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	
Course failure in ELA	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	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	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	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	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	
Course failure in ELA	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	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	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	

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	79%	43%	50%				84%	43%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	64%						68%	49%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%						62%	45%	47%
Math Achievement	79%	35%	36%				89%	49%	58%
Math Learning Gains	65%						66%	50%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60%						60%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	80%	48%	53%				86%	44%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	92%	53%	58%				92%	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	83%	47%	36%	54%	29%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	83%	44%	39%	52%	31%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				
08	2022					
	2019	87%	49%	38%	56%	31%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	88%	51%	37%	55%	33%
Cohort Comparison						

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
07	2022					
	2019	87%	47%	40%	54%	33%
Cohort Comparison		-88%				
08	2022					
	2019	0%	32%	-32%	46%	-46%
Cohort Comparison		-87%				

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	61%	40%	21%	48%	13%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					
2019	96%	67%	29%	67%	29%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2022					
2019	92%	69%	23%	71%	21%

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	89%	57%	32%	61%	28%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	100%	61%	39%	57%	43%

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	51	39	37	44	52	41	41	68	47		
ELL	85	67	73	92	76			92			
ASN	94	75	73	95	80	82	93	95	97		
BLK	66	56	45	64	54	54	65	85	64		
HSP	69	59	50	76	62	70	86	94	75		
MUL	95	75		91	79	73	85	100	89		
WHT	84	67	55	87	69	61	88	96	91		
FRL	67	54	41	67	58	54	70	82	72		
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	55	55	46	55	37	26	50	50	64		
ELL	78	82	77	78	55						
ASN	94	78	73	95	60	54	98	96	99		
BLK	67	56	41	58	24	26	60	83	65		
HSP	78	65	57	71	27	31	92	88	86		
MUL	93	67		81	37		91	93	95		
WHT	87	67	60	86	44	51	89	95	92		
FRL	68	60	50	57	23	25	66	90	69		
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	56	55	47	64	67	52	64	76	75		
ELL	71	78		88	72			100			
ASN	94	78	73	98	82	69	97	96	97		
BLK	71	59	59	79	57	56	71	86	85		
HSP	85	61	55	92	64		94	95	95		
MUL	93	74		95	79		82	96	94		
WHT	92	71	60	93	65	63	94	96	93		
FRL	71	62	54	80	61	61	78	84	87		

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)	N/A
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	652
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	81
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	87
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	61
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	71

Hispanic Students	
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	86
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	63
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?

ELA stayed level regardless of grade level even with the loss of one teacher after the first nine weeks, and another teacher after the second nine weeks.
Math continues to be an area where we need to improve. With all students being required to take Algebra I in 8th grade we need to prioritize preparation for our non-proficient 7th grade students.

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

Math proficiency

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

The contributing factors include a teacher being out for one nine weeks due to military duties and students having been poorly prepared in the previous school year. We are double blocking non-proficient students in Algebra I who are required to take the course due to the charter, not because they are actually prepared.

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

Math Gains - they rebounded to where they had been in years past.

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

We had a strong math teacher who got a released period to work with struggling students and she led PLC's to help other teachers improve.

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

This successful math teacher is now our Math coach, and we will continue to work with those students who are not coming in ready for success in Math.

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.

Our Math coach will be providing training on the new standards and implementing those through instruction. Our admin team will be providing professional development on using groups/rotations to differentiate student learning.

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

We are consistently looking for teachers who are model instructors and putting them in front of the faculty and staff to model their best practices.

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 Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	We will be focusing on our students who are taking High School courses and the state exam that goes along with the High School course. These student take Algebra, Geometry, and Biology.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	JWJ will score 6 points higher on the acceleration portion of the school grade in 2022-2023.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The Leadership Team and Teachers will monitor students for success in both formative and summative assessments and provide remediation when evidence shows students have not reached mastery.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	James Stuckey (stuckeyj@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Common Planning Data Analysis
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	The Leadership Team and teachers will be present and focused on reviewing the data to provide timely feedback to students and change instruction to ensure mastery.

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.

Review initial data

Person Responsible	Cadijah Anderson (andersonc1@duvalschools.org)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Student Safety	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Student safety is one of our lowest rated areas in the 5E survey from students.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	JWJ will improve student safety scores in the 5E survey by 20% in 2022-2023
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Students will be reminded throughout the year during large group gatherings like the beginning of the year discipline meetings, over the intercom, and during lunches/games/club meetings/etc...what it means to be safe and how they notify an adult if something is unsafe.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	James Stuckey (stuckeyj@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Student exposure - students often don't understand what a safe campus looks and feels like and may be unclear on who to report their concerns to. We will communicate overtly and consistently about ensuring a safe campus.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Our overall discipline numbers are down year over year, but our safety rating did not increase very much. We need to be able to effectively communicate to students that we have a safe campus, but also garner information from them about additional ways they would feel safe.

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

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.

We discuss daily in our announcements that we lift every voice, every day, in the JWJ way. We have also started leadership classes for students and are in the process of nominating and selecting leaders that will meet monthly with the principal to discuss schoolwide issues and concerns.

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

Our faculty and staff reinforce with our students in their classrooms expectations for how to be successful. Our administrative and security team are in the hallways during class change monitoring behavior and redirecting behavior that is not appropriate. The principal does weekly communication messages via phone and email to reinforce with parents/guardians any issues or areas where the students need additional support.