

Pasco County Schools

# River Ridge Middle School



## 2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# River Ridge Middle School

11646 TOWN CENTER RD, New Port Richey, FL 34654

<https://rrms.pasco.k12.fl.us>

## Demographics

**Principal: Angela Murphy L**

Start Date for this Principal: 2/22/2017

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	49%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (59%) 2014-15: B (61%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pasco 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](http://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	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

## River Ridge Middle School

11646 TOWN CENTER RD, New Port Richey, FL 34654

<https://rrms.pasco.k12.fl.us>

### 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	No	48%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	22%

### School Grades History

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

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pasco 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.

To provide a world-class education to all students.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

All of our students achieve success...in college...career...and life.

### 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
Murphy, Angie	Principal	Principal
Astone, Alex	Assistant Principal	7th grade, State EOC testing
White, Danielle	Assistant Principal	8th grade, FSA tests
Kolean, Kevin	Assistant Principal	6th grade, SBP, District Finals
Adams, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	
Allen, Karen	Teacher, K-12	
Baumaister, Chrissy	Instructional Coach	
Brissey, Melina	Teacher, K-12	
Cadle, Kelly	Teacher, K-12	
McQuatters, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	
Darling, Abby	Teacher, K-12	
Fallon-Johnson, Carrie	Teacher, K-12	
Fields, Tamara	Teacher, K-12	
Zampella, Michael	Teacher, K-12	
Griffin, Kara	Teacher, K-12	
Gibbons, Kourtney	Teacher, K-12	
Mekus, Mary	Teacher, K-12	
Thompson, Gina	Teacher, K-12	

### 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	435	386	434	0	0	0	0	1255	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	31	41	0	0	0	0	127	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	61	93	0	0	0	0	180	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	50	72	0	0	0	0	166	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	109	88	120	0	0	0	0	317	

**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	57	58	86	0	0	0	0	201	

**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	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

82

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Friday 8/9/2019

**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	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 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	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	

## 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	54%	52%	54%	59%	50%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	55%	54%	56%	52%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	47%	47%	41%	40%	44%
Math Achievement	69%	60%	58%	71%	53%	56%
Math Learning Gains	67%	61%	57%	70%	58%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	52%	51%	59%	48%	50%
Science Achievement	52%	52%	51%	55%	45%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	68%	68%	72%	80%	70%	70%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
Number of students enrolled	435 (0)	386 (0)	434 (0)	1255 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	55 ( )	31 ( )	41 ( )	127 (0)
One or more suspensions	26 ( )	61 ( )	93 ( )	180 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	44 ( )	50 ( )	72 ( )	166 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	109 ( )	88 ( )	120 ( )	317 (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	55%	56%	-1%	54%	1%
	2018	50%	51%	-1%	52%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	46%	51%	-5%	52%	-6%
	2018	58%	51%	7%	51%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
08	2019	58%	58%	0%	56%	2%
	2018	60%	58%	2%	58%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	59%	59%	0%	55%	4%
	2018	64%	53%	11%	52%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	50%	42%	8%	54%	-4%
	2018	58%	44%	14%	54%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-14%				
08	2019	76%	68%	8%	46%	30%
	2018	65%	63%	2%	45%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		18%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	49%	54%	-5%	48%	1%
	2018	58%	53%	5%	50%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018	0%	65%	-65%	65%	-65%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	67%	70%	-3%	71%	-4%
2018	70%	71%	-1%	71%	-1%
Compare		-3%			
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	99%	60%	39%	61%	38%
2018	99%	63%	36%	62%	37%
Compare		0%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	62%	-62%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	60%	-60%	56%	-56%
Compare		0%			

## 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	18	40	42	31	48	47	14	33	44		
ELL	20	50	47	60	78						
ASN	73	64		91	83			80	100		
BLK	27	53		38	53	50	9				
HSP	45	47	37	64	65	55	47	62	44		
MUL	63	50		59	57	64	8	100			
WHT	55	52	46	70	68	57	56	68	63		
FRL	41	45	44	55	60	52	38	56	50		
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	25	44	43	37	48	38	34	53	27		
ELL	19	33	30	57	62						
ASN	67	58		81	75		67	90	67		
BLK	39	41		55	56						
HSP	49	48	43	68	62	44	68	73	50		

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
MUL	52	50	60	67	58	55	56	86	50		
WHT	59	53	46	70	63	56	60	72	63		
FRL	48	48	42	60	59	52	56	66	43		
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	21	37	27	34	56	46	20	49	29		
ELL	35	44	50	50	70						
ASN	79	79		83	80						
BLK	33	29		73	71						
HSP	49	54	38	62	70	71	43	74	58		
MUL	51	53	45	61	66	50	58	69	54		
WHT	61	56	41	72	70	56	56	80	55		
FRL	50	52	39	63	66	57	46	71	39		

### 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	60
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	73
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	598
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	55
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	82
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	38
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	52
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	57
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	59
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	49
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 and math for SWD showed the lowest performance, specifically in 7th grade in 2018-19. This cohort has historically lagged behind other groups in proficiency/learning gains. There are also not as many SWD in accelerated courses. SWD in Adv Science are scoring the same or better than non-SWD peers based on District Quarterly Checks.

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

7th grade ELA learning gains and science achievement both showed a significant drop from 2018 to 2019. Both areas were also below the district average.

#### 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.

ELA growth of lowest 25% had the greatest gap when comparing school to state, by 3%. We did better than the state by 3%. A contributing factor would be enrollment of all SWD in the SBP program into intensive reading classes to focus on fundamental reading skills.

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

8th grade math showed an increase of 11%. We attribute this to teachers regularly utilizing state test specifications to determine the rigor of standards and assessment strategies to align their instructional practices and assessments to standard expectation.

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

Course performance (Ds and Fs) has increased with more students off track from 1st to 3rd quarter during the 2018-19 SY.

Black student discipline is significantly off track compared to other subgroups.

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

1. High Impact Instruction: 100% of PLC's will intentionally plan, deliver literacy-rich lessons that are aligned to the rigor of standards, and monitor student mastery of the essential standards as evidenced by FSA/EOC, Quarterly Assessments, CFAs and IPG walk through.
2. Data Driven Decisions: Second Change Learning Opportunities (TIERed Interventions), alignment

of standards-based instruction and assessments will result in a decrease in the number of students earning a D or F by 5% (from quarter to quarter) based on myEWS and myStudent data. (EOY 2018-112 students needing recovery, 364 semester courses needing recovery, 10 potential 8.5 students).

3. Collaboration: Building and utilizing staff's strengths and weaknesses identified through the Clifton Strengths Finder to develop and implement interventions. Increase student and staff engagement by fostering a "Culture of Caring" within the RRMS community as evidenced by a decrease in the number of students earning ODR's by 5% based on myEWS and myStudent. (EOY 2018-339 students with referrals, 1256 total referrals)

4. Increase SWD achievement with focus on blended learning standards-based strategies, PBIS strategies and trauma informed care, specifically SBP, by reducing SWD ODR's by 5%.

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

#### Areas of Focus:

#1	
<b>Title</b>	High Impact Instruction
<b>Rationale</b>	In evaluating our data, we want to see increase in learning gains in all content areas, especially for SWD. Based on stakeholder feedback through the CNA and BPIC, we believe our work during the 2018-19 school year on PLC Q1 and Q2 with a focus on essential standard identification, instruction, and monitoring through CFA's is at a satisfactory level in all PLC's. We will continue to provide support on Q1 and Q2, but stakeholders are now asking for more PD on Q3 and Q4 as we dive deeper into intervention and enrichment planning to extend learning.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	100% of PLC's will intentionally plan, deliver literacy-rich lessons that are aligned to the rigor of essential standards, monitor student mastery of the essential standards as evidenced by FSA/EOC, Quarterly Assessments, CFAs and IPG walk throughs, and purposely plan interventions and enrichment opportunities
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Angie Murphy (amurphy@pasco.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Plan and facilitate staff summer retreat focused on Clifton Strengths for collaboration/team building; Book Study with 6th grade teachers-Detracking for Excellence and Equity; Book study for SLT-Starting a Movement: Building Culture from the Inside Out in Professional Learning Communities.; Book study for Math and ELA-The Common Core Companion: The Standards Decoded; Continue with Core Action 2 through mini-workshops to increase opportunities for staff showcasing of questioning techniques and student collaboration opportunities; Refine PLC Notebooks in Sharepoint including documents, articles, and videos from Solution Tree; Focus PD and PLC conversations on PLC Q3 and Q4.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	In evaluating our data, we want to see increase in learning gains in all content areas, especially for SWD. Based on stakeholder feedback through the CNA and BPIC, we believe our work during the 2018-19 school year on PLC Q1 and Q2 with a focus on essential standard identification, instruction, and monitoring through CFA's is at a satisfactory level in all PLC's. We will continue to provide support on Q1 and Q2, but stakeholders are now asking for more PD on Q3 and Q4 as we dive deeper into intervention and enrichment planning to extend learning.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Teachers will participate in PLC's, plan instructional units, and create CFAs based on essential standards and level of rigor. PLCs will implement the Team Teaching Assessing Cycle throughout the year.</li> <li>2. Teachers will collaborate on essential standards, expected outcomes, and reflect on student data with students through posted learning targets, using student-friendly scales, reflection/feedback forms and conferencing.</li> <li>3. Every lesson, every day will include opportunities for students to read, write, think and talk using grade-level challenging text and research-based best practices grounded in essential standards.</li> <li>4. PLCs will analyze quarterly data utilizing the Quarterly Data Chat Protocol, implement a school-wide data tracker using comprehension checks and IRLA spreadsheet checks monthly.</li> <li>5. After an assessment is given, PLC's will determine to whom and how they will provide TIER 2 support to students who did not demonstrate mastery of the standard.</li> </ol>



6. Professional Development will focus on implementing the Team Teaching Assessing Cycle, Core Action 2 and using Unify/Zipgrade to pull and analyze data based on essential standards for intervention and enrichment.

**Person Responsible** Angie Murphy (amurphy@pasco.k12.fl.us)

---

#2	
<b>Title</b>	Data Driven Decisions
<b>Rationale</b>	At the end of the 2018-19 SY, 112 students needed recovery in at least one course, 364 semester courses needed recovery, and there were 10 potential 8.5 students. A significant number of students are meeting standard expectations on quarterly checks, district finals, and other benchmarks assessments. The disconnect between student standardized performance and classroom grades is hypothesized to be due to lack of engagement in classroom assignments either due to lack of understanding or lack of interest. PLC's will need to analyze data to determine will, skill and enrichment needs to be addressed through Second Chance Learning Opportunities to improve student academic grade performance.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Second Chance Learning Opportunities (TIERed Interventions), alignment of standards-based instruction and assessments will result in a decrease in the number of students earning a D or F by 5% (from quarter to quarter) based on myEWS and myStudent data. (EOY 2018-112 students needing recovery, 364 semester courses needing recovery, 10 potential 8.5 students).
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Danielle White (dmwright@pasco.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Deepen understanding of strategies to use for Second Chance Learning Opportunities for staff and students through supplemental resources from textbooks, Secondary Learning Network, ALEKS, Achieve 3000, APEX, Khan Academy, Nearpod.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Teachers will need to receive PD and coaching on how to determine will, skill, and enrichment needs. Teachers will then need the resources listed above to provide interventions and enrichment opportunities through flexible scheduling.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Full Grade-Level Teams will meet bi-weekly to collect, analyze and build support plans for at risk and off-track students based on all factors. PLCs will meet weekly to analyze data to build in supports through "Knight Time" intervention and in class means.</li> <li>2. Build understanding of Second Chance Learning Opportunities cycle, standards recovery, and alternative performance assessment through professional development and sharing effect strategies with in PLCs and GLTs.</li> <li>3. Weekly Student Success Team meetings and bi-weekly MTSS meetings to engage in the problem-solving cycle. School Intervention Team (SIT) will identify, support, and monitor the lowest 35% of students.</li> <li>4. Quarterly data chats with each student with MTSS team members to build strong relationships and review academic data, behavioral data, goal setting, etc. Communication with student, parent, and teachers regarding student progress/goals.</li> <li>5. Monthly whole school lessons (more frequently for 6th grade) for students on executive functioning, study skills, character education, and mindfulness.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Danielle White (dmwright@pasco.k12.fl.us)

#3	
<b>Title</b>	Culture of Caring
<b>Rationale</b>	By the end of the 2018-19 SY, 339 students had received at least 1 ODR, and a total of 1256 referrals had been written. This has resulted in lost instruction time while the behaviors on the ODR occurred, while the ODR was processed, and while the consequence from the ODR was being served. Through PD on trauma informed care, PBIS rewards systems, and TIERS of intervention (MTSS/RTI).
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Building and utilizing staff's strengths identified through the Clifton Strengths Finder during collaborative sessions to develop and implement interventions. Increase student and staff engagement by fostering a "Culture of Caring" within the RRMS community as evidenced by a decrease in the number of students earning ODR's by 5% based on myEWS and myStudent.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Kevin Kolean (kkolean@pasco.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. School-wide behavior intervention plan with on ramps for team-based decision-making will focus on how to exhibit the Knightly Values, restorative practices and mindfulness including Royal Rewards incentives for "on track" and students making growth in academics, behavior, and attendance.</li> <li>2. Behavior Intervention Team will be created which will include Student Success Team members and behavior specialists will address students with multiple referrals, academic and/or attendance issues and complete a problem solving/goal setting cycle.</li> <li>3. "Knight Time" school-wide monthly character sessions to increase student engagement through "Knightly Values" lessons and student driven school-wide clubs.</li> <li>4. Partner with PTSA and community organizations to offer a community event each quarter that supports the RRMS Success Plan goals.</li> <li>5. Frequent student and staff surveys to monitor engagement based on opinions matter and levels of engagement in school.</li> <li>6. Engage staff in PD to utilize strengths within collaboration opportunities and monitor growth through semesterly feedback sessions with administration.</li> <li>7. Communicate with the RRMS community through Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, and by utilizing a "Principal's Weekly Message" in a blog format on the website to share progress towards reaching Success Plan goals, highlighting students and staff, points of pride, and other important information for families.</li> <li>8. Integrate Social Emotional Learning/Trauma Informed Care from PD sessions to increase opportunities to build relationships with all stakeholders.</li> </ol>

**Person Responsible** Kevin Kolean (kkolean@pasco.k12.fl.us)

---

#4	
<b>Title</b>	SWD MTSS Supports
<b>Rationale</b>	Data review of course performance, standardized tests, quarterly checks, IRLA, and ODR's, indicates a need for more specialized staff development in the area of understanding and assisting students with disabilities academically and behaviorally. Data indicates that SWD are lagging behind their non-disabled peers in mainstreamed and self contained classes.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Increase student achievement with focus on SWD and Black subgroups, specifically within the Social Behavioral Program reducing SBP ODR's by 5% and aligning SBP curriculum to the SNL scope and sequence, increasing rigor of SBP curriculum through the use of blending learning opportunities and SNL resources to increase match mainstream performance levels as measured by quarterly checks and course performance rates.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Kevin Kolean (kkolean@pasco.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	We will utilize PBIS strategies, team teach and assessment cycle, PLC questions, trauma informed care training.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Teachers will participate in PLCs, plan instructional units, and create common formative and summative assessments based on essential standards and level of rigor. PLCs/ teachers will implement the Team Teaching Assessing Cycle multiple times.</li> <li>2. Teachers will share standards, expected outcomes, and student data with students through posting learning targets, using student-friendly scales, reflection/feedback forms and conferencing.</li> <li>3. Every lesson, every day will include opportunities for students to read, write, think, and talk using grade-level challenging text and research-based best practices grounded in the standards.</li> <li>4. PLC members will analyze quarterly data utilizing the Quarterly Data Chat Protocol, implement a school-wide data tracker using comprehension checks and IRLA spreadsheet checks monthly.</li> <li>5. After an assessment is given, PLCs/teachers will determine to whom and how they will provide Tier 2/Tier 3 support to students who did not demonstrate of the standard.</li> <li>6. PD will focus on building expertise in APEX/blended instruction, differentiated instruction, and trauma informed care.</li> <li>7. SBP community building and continuity through training and implementation of common team expectations, levels and interventions.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Kevin Kolean (kkolean@pasco.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).**

NA