

Bay District Schools

Rutherford High School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	19
Budget to Support Goals	21

Rutherford High School

1000 SCHOOL AVE, Panama City, FL 32401

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Robert Mitchell

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2011

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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: C (44%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (46%) 2014-15: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A

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 Bay County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	19
Budget to Support Goals	21

Rutherford High School

1000 SCHOOL AVE, Panama City, FL 32401

[no web address on file]

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)
High School 6-12	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	55%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Bay 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.

Mission Statement

The mission of Rutherford 6-12 School is to meet the diverse needs of all students by providing challenging, rigorous and relevant curriculum in an engaging, caring, and positive learning environment. To this end, all Rutherford staff, in cooperation with parents and community, will challenge all students to act with honesty and integrity as they develop a natural curiosity for the world around them and become productive, responsible, and accountable members of society in pursuit of excellence.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision

We at Rutherford believe that:

All students can learn, achieve and succeed. Students, teachers, and staff are entitled to a safe, clean environment conducive to teaching and learning. Teachers, administrators, parents, students and the community share the responsibility for advancing the school's mission.

Offering a challenging, relevant curriculum that involves all students will prepare them to succeed in a global, multicultural society. Maintaining partnerships with parents, community agencies, and local businesses will enhance the total educational experience.

Students benefit from a small community of learners and educators committed to professional growth, educational innovation, and technological advancement. All stakeholders are responsible for nurturing an environment of mutual trust and respect. Students who are "at risk" and need support are provided that environment by each teacher in each subject.

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
Pilson, Coy	Principal	
Banks, Andrea	Assistant Principal	
Mcpherson, Corrie	Teacher, K-12	
Carlisle, Millie	Teacher, ESE	
Barron, Beverly	Teacher, K-12	
Whitlock, Catherine	Teacher, K-12	
Sirmans, Tracey	Other	Graduation Coach

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	223	172	180	246	252	162	196	1431	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	53	78	77	86	62	80	508	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	0	3	0	0	9	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4	15	20	18	7	80	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	66	67	57	99	63	61	499	

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	33	25	33	28	63	43	45	270	

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	1	1	2	12	13	11	5	45	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	11	4	15	19	12	14	84	

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

102

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/19/2019

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	60	35	37	195
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	78	53	38	267
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	61	47	27	208
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125	86	54	39	304

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	110	85	54	39	288	

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	63	60	35	37	195
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	78	53	38	267
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73	61	47	27	208
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125	86	54	39	304

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	110	85	54	39	288

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	39%	57%	56%	37%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	37%	49%	51%	33%	44%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	21%	35%	42%	30%	35%	41%
Math Achievement	33%	58%	51%	37%	58%	49%
Math Learning Gains	43%	53%	48%	52%	50%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	50%	45%	43%	48%	39%
Science Achievement	54%	74%	68%	53%	68%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	65%	76%	73%	66%	77%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	223 (0)	172 (0)	180 (0)	246 (0)	252 (0)	162 (0)	196 (0)	1431 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	72 (0)	53 (0)	78 (0)	77 (63)	86 (60)	62 (35)	80 (37)	508 (195)
One or more suspensions	3 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	0 (98)	3 (78)	0 (53)	0 (38)	9 (267)
Course failure in ELA or Math	6 (0)	10 (0)	4 (0)	15 (73)	20 (61)	18 (47)	7 (27)	80 (208)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	86 (0)	66 (0)	67 (0)	57 (125)	99 (86)	63 (54)	61 (39)	499 (304)

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					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	41%	58%	-17%	55%	-14%
	2018	33%	54%	-21%	53%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		41%				
10	2019	32%	53%	-21%	53%	-21%
	2018	43%	52%	-9%	53%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	59%	71%	-12%	67%	-8%
2018	40%	64%	-24%	65%	-25%
Compare		19%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	66%	74%	-8%	70%	-4%
2018	61%	73%	-12%	68%	-7%
Compare		5%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	39%	64%	-25%	61%	-22%
2018	30%	64%	-34%	62%	-32%
Compare		9%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	31%	62%	-31%	57%	-26%
2018	40%	62%	-22%	56%	-16%
Compare		-9%			

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	11	26	17	21	35	29	8	36		80	17
ELL	19	22	18	14	54						
ASN	47	40		55	64		75			90	44
BLK	26	28	18	25	38	36	30	56		72	15
HSP	18	27	10		29	38				67	
MUL	34	45		50	71		54	70		89	41
WHT	53	45	29	40	45	48	67	70		78	39
FRL	34	33	19	31	44	39	47	60		71	27

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	11	34	28	16	39	48	17	45		74	4
ELL	29	18		25							
ASN	67	64		50				60		82	
BLK	20	31	24	18	42	52	19	38		73	29
HSP	29	28		26	50		42	55		69	36
MUL	33	49		35	43		62	65		77	30
WHT	50	52	45	45	54	50	50	70		76	47
FRL	31	41	30	29	43	50	36	53		66	40
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	10	22	18	15	50	45	42	39		54	21
ASN	67	45		68	85		58	88		94	81
BLK	25	28	16	22	48	44	29	50		77	38
HSP	31	37	42	47	54		53	75		93	43
MUL	34	30		46	59		82	75		89	63
WHT	42	35	42	41	47	36	62	71		80	52
FRL	27	29	29	29	46	42	43	62		73	47

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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	498
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
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	31
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	59
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	34
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	30
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	51
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	42
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.

In comparing school data from year to year, it is noticeable that the lowest 25th percentile decreased in ELA Achievement. There was also a 5% decrease in Math Learning Gains with the lowest 25th percentile. This data trend shows that emphasis was not placed on students who made up the lowest 25th percentile of the student population. Contributing factors, such as student placement, scheduling challenges, and the ELA Curriculum with many adjustments could have impacted these findings. Another contributing factor could have been the absence of identifying students within the lowest 25th percentile and providing intensive supports to help them show mastery of the grade level standards in ELA and Math.

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

More than five identified subgroups showed a decrease in the percentage of learning gains or achievement in ELA, Math, Graduation and Acceleration. The most alarming is the students with disabilities. According to the subgroup data, these students showed a decrease in all content areas, which speaks to possible ineffective, less rigorous instructional delivery in all content areas, with the use of specific accommodations.

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.

The Lowest 25th percentile in ELA showed the greatest gap in achievement as compared to the state averages. This is evident when comparing year to year also. There was a 21 point difference in one year and 14 point difference in the other. Together, the ELA Lowest 25th percentile showed a decrease by 35 points, which presents the lowest achievement area from all subgroups. This could have been the inconsistency in some courses using Achieve 3000, others using components of the ELA pacing guide, and some not exposing students to higher-order thinking questioning format in preparation for the state assessment.

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

Science achievement as observed in the comparison data from school, district, and state. The data indicates an increase of 13 points in Science Achievement. This was the greatest amount of growth seen in all data displays. Currently, the school data shows a difference of 20 points when compared to the district and 14 points difference when compared to the state, which gives an overall increase from the previous year where the school was 26 points from the district and state. There are many things that could have contributed to this spike in performance. One major factor to acknowledge

would be the alignment between the Science Pacing Guides and the scheduling of science assessments, used by the entire department. The results of the common assessments were shared among science team members, which was much different than previous years.

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

After entering and reviewing the data from the EWS, the area of most concern is the number of students scoring a Level 1 on statewide assessments. There are a total of 499 students in this category. The cohort groups that are most alarming at the 11th and 8th grade groups. This is relevant to the projected graduation rates because 63 students are now a part of the senior class, who scored a Level 1 on statewide assessments. As many requirements are factored into graduation, the number of current seniors not meeting mastery of the grade level standards, as measured on the FSA, will need multiple opportunities and interventions to meet testing requirements. Another concern would also be the (67) 8th grade students, who are now considered to be the 9th grade cohort group being strategically scheduled into courses that would help them pass statewide assessments.

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

1. Curriculum Blend for grades 6th-12th
2. Alignment of Student Services and Supports
3. Academic and Social-Emotional Supports of all our subgroups
4. Increase graduation rates and students meeting mastery of grade level standards
5. Amount of students testing for EOC and Statewide Assessments

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Guaranteed and Viable Curriculum
Rationale	In order to ensure students are exposed to a guaranteed and viable curriculum, teachers need time to collaborate and create common lessons and analyze common assessment data. Utilizing the PLC time to plan lessons and reflect on assessment data will help boost student achievement.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If teachers engage in quality professional development, collaborate, develop higher order standards-based lessons and increase active engagement, then student learning gains will increase in reading, writing, and literacy across the disciplines. Our goal is to improve in the areas of proficiency and learning gains by at least 5 percentage points in ELA FSA and Math EOC scores and increase proficiency in Biology and the 8th grade Science FSA, as well as, U.S. History and Civics by focusing on developing a guaranteed and viable curriculum, sound lessons and infusing literacy in all content areas. Additionally, our goal is to improve proficiency and learning gains by 5% in the SWD subgroup in all tested subject areas.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Andrea Banks (banksae@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Embed collaboration in PLC teams to plan standards-based instruction, create common lessons, analyze student work/common assessments, and reflect on teaching. -Continue to incorporate the Fundamental 5 components of quality instruction into teaching practice and include literacy in all content areas (Think, Read, Write, Discuss)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Students need to be exposed to the same content regardless of what class the students are enrolled. By teachers working collaboratively in PLC teams and utilizing the district created pacing guides, students should have the access to a guaranteed and viable curriculum.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers collaborate weekly in the PLC process to plan common lessons. 2. Teachers participate in data chats with their PLC team and administration to analyze common assessment data. 3. After data analysis is complete, teams will plan for reteaching and remediation. 4. Cycle repeats 5. The students in the SWD subgroup have been identified and supported through inclusion this year. These students will receive additional classroom supports from an ESE certified teacher and have the opportunity to interact with their peers in an inclusive classroom setting. ESE teachers and ESE paraprofessionals have receive training on inclusion education and keep track on student interventions through a daily tracking system. Students of concern are reported to our Inclusion Coordinator and additional supports are provided to the students in need.
Person Responsible	Andrea Banks (banksae@bay.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Improve Grad Rate
Rationale	Our graduation rate continues to steadily decline from year to year. Our goal is to implement preventive strategies such as MTSS 6th-12th, monthly GAT meetings, and utilizing our graduation coach to coach students at risk of not graduating with their cohort group.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	2. If collaborative data teams analyze multiple data sources, provide quality feedback to students and implement appropriate remediation and enrichment strategies, then we will see a decrease in the percentage of D's and F's, improved attendance, and an increase in the number of students graduating from high school in four years. Our goal is to improve the graduation rate by at least 5 percent.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Andrea Banks (banksae@bay.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Strategies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Monthly GAT AND MTSS meetings- This team consists of guidance counselors, administration, and the school graduation coach. This team analyzes student data and develops plans for at-risk students to help ensure they graduate with their cohort group. -Weekly Problem-Solving PLCs to analyze student discipline, attendance, etc. -Provide PERT Prep Boot Camp sessions during lunch and after school for student who have not earned a concordant score for the Algebra 1 EOC. -Provide ACT/SAT practice through our Applied Communications classes for students who need a concordant score in reading. -Provide instructional support in the reading and math classes to assist in remediation of students
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Our graduation continues to decline from year to year. Our goal is to improve the graduation rate by implementing MTSS 6th-12th grades and utilizing our graduation coach to assist students at risk for graduating with their cohort.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Monthly MTSS meetings to determine students with the most need of interventions 2. Roles are assigned to team members to monitor student progress (attendance, grades, etc) 3. Grad Coach meets weekly with students out of cohort and monitors student progress in the credit recovery lab. 4. Instructional coaching provided to teachers 5. Testing boot camps offered to students so they have the opportunity to earn concordant scores for graduation and have success on end of course exams (PERT, SAT, Civics, Biology, Science FSA).
Person Responsible	Andrea Banks (banksae@bay.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Decrease the number of discipline referrals
Rationale	Last school year, our discipline referrals decreased significantly for minor behaviors because of the use of the Hero program. This year, we have seen an influx of negative behaviors and a dramatic increase in discipline referrals. We feel it is largely due to the impact of Hurricane Michael and from the trauma that students face day to day. We hope to implement a school-wide mentoring program to assist our struggling students so they get the supports they need to be successful.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	3. Focusing on the effects of trauma impacting adolescents, there is an increased need for supports at secondary multi-tiered levels addressing behavior. Utilizing a SEL curriculum framework to meet the needs of specific subgroups of students, RHS will reduce the number of discipline referrals by at least 10% by implementing a school-wide mentoring program for at-risk students. This will build the emotional muscle of struggling students, leading towards a successful educational experience.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Strategies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implementation of the Hero program- Hero is a program that helps schools manage student behavior - reducing classroom disruption, office referrals, and tardiness. Hero supports all positive behavior reinforcement programs, allowing teachers and administrators to award points for positive student activity and participation. -Utilization of hall monitors -Social Emotional Learning Curriculum for all students (Merrell's Strong Teens Curriculum) -Trauma-Informed Care training for all teachers -BDS 360- a program that will allow students to turn discipline into a learning opportunity with a conduct and behavior curriculum for students. -Problem-Solving PLCs- teams of teachers will work collaboratively to track and mentor at-risk students and work closely with the district MTSS team on interventions to help these students be successful.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Having accountability is crucial to a student's success at school. Our goal by implementing a school-wide mentoring program is to help provide students a trusted adult on campus that they can turn to in times of crisis. Our hope is to help educate the "whole child"....academically, socially, and emotionally.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Embed the "RAMS Way" in all classrooms and create a common language for all faculty, staff and students on campus (Tier 1 MTSS) 2. The student services team will provide guidelines to teachers on referring students to the Student Services Team for additional support (counseling, wraparound services, etc). Teachers use the spreadsheet to refer students of most concern 3. Problem-Solving PLC team meets weekly to analyze discipline and attendance data. Team members are responsible for mentoring students weekly and documenting student progress 4. Discipline reports are analyzed month to month and shared with all staff members. 5. Hero data is used to determine the students who are in need of additional support for minor classroom infractions (parent conferences, counseling, meet with an admin, etc).

Person Responsible Andrea Banks (banksae@bay.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).

Strategies

- Monthly GAT AND MTSS meetings- This team consists of guidance counselors, administration, and the school graduation coach. This team analyzes student data and develops plans for at-risk students to help ensure they graduate with their cohort group.
- Weekly Problem-Solving PLCs to analyze student discipline, attendance, etc.
- Provide PERT Prep Boot Camp sessions during lunch and after school for student who have not earned a concordant score for the Algebra 1 EOC.
- Provide ACT/SAT practice through our Applied Communications classes for students who need a concordant score in reading.
- Provide instructional support in the reading and math classes to assist in remediation of students

3. Focusing on the effects of trauma impacting adolescents, there is an increased need for supports at secondary multi-tiered levels addressing behavior. Utilizing a SEL curriculum framework to meet the needs of specific subgroups of students, RHS will reduce the number of discipline referrals by at least 10% by implementing a school-wide mentoring program for at-risk students. This will build the emotional muscle of struggling students, leading towards a successful educational experience.

Strategies

- Implementation of the Hero program- Hero is a program that helps schools manage student behavior - reducing classroom disruption, office referrals, and tardiness. Hero supports all positive behavior reinforcement programs, allowing teachers and administrators to award points for positive student activity and participation.
- Utilization of hall monitors
- Social Emotional Learning Curriculum for all students (Merrell's Strong Teens Curriculum)
- Trauma-Informed Care training for all teachers
- BDS 360- a program that will allow students to turn discipline into a learning opportunity with a conduct and behavior curriculum for students.
- Problem-Solving PLCs- teams of teachers will work collaboratively to track and mentor at-risk students and work closely with the district MTSS team on interventions to help these students be successful.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

Parents are invited and encouraged to join the School Advisory Council (SAC) at orientation and the Title 1 Annual Meeting./Open House. The results from the Title 1 Spring Survey are tallied and shared with faculty and staff before writing the Parent Family Engagement Plan. Input from SAC members (teachers and parents) is used to plan, update and improve our PFEP. Rutherford offers many parent events during the school year to help build the school to home connection. Rutherford also reaches out to the community stakeholders to invite participation in our school improvement efforts; such as mentoring, contribution of resources, and volunteering to improve our facilities.

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Rutherford High School works to assist students in their transition to post-secondary education and career fields. RHS participates in Career Connections which is where students get to sample different career opportunities in the area. RHS hosts a senior night where local colleges, Haney Technical Center and the military share post high school opportunities. RHS also works with colleges around the county who visit the school and meet with students. We host representatives from the local universities and local state college to meet with students in groups during college fairs and filling out financial aid information. RHS also administers the ASVAB twice a year for students interested in military career options.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

The School Improvement Team regularly looks at data based on class grades, test grades, and writing responses, discipline and our MAP assessment for ELA and Math etc. This team looks at Academic data (FSA, EOC, MTSS, and IEP data) to identify barriers and initiate improvement steps in making sure that students have all of the educational opportunities and are in the least restrictive environment. This team works together with the department heads and faculty to support academic achievement, professional development, and initiatives that may be appropriate to the school. The School Improvement Team meets once a month along with the Department Heads to coordinate information, data, and school initiatives.

Rutherford High School has few separate monies available to supplement programs and provide student support. Below is the list of funds and the focus on which they will be spent.

1. Job Training is available to students through Coop programs which will serve 70 students this year. The district in cooperation with local businesses annually take groups of interested 11th and 12th graders to different businesses in our community and that initiative is funded through the district. We also offer "on the Job Training" for our ESE population through partnerships with our "job coaches, Goodwill Industries" and local businesses
2. Rutherford High School has \$21,500 in Drop Out Prevention money to support programs, opportunities, professional development, tutoring, summer enrichment, and the HERO behavior program.
3. The SAC's Committee is receiving around \$5,000 in funds this school year. Requests will be made to use those funds for school supplies and funding the RAM store.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

Guidance works with students on their individual course selection based on career choices. Students choose courses each year and the master schedule is based on those selections and the state requirements. Select students have mentors comprised of community members who visit with them each week to ensure they stay in school and attend to their academics. We have academics that offer Career and Technical components and certification. Colleges, military and community members are invited into the school and students may sign up to have conferences with these representatives.

Elective courses that are offered to students for future employment or job skill training include: Culinary Operations I-IV with SERVESAFE Certification, Television Production I-IV, Marketing I-III, Marketing Co-op, Digital and Multimedia Foundations I - VIII with Photoshop, Premier, Illustrator and Dreamweaver Certifications, Advanced Automation and Robotics Technology, Journalism IV - VII honors with InDesign Certification, Auto Production and Engineering, Construction and Carpentry Academy Communication's Technology Academy, Air Force JROTC, Internships, Co-Op and blended Career and Technical Instruction in cooperation with Haney Technical Center.

Students are encouraged to select these classes through their guidance counselors. Students are also exposed to these elective courses throughout the year as the classes participate in school wide activities. Students are recruited yearly to participate in an employment tour around the city to visit the main employers. We encourage the community to come and recruit students for jobs and internships. In addition, seniors and their parents are invited to a presentation with colleges and universities, technical centers and military representatives to share information regarding future majors and careers. Our students also have the opportunity to participate in Career Connections sponsored by the local Chamber of Commerce to acquaint students with the employment possibilities and contacts for those in our community.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

Rutherford is the only high school in Bay District to offer the AVID program. AVID stands for Advancement Via Individual Determination and is designed to help students learn the skills necessary to take advanced courses. AVID has a curriculum focused on critical reading and writing skills, as well as organizational skills and involves the assistance of college tutors, weekly guest speakers and field trips to colleges and businesses in the community.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Guaranteed and Viable Curriculum	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Improve Grad Rate	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Decrease the number of discipline referrals	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00