

Duval County Public Schools

Jean Ribault 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 | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 18 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Jean Ribault Middle School

3610 RIBAUTL SCENIC DR, Jacksonville, FL 32208

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

Demographics

Principal: Ronnie Williams

Start Date for this Principal: 7/7/2020

| | |
|--|--|
| 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 | Yes |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: D (38%) 2016-17: C (41%) 2015-16: D (34%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Northeast |
| Regional Executive Director | Cassandra Brusca |
| 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 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.

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 | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 15 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Jean Ribault Middle School

3610 RIBAUTL SCENIC DR, Jacksonville, FL 32208

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

School Demographics

| | | |
|--|---|---|
| <p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>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>100%</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>96%</p> |

School Grades History

| Year | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | C | C | D | C |

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.

To provide exceptional educational opportunities for every student, everyday.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All students are motivated to capitalize on every learning opportunity that will prepare them for high school and beyond.

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 |
|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Williams, Ronnie | Principal | |
| | School Counselor | |
| Burroughs, Lakeisha | Instructional Coach | |
| Moses, Lisa | Instructional Coach | |
| Hall, Mishel'le | Dean | |
| Brown, Latoya | Assistant Principal | |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/7/2020, Ronnie Williams

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

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 | Yes |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: D (38%) 2016-17: C (41%) 2015-16: D (34%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Northeast |
| Regional Executive Director | Cassandra Brusca |
| 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 | 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 | 0 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 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 | 0 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 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 | 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 | 0 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/22/2020

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 | 0 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 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 | 0 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 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 | 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 | 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 | 0 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 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 | 0 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 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 | 0 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 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 | 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 | 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 | 0 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 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 | 26% | 43% | 54% | 20% | 41% | 52% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 37% | 49% | 54% | 41% | 48% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 32% | 45% | 47% | 41% | 43% | 44% |
| Math Achievement | 39% | 49% | 58% | 34% | 44% | 56% |
| Math Learning Gains | 45% | 50% | 57% | 48% | 49% | 57% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 42% | 47% | 51% | 52% | 46% | 50% |
| Science Achievement | 15% | 44% | 51% | 16% | 45% | 50% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 66% | 68% | 72% | 55% | 65% | 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 | 24% | 47% | -23% | 54% | -30% |
| | 2018 | 21% | 44% | -23% | 52% | -31% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 20% | 44% | -24% | 52% | -32% |
| | 2018 | 16% | 41% | -25% | 51% | -35% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 23% | 49% | -26% | 56% | -33% |
| | 2018 | 21% | 51% | -30% | 58% | -37% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 7% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2019 | 36% | 51% | -15% | 55% | -19% |
| | 2018 | 32% | 42% | -10% | 52% | -20% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 28% | 47% | -19% | 54% | -26% |
| | 2018 | 20% | 50% | -30% | 54% | -34% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 8% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 30% | 32% | -2% | 46% | -16% |
| | 2018 | 17% | 31% | -14% | 45% | -28% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 13% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 10% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|----------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2019 | 13% | 40% | -27% | 48% | -35% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 2% | 44% | -42% | 50% | -48% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 11% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | 23% | 63% | -40% | 65% | -42% |

| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
|------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 61% | 69% | -8% | 71% | -10% |
| 2018 | 35% | 84% | -49% | 71% | -36% |
| Compare | | 26% | | | |

| 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 | 63% | 57% | 6% | 61% | 2% |
| 2018 | 82% | 61% | 21% | 62% | 20% |
| Compare | | -19% | | | |

| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 89% | 61% | 28% | 57% | 32% |
| 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 |
| SWD | 29 | 32 | 30 | 42 | 50 | 41 | 19 | 63 | | | |
| BLK | 25 | 36 | 30 | 38 | 45 | 43 | 12 | 65 | 71 | | |
| MUL | 69 | 46 | | 50 | 53 | | | | | | |

| 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 |
| WHT | 52 | 59 | | 52 | 43 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 25 | 36 | 31 | 37 | 44 | 40 | 11 | 65 | 79 | | |
| 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 | 38 | 50 | 42 | 40 | 49 | 46 | 54 | 55 | | | |
| BLK | 23 | 35 | 37 | 34 | 42 | 44 | 17 | 41 | 56 | | |
| MUL | 42 | 50 | | 53 | 50 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 41 | 44 | | 53 | 50 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 25 | 36 | 39 | 34 | 42 | 46 | 18 | 43 | 62 | | |
| 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 | 6 | 36 | 32 | 13 | 35 | 45 | 11 | 28 | | | |
| BLK | 19 | 40 | 41 | 34 | 48 | 52 | 15 | 53 | 56 | | |
| MUL | 47 | 41 | | 31 | 44 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 27 | | | 43 | 40 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 19 | 38 | 42 | 32 | 48 | 51 | 15 | 53 | 59 | | |

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 | 42 |
| 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 | 374 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 9 |
| Percent Tested | 98% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 38 |
| 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 | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 41 |
| 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 | |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 55 |
| 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 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 | 52 |
| 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 | 41 |
| 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.

All questions need to be completed

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

-

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.

-

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

-

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

-

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

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.
- 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: Less than 20% of the teachers are utilizing the Learning Arc to align their instruction to the standard. In developing the teachers with the implementing standards-based instruction it is important that we provide training on how to utilize the Learning Arc to decrease the deficit during the 2019-20 school year. This will enable teachers to plan effective lessons using the item specifications and ALDS to make sure that the learning task are aligned to the standard.

Measurable Outcome: 95% of our core teachers will show progress towards fully implementing the learning arc while planning instructional delivery decreasing the deficit of standards-based instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Ronnie Williams (williamsr9@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: To deliver standards-based instruction by unpacking standards, utilizing learning arcs, item specs, and ALDS.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: As expressed in the Opportunity Myth, schools need to ensure students are getting standards-aligned and grade appropriate instruction, so they are prepared to face the assessments designed by the state, along with the following year’s progression of standards

Action Steps to Implement

Ms. Jefferson (Assistant Principal), Ms. Burroughs (Math Coach) and Mrs. Moses (Reading Coach) will Facilitate Professional Development for teachers during Pre-Planning on the Learning Arc.

Person Responsible Ronnie Williams (williamsr9@duvalschools.org)

Administrators and Coaches will provide continuous support during weekly PLC time in planning standards based instruction utilizing the Learning Arc for each standard.

Person Responsible Ronnie Williams (williamsr9@duvalschools.org)

Continue to conduct Standards -Based walkthroughs with administration and academic coaches weekly

Person Responsible Ronnie Williams (williamsr9@duvalschools.org)

Analyze Standards Walkthrough Tool observational data generated through walkthroughs to determine next steps of support

Person Responsible Ronnie Williams (williamsr9@duvalschools.org)

Provide instructional support via coaching cycle to identified teachers in the specific areas of need for standards based instruction.

Person Responsible Lisa Moses (mosesl1@duvalschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The focus of PLC is collaborative lesson planning through professional development on standard driven instruction utilizing learning arcs and how it impacts student learning. Through classroom observations there were 45% of core teachers were consistently aligning standards to what was being taught in the classroom.

Measurable Outcome: 100% of our core teachers will collaborate weekly in PLCs with coaches and administrators in planning for standards based lessons/instruction using the Learning Arc Framework.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Ronnie Williams (williamsr9@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: This will be reflected in instructional delivery and student mastery of the standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students will be provided with standard driven instruction to close the student achievement gaps and promoting standard mastery for adequate student progression on state assessments.

Action Steps to Implement

Facilitate Professional development during PLCs and Early Release days on Effective Lesson Planning utilizing Learning Arcs, ALDs and Item Specifications.

Person Responsible Ronnie Williams (williamsr9@duvalschools.org)

Coach and Administrator Walkthroughs to provide support in the implementation and delivery of the standards driven lesson plans developed.

Person Responsible Ronnie Williams (williamsr9@duvalschools.org)

Provide intense support to the teachers that are struggling with lesson planning and utilizing standards to drive instruction through coaching cycles.

Person Responsible Ronnie Williams (williamsr9@duvalschools.org)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Decreasing the amount of referrals with a focus on Level 2 referrals. Level two referrals account for 51% of the referrals at Jean Ribault Middle School. Level 2 referral recipients are typically repeat offenders and normally have a consequence of In School Suspension or Out of School Suspension removing the students from their learning environment.

Measurable Outcome: The number of Level 2 referrals will decrease to 30% or below.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Ronnie Williams (williamsr9@duvalschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Adequate restorative practices will be implemented with the objective to decrease referrals and eliminate repeat offenders. The PBIS Team will implement positive behavior incentives classroom wide as well as school wide on a bi-weekly and monthly basis.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The combination of Restorative justice practices and positive behavior incentives fosters a positive culture and climate within the school building when implemented by administration, teachers and students.

Action Steps to Implement

PBIS Team implementation facilitated by Assistant Principal Ms. Jefferson and the Deans.

Person Responsible Ronnie Williams (williamsr9@duvalschools.org)

Restorative Justice Professional Development for Faculty and Staff

Person Responsible Ronnie Williams (williamsr9@duvalschools.org)

Implementation of a Student Accountability Board

Person Responsible Ronnie Williams (williamsr9@duvalschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

NA

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.

Jean Ribault Middle School encourages positive culture through many facets. Through implementation of the PBIS plan, monthly incentives are presented to the faculty and staff for their job of excellence. Students are rewarded with similar opportunities through bi-weekly and monthly celebratory incentives. In working with external entities, such as Achiever For Life, Communities and Schools and City Year, Jean Ribault Middle School commits to working within and alongside the community. Parent community nights, Data-and-Dine sessions, food drives, Thanksgiving basket donations, and coat drives are implemented to help foster a positive school culture and environment with our stakeholders in mind.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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