

Duval County Public Schools

# Mattie V Rutherford Alt Ed Center



2020-21 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>6</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>18</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>18</b> |

## Mattie V Rutherford Alt Ed Center

1514 HUBBARD ST, Jacksonville, FL 32206

<http://www.duvalschools.org/mvr>

### Demographics

Principal: Sadie Milliner Smith

Start Date for this Principal: 6/10/2020

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Combination School<br>4-8  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Alternative Education  |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%   |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) |  |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: No Grade<br>2017-18: No Grade<br>2016-17: No Grade<br>2015-16: No Grade |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Northeast  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   |  |
| * 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 Duval 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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>18</b> |

## Mattie V Rutherford Alt Ed Center

1514 HUBBARD ST, Jacksonville, FL 32206

<http://www.duvalschools.org/mvr>

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Combination School<br>4-8                        | Yes                    | %  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| Alternative Education                            | No                     | %  |

### School Grades History

Year

Grade

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval 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.**

The mission of Mattie V. Rutherford Alternative Middle School is to provide our students with a holistic and supportive educational experience. We are committed to helping our students achieve the highest level of academic behavioral, and socio-emotional functioning.

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

Students will leave Mattie V. Rutherford with the capacity to be successful in any middle or high school.

### 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  |
|-----------------------|---------------------|--|
| Milliner Smith, Sadie | Principal           | Mrs. Milliner-Smith is responsible for the oversight of curriculum, instruction, assessment and day-to-day operation of the school. She develops school-wide goals with the faculty that are aligned with school's strategic plan. She uses student achievement data to assist faculty with creating student's academic growth plans. Mrs. Milliner-Smith conduct classroom walkthroughs, and facilitate parent meetings regarding the school's academic progress. |
| McQueen, Marvin       | Assistant Principal | Dr. Marvin McQueen, Assistant Principal will assist in managing the discipline process for students, co-facilitate the parent engagement meetings, conduct emergency and safety drills and training for teachers and will be the liaison for Science and Math department.  |
| Tillman, Charlene     | School Counselor    | Ms. Charlene Tillman is the Guidance department chairperson. She provide guidance services to students, and disseminate guidance information to both faculty and students.   |
| Kelly, Kacy           | Teacher, K-12       | Ms. Kacy Kelly-Williams is a 6th grade Language Arts and Reading instructor and department head. She will distribute instructional materials and information to the Language Arts and Reading department. She will assist facilitating department meetings, provide professional development and assist with analyzing data to other Language Arts and reading instructors.  |
| Owens, Latonya        | Teacher, ESE        | Ms. Latanya Owens is an ESE support facilitator that provides support services to students in math and science. She will provide instructors with data points and effective strategies to meet the needs of students with disabilities.  |
| Walker, Joann         | Teacher, K-12       | Ms. Joann Walker is a 6th grade social studies instructor and department head. She will distribute instructional materials and information to the social studies department. She will facilitate department meetings, provide professional development and assist with analyzing data to other social studies instructors.   |
| Battle, Barbara       | Teacher, K-12       | Ms.Barbara Battle is a 6th grade math instructor and department head. She will distribute instructional materials and information to the math department. She will facilitate department meetings, provide professional development and assist with analyzing data to other math instructors.  |
| Griffin, Albert       | Dean                | Mr. Albert Griffin will monitor students discipline data, referrals and facilitate SEIR Team meetings.   |

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Wednesday 6/10/2020, Sadie Milliner Smith

**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.*

0

**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.*

3

### Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

16

### Demographic Data

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2020-21 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Combination School<br>4-8  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Alternative Education  |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%   |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) |  |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: No Grade<br>2017-18: No Grade<br>2016-17: No Grade<br>2015-16: No Grade |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Northeast  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |



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

## 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 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 45 | 50 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 105 |       |
| 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                     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |     |       |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |     |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 20 | 25 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 50  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 20 | 20 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 46  |       |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/15/2020

### 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| 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  |       |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

**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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| 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  |       |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

## 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             | 0%     | 54%      | 61%   | 0%     | 50%      | 57%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 0%     | 56%      | 59%   | 0%     | 54%      | 57%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 0%     | 53%      | 54%   | 0%     | 47%      | 51%   |
| Math Achievement            | 0%     | 57%      | 62%   | 0%     | 52%      | 58%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 0%     | 57%      | 59%   | 0%     | 52%      | 56%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 0%     | 52%      | 52%   | 0%     | 46%      | 50%   |
| Science Achievement         | 0%     | 50%      | 56%   | 0%     | 47%      | 53%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  | 0%     | 76%      | 78%   | 0%     | 76%      | 75%   |

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) |     |     |     |     | Total |
|-----------|-----------------------------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-------|
|           | 4                                 | 5   | 6   | 7   | 8   |       |
|           | (0)                               | (0) | (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 |
| 04                    | 2019 | 0%     | 52%      | -52%                       | 58%   | -58%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 0%     | 49%      | -49%                       | 56%   | -56%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 0%     | 50%      | -50%                       | 56%   | -56%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 0%     | 51%      | -51%                       | 55%   | -55%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 06                    | 2019 | 8%     | 47%      | -39%                       | 54%   | -46%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 4%     | 44%      | -40%                       | 52%   | -48%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 4%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 8%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                    | 2019 | 2%     | 44%      | -42%                       | 52%   | -50%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 6%     | 41%      | -35%                       | 51%   | -45%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -4%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -2%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                    | 2019 | 3%     | 49%      | -46%                       | 56%   | -53%                    |

| ELA                   |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|                       | 2018 | 22%    | 51%      | -29%                       | 58%   | -36%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -19%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -3%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 04                    | 2019 | 0%     | 64%      | -64%                       | 64%   | -64%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 0%     | 60%      | -60%                       | 62%   | -62%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 0%     | 57%      | -57%                       | 60%   | -60%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 0%     | 61%      | -61%                       | 61%   | -61%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 06                    | 2019 | 7%     | 51%      | -44%                       | 55%   | -48%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 0%     | 42%      | -42%                       | 52%   | -52%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 7%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 7%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                    | 2019 | 15%    | 47%      | -32%                       | 54%   | -39%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 14%    | 50%      | -36%                       | 54%   | -40%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 1%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 15%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                    | 2019 | 3%     | 32%      | -29%                       | 46%   | -43%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 10%    | 31%      | -21%                       | 45%   | -35%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -7%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -11%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                    | 2019 | 0%     | 49%      | -49%                       | 53%   | -53%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 0%     | 56%      | -56%                       | 55%   | -55%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                    | 2019 | 6%     | 40%      | -34%                       | 48%   | -42%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 10%    | 44%      | -34%                       | 50%   | -40%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -4%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 6%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| 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         | 19%    | 69%      | -50%                  | 71%   | -52%               |
| 2018         | 18%    | 84%      | -66%                  | 71%   | -53%               |
| 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         | 0%     | 57%      | -57%                  | 61%   | -61%               |
| 2018         | 0%     | 61%      | -61%                  | 62%   | -62%               |
| Compare      |        | 0%       |                       |       |                    |
| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019         |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| 2018         |        |          |                       |       |                    |

### 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 |
| 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 |
| 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 |

### 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)  |     |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  |     |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | N/A |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    |     |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency |     |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       |     |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  |     |
| Percent Tested  |     |
| Subgroup Data   |     |

## 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.**

7th Grade ELA/Reading - 2% proficient

The factors for low performance are:

1. Discipline issues and lack of student motivation
2. Lack of teaching standards at appropriate grade level
3. High mobility rate by students
4. Teacher lack of rigorous instructional delivery

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

8th Grade ELA/Reading - From 22% to 3% proficient

The factors for low performance are:

1. Discipline issues and lack of student motivation
2. High mobility rate by students
3. Instructor attendance
4. Teacher lack of rigorous instructional delivery

**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.**

8th Grade ELA/Reading - State Proficiency 56%, School proficiency 3%, (53 percentage points difference)

1. Discipline issues and lack of student motivation
2. High mobility rate by students
3. Instructor attendance
4. Teacher lack of rigorous instructional delivery

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

Civics - 2018 - 0% 2019 - 19%

1. Different Instructor
2. Student Task aligned to standard
3. More 8th grade students were assessed than the previous year

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

1. One or more suspensions
2. Attendance Below 90%

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

1. Out of School Suspension
2. Student Attendance
3. Failure in ELA/Reading
- 4.
- 5.

### **Part III: Planning for Improvement**

**Areas of Focus:**

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Based on the Standard Walkthrough Focus Tool MVR will focus is ensuring teachers are producing standards aligned assessments. Based on the analysis of the Standard Walkthrough form there are a slight majority of teachers creating appropriate tasks/activities to allow students to show mastery on appropriate course level standards. If teachers are unable to provide students with appropriate course level task to effectively assess students learning then student achievement will be negatively impacted.

**Measurable Outcome:** Using the Learning Arc, a vast majority of our teachers will implement standard aligned assessments.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Sadie Milliner Smith (milliner-s@duvalschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Standards aligned assessments will be implemented to ensure students mastery of the standards. This will be monitored using the Standards Walkthrough Tool.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** As expressed in the Opportunity Myth, if teachers are implementing standards aligned tasks and assessments, students will be able to successfully master grade course standards.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Facilitate professional development on standard and task alignment by using the Learning Arc in PLC.

**Person Responsible** Sadie Milliner Smith (milliner-s@duvalschools.org)

Weekly standard-based classroom walkthroughs will be used to monitor the assessment of student learning.

**Person Responsible** Marvin McQueen (mcqueenm@duvalschools.org)

Conduct data chats and provide feedback and support to teachers based on walkthroughs.

**Person Responsible** Sadie Milliner Smith (milliner-s@duvalschools.org)

Provide support for teachers with planning tasks aligned to appropriate course level.

**Person Responsible** Marvin McQueen (mcqueenm@duvalschools.org)

Paraprofessionals - Title 1 funds will be utilized to provide additional paraprofessional which will be used to provide additional small group instruction and support to improve student achievement.

**Person Responsible** Sadie Milliner Smith (milliner-s@duvalschools.org)



**#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** MVR will focus on creating a positive behavior intervention support to provide a supportive environment for all students. The 5 Essentials Survey during the 2019-2020 school year students' indicated an overall very weak response to supportive environment.

**Measurable Outcome:** To ensure a safe learning environment, the school will implement a Positive Behavior Intervention and Support Plan that will aid in decreasing the number of referrals.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Marvin McQueen (mcqueenm@duvalschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** The Positive Behavior Intervention and Support Team will develop a school-wide positive behavior plan that will teach students effective ways to resolve conflict.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** As expressed in the 5 Essentials Survey, in a school with a supportive environment, students feel safe in and around the school. Utilizing a Restorative Practice alternative will reduce the number of incidences and increase the positive culture on our campus.

**Action Steps to Implement**

The PBIS team will meet to analyze data and create the school-wide positive behavior plan to include:  
Tier 1 Community Building Circles  
Tier 2 Restorative Conferences  
Tier 3 Circle of Support and Accountability

**Person Responsible** Albert Griffin (griffina@duvalschools.org)

Train all staff on the Calm Classroom Program to help teachers and students develop self-awareness, mental focus and inner calm.

**Person Responsible** Sadie Milliner Smith (milliner-s@duvalschools.org)

The PBIS team will train the staff on how to implement the Positive Behavior plan in their classrooms

**Person Responsible** Albert Griffin (griffina@duvalschools.org)

Meet monthly with PBIS Team to collect and analyze referral data to identify where additional support is needed.

**Person Responsible** Marvin McQueen (mcqueenm@duvalschools.org)

**#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

**Measurable Outcome:**

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** [no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Action Steps to Implement**

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

## Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

**Our school leadership team will address all remaining schoolwide improvement priorities by:**

- 1. Provide professional development on implementing school-wide discipline plan.**
- 2. Collaborate with teacher and support specialist to ensure provide support to our Tier 2 and Tier 3 teachers.**
- 3. Improve parent enagement by offering virtual opportunities to engage with teachers in lieu of face-to-face meetings.**

## 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.

All parents are required to attend orientation before enrolling into MVR. Parents and student receive important information regarding the mission, vision, school expectations and programs that will assist and support the school. Through the use of the school's automated messenger system, calls are made to the parents regularly by the principal informing parents of critical information. Our Parent Liaison solicits community support by meeting monthly with various perspective business partners. The school has a partnership with Girls Matters.

### 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: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction |                                       |                 |     | \$60,330.62 |
|--|----------|---|---------------------------------------|-----------------|-----|-------------|
|  | Function | Object  | Budget Focus                          | Funding Source  | FTE | 2020-21     |
|  | 5100     | 150-Aides   | 0061 - Mattie V Rutherford Alt Ed Ctr | Title, I Part A |     | \$25,166.12 |
| Notes: Paraprofessional Alternative School |          |   |                                       |                 |     |             |

|        |        |  |  |                 |  |             |
|--------|--------|--|--|-----------------|--|-------------|
|        | 5100   | 150-Aides  | 0061 - Mattie V Rutherford Alt Ed Ctr      | Title, I Part A |  | \$28,319.03 |
|        |        |  | Notes: Paraprofessional Alternative School |                 |  |             |
|        | 6100   | 160-Other Support Personnel  | 0061 - Mattie V Rutherford Alt Ed Ctr      | Title, I Part A |  | \$6,845.47  |
|        |        |  | Notes: Parent Involvement Liaison          |                 |  |             |
| 2      | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports |  |                 |  | \$0.00      |
| 3      | III.A. | Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:  |  |                 |  | \$0.00      |
| Total: |        |  |  |                 |  | \$60,330.62 |