Volusia County Schools

River Springs Middle School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

River Springs Middle School

900 W OHIO AVE, Orange City, FL 32763

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/riverspringsmiddle/pages/default.aspx

Demographics

Principal: Thomas Vaughan W

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2011

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)	89%
2018-19 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: B (55%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: C (52%) 2014-15: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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 Volusia 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

River Springs Middle School

900 W OHIO AVE, Orange City, FL 32763

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/riverspringsmiddle/pages/default.aspx

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	62%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	34%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	B	B	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia 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.

At River Springs Middle School, all students will move forward career and college ready.

Provide the school's vision statement.

River Springs Middle School will provide an inclusive school community committed to academic excellence.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Gotlib, Stacy	Principal	Facilitate school leadership meetings, facilitate data analysis in PLC's, monitor SIP progress
Marchione, Lauren	Instructional Coach	Facilitate data analysis during PLC's, monitor SIP progress, participate in school leadership meetings, provide professional learning and support for teacher-led small group instruction
Beery, Brenda	Assistant Principal	Facilitate data analysis during PLC's, monitor SIP progress, participate in school leadership meetings
McLeod, Debbie	Teacher, K-12	Mixed media teacher, monitor SIP progress, participate in school leadership meetings
Barrios, Alisa	Teacher, ESE	ESE support facilitation teacher, facilitate data analysis during PLC's, monitor SIP progress, participate in school leadership meetings
Fratus, Melissa	Dean	Dean of Student Relations, facilitate school leadership meetings, facilitate data analysis during PLC's, monitor SIP progress, provide professional learning for teacher-led small group instruction, monitor identified SEL student progress, collaborate with SEL teacher
Mohr, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	Math Teacher, facilitate data analysis during PLC's, monitor SIP progress, participate in school leadership meetings
Nash, Curtis	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal, facilitate data analysis during PLC's, monitor SIP progress, participate in school leadership meetings
Folsom, Teresa	Teacher, K-12	Science Teacher, facilitate data analysis during PLC's, monitor SIP progress, participate in school leadership meetings
Pietroski, Lindsy	Teacher, K-12	ELA Teacher, facilitate data analysis during PLC's, monitor SIP progress, participate in school leadership meetings
Parker, Susan	Teacher, K-12	Science Teacher, facilitate data analysis during PLC's, monitor SIP progress, participate in school leadership meetings
Harper, Jacob	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies teacher, facilitate data analysis during PLC's, monitor SIP progress, participate in school leadership meetings
Twomey, Denis	Teacher, K-12	Social Studies teacher, facilitate data analysis during PLC's, monitor SIP progress, participate in school leadership meetings

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Ezell, Candace	Assistant Principal	Facilitate data analysis during PLC's, monitor SIP progress, participate in school leadership meetings

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	436	430	381	0	0	0	0	1247
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	49	45	0	0	0	0	148
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	11	5	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	131	121	0	0	0	0	352

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	19	22	19	0	0	0	0	60

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	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	2

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

81

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/22/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	42	47	39	0	0	0	0	128
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	106	78	0	0	0	0	223
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	15	13	0	0	0	0	62
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	131	120	0	0	0	0	351

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	48	75	59	0	0	0	0	182

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	52%	51%	54%	51%	51%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	48%	51%	54%	49%	53%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	42%	47%	37%	40%	44%
Math Achievement	56%	54%	58%	59%	53%	56%
Math Learning Gains	47%	51%	57%	51%	53%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	39%	42%	51%	40%	42%	50%
Science Achievement	60%	58%	51%	64%	59%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	72%	71%	72%	72%	71%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	436 (0)	430 (0)	381 (0)	1247 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	54 ()	49 ()	45 ()	148 (0)
One or more suspensions	6 ()	11 ()	5 ()	22 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	100 ()	131 ()	121 ()	352 (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.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	52%	50%	2%	54%	-2%
	2018	51%	48%	3%	52%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	47%	47%	0%	52%	-5%
	2018	47%	47%	0%	51%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
08	2019	52%	50%	2%	56%	-4%
	2018	53%	56%	-3%	58%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	52%	48%	4%	55%	-3%
	2018	59%	49%	10%	52%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	51%	47%	4%	54%	-3%
	2018	46%	44%	2%	54%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
08	2019	17%	29%	-12%	46%	-29%
	2018	34%	37%	-3%	45%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison		-29%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2019	58%	57%	1%	48%	10%
	2018	62%	60%	2%	50%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
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	69%	68%	1%	71%	-2%
2018	63%	66%	-3%	71%	-8%
Compare		6%			

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	82%	54%	28%	61%	21%
2018	93%	57%	36%	62%	31%
Compare		-11%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	90%	55%	35%	57%	33%
2018	95%	55%	40%	56%	39%
Compare		-5%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	14	35	34	20	32	30	23	37	50		
ELL	25	41	36	34	45	46	24	50	67		
ASN	54	46		75	50						
BLK	31	35	28	36	35	22	40	50			
HSP	46	48	43	47	48	53	57	68	68		
MUL	61	62	27	55	31		43	82			
WHT	55	49	37	61	49	38	64	75	85		
FRL	42	45	36	45	44	38	48	62	75		

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	15	29	29	23	40	33	31	25	50		
ELL	16	41	42	31	51	38	27	39			
ASN	48	68		81	82						
BLK	31	34	24	36	39	29	52	44	75		
HSP	46	49	50	53	57	45	55	62	62		
MUL	59	48		71	45			57			
WHT	55	48	35	64	51	45	68	67	79		
FRL	43	45	38	51	49	42	57	56	69		

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	9	29	29	17	34	31	18	34			
ELL	15	38	39	28	38	36	47	40	50		
ASN	57	35		78	61		80		100		
BLK	37	46	41	39	43	33	44	58	55		
HSP	44	53	42	51	47	42	60	70	54		
MUL	54	46	27	51	51		67	80	71		
WHT	54	49	35	62	53	39	66	74	74		
FRL	40	46	37	48	47	40	53	67	57		

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	42
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	535
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
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	41
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	56
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	35
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	53
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	52
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	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	54
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	48
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

ELA lowest quartile demonstrated the lowest performance. New teachers and vacancies were contributing factors.

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

Math learning gains showed the greatest decline form the previous year. There were serious attendance issues for one of our pre-algebra teachers due to health issues. We also had new teachers and vacancies in math.

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.

Math lowest quartile had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. There were serious attendance issues for one of our pre-algebra teachers due to health issues. We also had new teachers and vacancies in math.

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

7th grade Civics and middle school acceleration showed the greatest improvement. The Civics teachers collaborated during PLC to develop standards-based lessons and assessments. Civics bootcamps were provided to 7th grade students. For middle school acceleration, there were more offerings for high school credits.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

The number of students scoring a level 1 on the state-wide assessments is a potential area of concern.

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

1. Lowest quartile in ELA
2. Lowest quartile in Math
3. Social Emotional Learning
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Lowest Quartile in ELA
Rationale	Our data showed that only 37% of our lowest quartile students made learning gains on the 2019 ELA FSA.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase ELA lowest quartile form 37% to 45%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Stacy Gotlib (sjgotlib@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teacher-led small group instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Small Group Instruction has a .49 effect size according to John Hattie. FL Center for Reading Research (FCRR) and Just Read Florida recommends small group instruction to help differentiate core instruction and provide intervention for struggling students in a timely manner.
Action Step	
Description	1. Review Lowest Quartile Data to finalize master schedule focused on proper placement of students for ESE and ESOL support. 2. Facilitate PL on Small Group Instruction. 3. Facilitate PL on differentiated strategies. 4. PLC's will choose/develop common formative and summative assessments. 5. Once a month during PLC's data chats will be focused on reviewing student groupings and planning for interventions including our ESSA subgroups (ESE and African American). 6. Identify model classrooms for learning walks. 7. Conduct learning walks during small group instruction. 8. Monitor small group instruction through ongoing Administrative walkthroughs and feedback. 9. Coach will utilize coaching cycles to support teacher growth in small group instruction. 10. SLT members will conduct monthly progress monitoring meetings to review data and support services to plan instruction. 11. Monitor learning walk data and provide feedback to teachers through PLC's. 12. Conduct Collaborative Planning sessions quarterly focused on developing teacher knowledge and skills in standards-based instruction to meet the needs of all students including our ESSA subgroups (ESE and African American). 13. Provide professional learning about unconscious bias and strategies on reaching all students.
Person Responsible	Stacy Gotlib (sjgotlib@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Lowest Quartile in Math
Rationale	Our data showed that only 39% of our lowest quartile students made learning gains on the 2019 Math FSA.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Increase Math lowest quartile form 39% to 49%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Brenda Beery (blbeery@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teacher-led small group instruction
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Small Group Instruction has a .49 effect size according to John Hattie. According to Cohen et. al, highly effective math instructional strategies involve partner and small group discussions and teacher prompting and modeling of meta-cognitive questioning. According to Rimm-Kaufman, La Paro, Downer, & Pianta, research also states that students show higher behavioral engagement when the teacher is present, versus when they are left to work on their own.
Action Step	
Description	1. Review Lowest Quartile data to finalize master schedule focused on proper placement of students for ESE and ESOL support. 2. Facilitate PL on Small Group Instruction. 3. Facilitate PL on differentiated strategies. 4. PLC's will choose/develop common formative and summative assessments. 5. Conduct PLC's monthly for data chats focused on reviewing student groupings and planning for interventions including our ESSA subgroups (ESE and African American). 6. Identify model classrooms for learning walks. 7. Conduct learning walks during small group instruction. 8. Monitor small group instruction through ongoing Administrative walkthroughs and feedback. 9. SLT members will conduct monthly progress monitoring meetings to review data and support services to plan instruction. 10. Monitor learning walk data and provide feedback to teachers through PLC's. 11. Conduct Collaborative Planning sessions monthly focused on developing teacher knowledge and skills in standards-based instruction to meet the needs of all students including our ESSA subgroups (ESE and African American). 12. Provide professional learning about unconscious bias and strategies on reaching all students.
Person Responsible	Brenda Beery (blbeery@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Increase Social Emotional Learning
Rationale	Need for a decrease in discipline referrals and understanding of our students' needs to more effectively impact their learning.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Decrease discipline referrals by 5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Melissa Fratus (mmfratus@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Utilizing restorative practices and implementing SEL instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	According to Casel, Social Emotional Learning helps children and adults understand and manage emotions, set and achieve positive goals, feel and show empathy for others, establish and maintain positive relationships, and make responsible decisions.
Action Step	
Description	1. SEL TOA will implement lessons and behavior coaching in the classroom and small groups, including ISS. 2. Provide Restorative Practices professional learning. 3. Providing strategies for students to resolve conflicts. 4. Identify model classrooms to allow teachers to observe effective classroom management strategies. 5. Identify students receiving the most discipline referrals and developing action plans to support those students. 6. Guidance will implement structured curriculum modules for SEL. 7. Monitor progress of identified students during bi-weekly Guidance Roundups (PLC).
Person Responsible	Melissa Fratus (mmfratus@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).