

Escambia County School District

Ransom Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Ransom Middle School

1000 W KINGSFIELD RD, Cantonment, FL 32533

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Alphonse Marsh Jr

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	50%
2019-20 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 (60%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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 Escambia 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	12
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Ransom Middle School

1000 W KINGSFIELD RD, Cantonment, FL 32533

www.escambiaschools.org

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Middle School 6-8</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>62%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>33%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Escambia 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.

Ransom Middle School believes all students can learn and be successful in middle school. Our purpose is to create a learning environment, which will enable each student to understand that learning is a life long process. The faculty is committed top providing rigorous academic courses that challenge students in order to prepare them for high school, college and the workforce.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Ransom Middle School is to connect teachers and students with a systematic and comprehensive instructional environment that combines rigorous and relevant curriculum. Innovative instructional practices serve as the catalyst in the transition from traditional learning to a student-centered, problem solving, project-driven approach that will carry students well into the next century.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lipnick, Regina	Principal	The purpose of this position is to provide leadership necessary to design, develop, implement, and evaluate a comprehensive program of instructional and support services which optimize available resources to establish and maintain a safe, caring, and enriching environment to promote student success.
Brown, Terry	Teacher, K-12	Subject area department chair. As the department chair the teacher will meet monthly in leadership meetings to provide input/feedback concerning instructional strategies and assist with making school-wide decisions. In addition, they will teach students subject matter and/or skills that will contribute to their development as mature, able and responsible men and women.
Kendrick, Holly	Teacher, K-12	Subject area department chair. As the department chair the teacher will meet monthly in leadership meetings to provide input/feedback concerning instructional strategies and assist with making school-wide decisions. In addition, they will teach students subject matter and/or skills that will contribute to their development as mature, able and responsible men and women.
McCants, Felicia	Teacher, ESE	As the behavior coach they will meet monthly in leadership meetings to provide input/feedback concerning instructional strategies and assist with making school-wide decisions. In addition, they will work with students by providing behavioral strategies and skills that will contribute to their development as mature, able and responsible men and women.
Bechtel, Carmela	School Counselor	Guidance Counselor will meet monthly in leadership meetings to provide input/feedback concerning instructional strategies and assist with making school-wide decisions. In addition, they will counsel students on behavior/academic skills that will contribute to their development as mature, able and responsible men and women.
Ikner, Jennell	Teacher, K-12	Subject area department chair. As the department chair the teacher will meet monthly in leadership meetings to provide input/feedback concerning instructional strategies and assist with making school-wide decisions. In addition, they will teach students subject matter and/or skills that will contribute to their development as mature, able and responsible men and women.
Isphording, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12	Subject area department chair. As the department chair the teacher will meet monthly in leadership meetings to provide input/feedback concerning instructional strategies and assist with making school-wide decisions. In addition, they will teach students subject matter and/or skills that will

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		contribute to their development as mature, able and responsible men and women.
Woods, Jodi	Teacher, K-12	Subject area department chair. As the department chair the teacher will meet monthly in leadership meetings to provide input/feedback concerning instructional strategies and assist with making school-wide decisions. In addition, they will teach students subject matter and/or skills that will contribute to their development as mature, able and responsible men and women.
Sears, Libby	Teacher, K-12	Subject area department chair. As the department chair the teacher will meet monthly in leadership meetings to provide input/feedback concerning instructional strategies and assist with making school-wide decisions. In addition, they will teach students subject matter and/or skills that will contribute to their development as mature, able and responsible men and women.
Walker, Janie	Teacher, K-12	Subject area department chair. As the department chair the teacher will meet monthly in leadership meetings to provide input/feedback concerning instructional strategies and assist with making school-wide decisions. In addition, they will teach students subject matter and/or skills that will contribute to their development as mature, able and responsible men and women.
Marsh, Alphonse	Assistant Principal	The purpose of this position is to assist the Principal with administrative and instructional functions to meet the educational needs of students and carry out the mission and goals of the school and the District.
Green, Adrienne	Assistant Principal	Monitor
Bond, Michael	Teacher, ESE	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Alphonse Marsh Jr

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

4

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

20

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

82

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	50%
2019-20 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 (60%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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 .	

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	461	441	428	0	0	0	0	1330
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	74	66	0	0	0	0	202
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	33	38	0	0	0	0	93
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	15	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	72	70	0	0	0	0	209
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	79	79	0	0	0	0	220

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	26	50	44	0	0	0	0	120

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	5	20	0	0	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	0	0	0	0	12

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/13/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	436	401	477	0	0	0	0	1314
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	63	90	0	0	0	0	231
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	35	40	0	0	0	0	110
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	14	23	0	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	106	90	140	0	0	0	0	336

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	54	45	61	0	0	0	0	160

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	3	2	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	0	0	0	0	8

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	436	401	477	0	0	0	0	1314
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	63	90	0	0	0	0	231
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	35	40	0	0	0	0	110
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	21	14	23	0	0	0	0	58
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	106	90	140	0	0	0	0	336

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	23	45	42	0	0	0	0	110

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	3	2	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	0	0	0	0	8

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	55%	48%	54%	51%	46%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	52%	54%	49%	51%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	45%	47%	36%	42%	44%
Math Achievement	63%	46%	58%	56%	43%	56%
Math Learning Gains	61%	47%	57%	52%	43%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	43%	51%	41%	40%	50%
Science Achievement	58%	43%	51%	55%	44%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	58%	58%	72%	61%	56%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey				
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)			Total
	6	7	8	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	51%	42%	9%	54%	-3%
	2018	45%	40%	5%	52%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	51%	43%	8%	52%	-1%
	2018	57%	41%	16%	51%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
08	2019	63%	50%	13%	56%	7%
	2018	62%	51%	11%	58%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	58%	36%	22%	55%	3%
	2018	47%	36%	11%	52%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	61%	50%	11%	54%	7%
	2018	60%	45%	15%	54%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
08	2019	37%	21%	16%	46%	-9%
	2018	30%	24%	6%	45%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-23%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	58%	42%	16%	48%	10%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	53%	45%	8%	50%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
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	58%	54%	4%	71%	-13%
2018	59%	51%	8%	71%	-12%
Compare		-1%			

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	91%	52%	39%	61%	30%
2018	85%	51%	34%	62%	23%
Compare		6%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	91%	47%	44%	57%	34%
2018	0%	48%	-48%	56%	-56%
Compare		91%			

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	20	41	36	30	45	34	37	23			
ASN	77	80		85	80		83		93		

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
BLK	39	53	45	44	51	37	41	35	96		
HSP	57	58		57	50			56			
MUL	56	57	56	60	63	52	54	58	81		
WHT	59	57	54	68	64	51	63	63	89		
FRL	47	52	48	54	56	42	51	47	83		
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	18	40	35	24	44	42	35	33	69		
ASN	81	67		89	88			83			
BLK	34	50	47	34	45	38	31	44	90		
HSP	46	47	36	51	56		50	27			
MUL	56	55	47	49	54	32	37	67			
WHT	58	54	45	60	57	48	59	61	81		
FRL	45	50	45	46	49	44	42	49	75		
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	15	34	29	19	36	35	17	40	30		
AMI	18	18		9	9						
ASN	76	79		81	46						
BLK	32	42	35	35	41	37	35	40	75		
HSP	48	39	30	42	48	60	50	50			
MUL	45	40	37	39	55	59	29	48	80		
WHT	55	51	36	62	55	41	61	66	85		
FRL	42	44	35	45	46	41	42	49	73		

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	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	540
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	83
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	49
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	56
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	60
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	63
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	53
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Students with disabilities (SWD) showed the lowest performance of any subgroup. Overall, when comparing 2018 to 2019 scores, SWD's showed improvement in most tested areas. The following scores for SWDs improved from 2018 to 2019:
 FSA ELA Achievement (2018) 18 to (2019) 20, ELA Lg (2018) 40 to (2019) 41, ELA L25% (2018) 35 to (2019) 36
 FSA Math Achievement (2018) 24 to (2019) 30, Math Lg (2018) 44 to (2019) 45
 FCAT Science (2018) 35 to (2019) 37

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

Two areas declined for students with disabilities: Math L25% 42 to 34 and Civics 33 to 23
 Contributing factors that led to the decline of the Math L25% and Civics scores could be the lack of differentiation, small group instruction and teacher training.

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 data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was Social Studies (Civics).

The states end of course exam average score for Civics was 72% as compared to our score of 58%.

Not all Civics teachers administered the district Schoolnet assessments on a regular basis. In addition, most of the teachers did not create the assessment probes after each unit, as indicated by the school district.

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

The data components that showed the most improvement were Math Proficiency and Math Learning Gains.

Math Proficiency (2018) 56% to (2019) 63%

Math Learning Gains (2018) 55% to (2019) 61%

The following new actions took place:

Math

- Provided faculty and staff with professional development for STAR 360
- Teachers disaggregated STAR 360 data quarterly and determined interventions and next steps for students.
- Teachers administered district Schoolnet assessments.
- A school-wide reward system was implemented quarterly for students who showed growth on the STAR 360 tests.
- Teachers provided quarterly data chats with students.
- Math specialists from the school district provided professional development for teachers on how to develop small group instruction, run data reports and disaggregate data.
- Substitutes were hired for teacher planning, collaboration, mining through data, designing instruction and determining strategies for students.
- Utilized research time to work on areas of need for students. Strategically placed high need students in research classes that focused on weak areas.

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

Two areas of concern are the Math L25% scores for students with disabilities and the 7th grade Civics scores.

Contributing factors that led to the decline of the Math L25% could have been the lack of differentiation, small group instruction and teacher training.

Contributing factors for the Civics decline could be that, not all of the Civics teachers administered the district Schoolnet assessments on a regular basis. Also, not all teachers created assessment probes after each unit as indicated by the district specialist.

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

1. Math L25% scores for students with disabilities.
2. Seventh grade Civics scores.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students with disabilities - Focus on Math L25% and proficiency scores for students with disabilities. Students with disabilities showed the lowest performance. The Math L25% scores for students with disabilities declined by 8%. Math L25% (2018) 42 to 34 (2019). In addition, proficiency scores for SWDs improved by 2% but were significantly lower at 20% as compared to the next lowest subgroup African Americans at 39%.

Measurable Outcome: The measurable outcome would be for the Math L25% scores for students with disabilities to improve by 8%. Moving from 34% to 42%. The measurable outcome would be for the proficiency scores for students with disabilities to improve by 5%. Moving from 20% to 25%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Adrienne Green (agreen@ecsdfl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: After conducting an analysis of FSA data and progress monitoring data, there is a need to reinforce the importance of utilizing data to make informed decisions regarding instruction. According to Using Student achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision making, an inquiry cycle for data use can be implemented in an educational setting and inform teachers of possible differentiated opportunities. Information on the implementation process of the inquiry cycle can be found using What Works Clearinghouse guide.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Professional development for STAR360 will be implemented by district specialists. After the professional development is offered substitutes will be hired for teachers to plan collaboratively, review data, design coherent instruction, and determine strategies for students. Students will be scheduled into research classes according to need. The strategies should target instructional areas the students are weak in and provide time where teachers can plan instructional intervention.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers disaggregate STAR360 data quarterly and determine interventions or next steps for students.
2. Teachers provide quarterly data chats with students.
3. Hire substitutes for teachers to plan collaboratively, review data, design strategies for students.
4. Administration coordinates learning walks with district specialist. Feedback provided to teachers and administration.
5. Teachers administer district Schoolnet probes and Assessments.

Person Responsible: Regina Lipnick (rlipnick@ecsdfl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Social Studies Civics end of course exam- Focus on improving end of course exam scores. The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was Social Studies (Civics). The state's end of course exam average for Civics was 72% as compared to our score of 58%.

Measurable Outcome: The measurable outcome is to improve the social studies Civics end of course exam scores by 5%. Moving from 58% to 63%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Regina Lipnick (rlipnick@ecsdfi.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: After conducting an analysis of FSA data and progress monitoring data, there is a need to reinforce the importance of utilizing data to make informed decisions regarding instruction. According to Using Student achievement Data to Support Instructional Decision making, an inquiry cycle for data use can be implemented in an educational setting and inform teachers of possible differentiated opportunities. Information on the implementation process of the inquiry cycle can be found using What Works Clearinghouse guide.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Professional development for Schoolnet and the CORE LMS (Google Classroom) will be implemented by the district specialist. After the professional development is offered substitutes will be hired for teachers to plan collaboratively, review data, design instruction and determine remediation strategies for students. Teachers utilize district Civics probes according to the curriculum framework calendar to plan instruction and track student progress.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide professional development for Schoolnet and Core LMS
2. Conduct teacher learning walks with the district specialist in order to provide strategies for struggling teachers.
3. Hire substitutes for planning.
4. Meet with the district specialist to devise a plan for Civics instruction.
5. Admin attends all Civics meetings/reviews lesson plans

Person Responsible Regina Lipnick (rlipnick@ecsdfi.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

- The school leadership team will work together to accomplish the following:**
- School administration and district specialists will conduct classroom walk-throughs.**
- School administration will provide resources and support for teachers.**
- School administration and the district data coach will provide quarterly data and conduct data chats with teachers for all subjects who take an EOC of FSA exam.**
- School administrations will provide substitutes for teacher planning.**

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Ransom Middle provides the following avenues to build a positive school culture and environment:

Parents, teachers and staff are involved in the School Advisory Council. Parents and Ransom staff make shared decisions concerning curriculum, funding, resources for parents and student support.

The Ransom Middle School faculty and staff feels so strongly about parent communication and involvement that three mornings are set aside for parent conferences. This year the days will be Monday, Tuesdays, and Fridays. Teachers will conduct a parent conference with each student's family who desires a conference. Grade reports can be accessed on Focus. A new parent resource center is being developed for parents and families in the innovation center. Admin, teachers, guidance and staff host parent meetings to explain programs, camps, clubs, FSA strategies.

Orientations are held for new students entering Ransom Middle School.

Department chairs for each subject area meet once a month to determine needs of students.

A behavior team meets monthly to determine strategies for students. Goals are set for students who are having difficulty in class.

Weekly call outs are made to families to keep them informed of the latest events. Information is updated and posted on our school's website and Facebook page each week.

Students of the month are named each month and posted on the marquee.

Students are recognized each quarter for academic excellence based on STAR360 data.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies	\$0.00

	Total: \$0.00
--	-----------------------------