St. Johns County School District

Fruit Cove Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Fruit Cove Middle School

3180 RACE TRACK RD, Saint Johns, FL 32259

http://www-fcs.stjohns.k12.fl.us/

Demographics

Principal: Kelly Jacobson

Start Date for this Principal: 8/20/2020

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
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	10%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
School Grades History	2018-19: A (72%) 2017-18: A (73%) 2016-17: A (77%) 2015-16: A (77%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
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 St. Johns 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

Fruit Cove Middle School is committed to building positive student-teacher relationships, focusing on high academic standards and preparing students with 21st Century Skills.

Provide the school's vision statement

Fruit Cove Middle School will inspire in all students a passion for lifelong learning, creating educated and caring contributors to the world.

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
Jacobson, Kelly	Principal	
Gamble, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	
Lynn, Erin	Assistant Principal	
Sisson, Lori	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 8/20/2020, Kelly Jacobson

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.*

2

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.*

24

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

63

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
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	10%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (72%) 2017-18: A (73%) 2016-17: A (77%) 2015-16: A (77%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	
* 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	375	394	436	0	0	0	0	1205
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	7	5	0	0	0	0	21
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	12	29	0	0	0	0	48
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	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	

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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/20/2020

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	404	437	459	0	0	0	0	1300
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	25	20	0	0	0	0	58
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	24	24	0	0	0	0	52
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	8	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	24	42	0	0	0	0	86

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	6	9	12	0	0	0	0	27

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	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

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	404	437	459	0	0	0	0	1300
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	25	20	0	0	0	0	58
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	24	24	0	0	0	0	52
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	8	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	24	42	0	0	0	0	86

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	6	9	12	0	0	0	0	27

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	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

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	78%	68%	54%	78%	69%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	68%	59%	54%	64%	57%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	48%	47%	48%	45%	47%
Math Achievement	85%	77%	58%	88%	76%	58%
Math Learning Gains	70%	68%	57%	72%	66%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	60%	51%	68%	58%	51%
Science Achievement	79%	70%	51%	82%	73%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Social Studies Achievement	97%	88%	72%	96%	87%	72%

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	81%	74%	7%	54%	27%
	2018	74%	71%	3%	52%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	77%	72%	5%	52%	25%
	2018	73%	70%	3%	51%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
08	2019	76%	71%	5%	56%	20%
	2018	85%	76%	9%	58%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	80%	74%	6%	55%	25%
	2018	78%	73%	5%	52%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	85%	80%	5%	54%	31%
	2018	90%	80%	10%	54%	36%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
08	2019	78%	78%	0%	46%	32%
	2018	82%	73%	9%	45%	37%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	78%	72%	6%	48%	30%
	2018	81%	75%	6%	50%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019					
2018					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	97%	90%	7%	71%	26%
2018	95%	89%	6%	71%	24%
Compare		2%			

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	100%	79%	21%	61%	39%
2018	100%	79%	21%	62%	38%
Compare		0%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	98%	81%	17%	57%	41%
2018	100%	77%	23%	56%	44%
Compare		-2%			

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 2016-17**	**C & C Accel 2016-17**
SWD	32	47	42	56	55	52	44	85	13		
ELL	36	67	69	67	63	64					

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
ASN	93	76	64	97	83		93	97	85		
BLK	69	84	71	65	63	45	50	88	54		
HSP	70	60	45	81	65	51	80	93	50		
MUL	61	53	69	76	58	50		94			
WHT	80	68	52	86	70	58	80	98	57		
FRL	60	62	51	69	53	50	68	86	29		

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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	36	40	35	57	54	53	36	81	14		
ELL	25	36	30	58	62						
ASN	91	82		99	87		100	100	90		
BLK	69	61	50	74	66	58	73	83	18		
HSP	71	60	41	84	66	61	73	94	56		
MUL	68	57	25	77	72	70	77		73		
WHT	79	63	49	88	72	68	84	97	56		
FRL	65	55	43	76	61	57	67	89	42		

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	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	647
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%

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	61
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	86
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	65
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	66
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	66
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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

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	72
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	59
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

The lowest performing component is ELA learning gains in the lowest quartile, at 54%. This was an increase of 6%, from 48% the prior year. Last year's focus was on supporting the reading teacher and the programs in place to increase the reading levels of the lowest quartile, we continue to work on this area and explore strategies that will continue to increase the learning proficiency in the lowest quartile of readers. We have added additional supports for struggling reading students by cohorting those in need of decoding. These students will be provided targeted interventions with a specific reading program. We have increased the sections of intensive reading from 4 to 10 sections to lower class size and service a greater amount of students. Level 2 students have been placed in Reading 1,2, or 3 courses based on FSA score, iReady data, and historical student data that will focus on reading comprehension strategies.

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

The math learning gains for the lowest quartile dropped 12 points, the greatest decline of all components. The greatest deficit was in 8th grade math. We also noticed that overall proficiency, of all learners, the only grade that did not show a decline in proficiency was 6th grade. We have added a math coach to the staff to work with the CLT teams to increase effectiveness of standard based planning and implementation of high yield instructional strategies. We have increased the number of support classes in order to lower the amount of struggling students in a class period.

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

Overall, FCMS outperformed state in all areas. We see a closing gap in the lowest quartile performance in reading. Math shows only 56% learning gains, the state is at a 51% average, only a 5% gap. ELA shows only a 54% learning gains, the state is at a 47% average, only a 7% gap.

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

ELA lowest quartile had the greatest increase, 6%, from 48% to 54%. The school had a department focus on supporting the lowest quartile by implementing incentives for students reaching their performance goals on progress monitoring. The ILC provided

hands on support which focused on the needs of individual students and instructing them in the reading classroom based on their present reading levels. The ILC has used the most recent iReady data to assign the school's most struggling readers a course which will provide intervention in the needed areas. The courses will be intensive reading decoding, intensive reading, and reading for students with unique needs.

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

EWS indicators show no significant decline in any area. The only area that may show concern is the amount of level one students. The number of 8th grade students went up from 34 to 42, other grades saw a decrease in level one achievement numbers.

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

1. Lowest quartile gains for math
2. Lowest quartile gains for ELA
3. Overall proficiency in math
4. Math learning gains overall
5. Overall proficiency in ELA

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Decrease the number of students suspended one or more times. When students are not in school they are missing instruction. Students who miss instruction struggle in school.
Measureable Outcome:	We will decrease the number of students suspended one or more times from 4.4% to 3 %.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Emmanuel Wellington (emmanuel.wellington@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Collective teacher efficacy: the collective belief of teachers in their ability to positively affect students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Collective teacher efficacy: the collective belief of teachers in their ability to positively affect students. Collective efficacy has an effect size of d+ 1.57 and is strongly correlated with student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1.) Focused positive mentorship of students struggling with behavior concerns.
2.) New school-wide PBIS implementation with a focus on promoting a positive school climate that encourages students to grow academically, socially, and emotionally.

Person Responsible	Emmanuel Wellington (emmanuel.wellington@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase the percentage of the lowest 25% making a learning gain on the 2021 ELA FSA. The percentage of students in the lowest 25% that made a learning gain from 2018-2019 increased from 48% to 54%; however, there is still a large discrepancy between this groups performance in the comparison to the rest of the school. Overall learning gains were 68% for the school in comparison to 54% for the lowest 25%.
Measureable Outcome:	The percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains will increase from 54% to 59%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kelly Jacobson (kelly.jacobson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Reading classes have been differentiated based on state test score performance. Evidenced-based interventions, such as scaffolding and explicit instruction. Evidence-based interventions, such as scaffolding and explicit instruction are used with the the reading classes to meet individual needs of the struggling students. iReady assessments and ongoing formative assessments are used for progress monitoring. Administrators actively participate in grade level ELA CLT meetings where student data and performance on formative assessments are reviewed by the CLT.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Scaffolding instruction (Hattie Effect Size .82) helps teachers meet the individual needs of students. Our teachers, also, use several explicit teaching strategies (Hattie .57 effect size) such as small group instruction, technology, differentiated reading programs to meet the individual needs of their students.When teachers use frequent progress monitoring and adjust instruction, they are better able to determine student needs and make instructional adjustments to promote student growth.

Action Steps to Implement

1.) All ELA teachers will identify students in the lowest 25% and create a plan of support.
2.) All core teachers will monitor the progress of the lowest 25% by reviewing data with their CLT on all common formative and summative assessments.
3.) ELA and reading teachers will use iReady data to analyze learning gaps and areas of weakness. ELA and reading teachers will work together to provide focused small group instruction based on student needs.
4.)Goal setting and incentive rewards will be created to motivate students to reach their reading goals.

Person Responsible	Kelly Jacobson (kelly.jacobson@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase the percentage of the lowest 25% making a learning gain on the 2021 Math FSA. The percentage of students in the lowest 25% that made a learning gain from 2018-2019 on FSA Math dropped from 68% to 56%, which was a 12 point decline. In addition to the previous year, this same group dropped from 76% to 68% which was a 8 point drop. Since 2017 there has been a 20 point decline in learning gains for this group.
Measureable Outcome:	The percentage of students in the lowest 25% , making learning gains will increase from 56% to 61%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Erin Lynn (erin.lynn@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Using formative assessment data to track student progress and collaborating on improvement strategies with the grade level math CLT.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The math team will focus their deliberate practice (Hattie .82 Effect Size) in the area of increasing student achievement through formative assessments and collaboration through the PLC process. Each grade level math CLT will focus on tracking students' in the lowest 25% performance on formative assessments and use the data to implement differentiated interventions.

Action Steps to Implement

1.)Math teachers will identify students who are in the lowest 25% and create a plan of support.
2.) Math teachers will monitor students who are in the lowest 25% performance by reviewing formative and summative assessment data.
3.) Math teachers will use iReady data and formative assessment data to analyze learning gaps and areas of weakness.
4.) Goal setting and incentive rewards will be implemented to motivate students to meet their math goals.

Person Responsible	Erin Lynn (erin.lynn@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school leadership team will monitor student performance by reviewing student progress reports and report cards. The team will review progress monitoring data after each iReady assessment. The leadership team will, also, meet with CLT teams to review student performance and growth on formative and summative assessments.

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.

The Positive Behavior Intervention System is a nationally recognized program that is committed to addressing student behavior through the usage of effective systems, data, and practices. Through the usage of the program, schools can experience better social and academic outcomes, a reduction in office discipline referrals, and improvement in student behavior.

As part of FCMS' implementation of the Positive Behavior Intervention System, we have established a clear Behavior Expectation Flight Plan that focuses on 3 of our 'Character Counts' pillars: Responsibility, Respect and Citizenship. For each Pillar, the Flight Plan outlines behaviors that are representative of (responsibility, respect, or citizenship) of all our stakeholders. The goal is to promote, encourage, and reward positive behaviors. The behaviors will be taught, reviewed, and highlighted with fidelity and are clearly and visually displayed throughout the school.

Some other important components to PBIS are behavior intervention plans (tracking behavior goals for individual students), collection of data for discipline referrals, and the Rewards feature that allows students to earn Pilot Points for demonstrating positive behavior expectations. Pilot Points can be used at the PBIS Store or for daily, weekly, monthly, or quarterly celebrations.

We know that supporting students, faculty and staff engage in positive behavior will build a school community where everyone feels they belong, can succeed, learn, and grow.

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

1	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline**	**$0.00**
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**	**$0.00**
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**	**$0.00**
		Total:	**$0.00**