



---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# River Ridge Middle School

11646 TOWN CENTER RD, New Port Richey, FL 34654

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Angela Murphy L**

Start Date for this Principal: 2/22/2017

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	49%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (59%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	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 Pasco County School Board.

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# River Ridge Middle School

11646 TOWN CENTER RD, New Port Richey, FL 34654

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

## School Demographics

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	41%
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	<b>Charter School</b>	<b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	24%

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
<b>Grade</b>	B	B	B	B

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pasco County School Board.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement.**

To provide a world-class education to all students.

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

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

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Murphy, Angie	Principal	Principal
Astone, Alex	Assistant Principal	7th grade, State EOC testing
White, Danielle	Assistant Principal	8th grade, FSA tests
Kolean, Kevin	Assistant Principal	6th grade, SBP, District Finals
Adams, Lisa	Teacher, K-12	
Allen, Karen	Teacher, K-12	
Baumaister, Chrissy	Instructional Coach	
Brissey, Melina	Teacher, K-12	
Cadle, Kelly	Teacher, K-12	
Darling, Abby	Teacher, K-12	
Fallon-Johnson, Carrie	Teacher, K-12	
Fields, Tamara	Teacher, K-12	
Griffin, Kara	Teacher, K-12	
Gibbons, Kourtney	Teacher, K-12	
Mekus, Mary	Teacher, K-12	
Thompson, Gina	Teacher, K-12	
Shaw, Pam	Teacher, K-12	Science Teacher
Angelo, Vicki	Teacher, K-12	Behavior Specialist
James, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	Civics Teacher
Stanton, Monica	Teacher, K-12	ELA Teacher

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Wednesday 2/22/2017, Angela Murphy L

**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**

54

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	49%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (59%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* 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	0	0	427	390	425	0	0	0	0	1242
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	18	25	0	0	0	0	65
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	59	52	0	0	0	0	144
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	61	54	87	0	0	0	0	202
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	77	55	51	0	0	0	0	183

**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	45	48	56	0	0	0	0	149

**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**

Monday 7/27/2020

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	58	86	0	0	0	0	201

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	435	386	434	0	0	0	0	1255
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	31	41	0	0	0	0	127
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	26	61	93	0	0	0	0	180
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	50	72	0	0	0	0	166
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	109	88	120	0	0	0	0	317

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	58	86	0	0	0	0	201

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

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

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	54%	52%	54%	59%	50%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	55%	54%	56%	52%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	47%	47%	41%	40%	44%
Math Achievement	69%	60%	58%	71%	53%	56%
Math Learning Gains	67%	61%	57%	70%	58%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	52%	51%	59%	48%	50%
Science Achievement	52%	52%	51%	55%	45%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	68%	68%	72%	80%	70%	70%

<b>EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey</b>				
<b>Indicator</b>	<b>Grade Level (prior year reported)</b>			<b>Total</b>
	<b>6</b>	<b>7</b>	<b>8</b>	
	(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.**

<b>ELA</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
06	2019	55%	56%	-1%	54%	1%
	2018	50%	51%	-1%	52%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	46%	51%	-5%	52%	-6%
	2018	58%	51%	7%	51%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
08	2019	58%	58%	0%	56%	2%
	2018	60%	58%	2%	58%	2%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

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

<b>SCIENCE</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
08	2019	49%	54%	-5%	48%	1%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	58%	53%	5%	50%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						

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

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	67%	70%	-3%	71%	-4%
2018	70%	71%	-1%	71%	-1%
Compare		-3%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	99%	60%	39%	61%	38%
2018	99%	63%	36%	62%	37%
Compare		0%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	62%	-62%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	60%	-60%	56%	-56%
Compare		0%			

**Subgroup Data**

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	18	40	42	31	48	47	14	33	44		
ELL	20	50	47	60	78						

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
ASN	73	64		91	83			80	100		
BLK	27	53		38	53	50	9				
HSP	45	47	37	64	65	55	47	62	44		
MUL	63	50		59	57	64	8	100			
WHT	55	52	46	70	68	57	56	68	63		
FRL	41	45	44	55	60	52	38	56	50		
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	25	44	43	37	48	38	34	53	27		
ELL	19	33	30	57	62						
ASN	67	58		81	75		67	90	67		
BLK	39	41		55	56						
HSP	49	48	43	68	62	44	68	73	50		
MUL	52	50	60	67	58	55	56	86	50		
WHT	59	53	46	70	63	56	60	72	63		
FRL	48	48	42	60	59	52	56	66	43		
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	21	37	27	34	56	46	20	49	29		
ELL	35	44	50	50	70						
ASN	79	79		83	80						
BLK	33	29		73	71						
HSP	49	54	38	62	70	71	43	74	58		
MUL	51	53	45	61	66	50	58	69	54		
WHT	61	56	41	72	70	56	56	80	55		
FRL	50	52	39	63	66	57	46	71	39		

### ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	73
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	598
Total Components for the Federal Index	10

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
Percent Tested	99%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	55
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	82
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	38
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	52
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	57
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	59
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	49
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.**

ELA and math for SWD showed the lowest performance, specifically in 7th grade in 2018-19. This cohort has historically lagged behind other groups in proficiency/learning gains. There are also not as many SWD in accelerated courses. We did not get new state data for this cohort during the 2019-20 SY. SWD in Adv Science, English, and US History scored the same or better than non-SWD peers based on District Quarterly Checks throughout the year.

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

7th grade ELA learning gains and science achievement both showed a significant drop from 2018 to 2019. Both areas were below the district average. We did not have new state data for the 2019-20 SY.

**Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.**

ELA growth of the lowest 25% had the greatest gap when comparing school to state by 3% in 2019. We did 3% better than the state average. A contributing factor would be enrollment of all SWD in the SBP program into intensive reading classes to focus on fundamental reading skills during the 2018-19 and 2019-20 school years. We do not have new state data for the 2019-20 SY.

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



8th grade math showed an increase of 11% in 2019. We attribute this to teachers regularly utilizing state test specifications to determine the rigor of standards and assessment strategies to align their instructional practices and assessment to standard expectations. We do not have new state data for the 2019-20 SY.

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

An area of concern continues to be the number of suspensions, for all students, including SWD and black students. Continuing to explore alternatives to suspension and implementing SEL practices will be priorities for 2020-21.

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

1. High Impact Instruction: 100% of PLCs/teachers will intentionally plan, deliver literacy-rich lessons that are aligned to the rigor of the standards, and monitor student mastery of the essential standards as evidenced by FSA/EOC, Quarterly Assessments, CFAs and IPG walk through.
2. Data Driven Decisions: Second Chance Learning/Preparation Opportunities, alignment of standards-based instruction, intervention and assessment will result in a decrease of the number of students earning a “D” or “F” by 5% (from quarter to quarter per year) based on myEWS and myStudent data. (EOY 2018-112 students needing recovery, 364 courses needing recovery, 10 potential 8.5 students, 2 retained; EOY-2019-31 students needing recovery, 84 courses needing recovery, 6 potential 8.5 students, 0 retained)
3. Collaborative Culture: Increase student and staff engagement by fostering a “Culture of Caring” within the RRMS community as evidenced by a decrease in the number of students earning ODRs by 5% based on myEWS and myStudent data. (EOY 2018-339 students with referrals, 1256 total referrals; EOY 2019-286 students with referrals, 930 total referrals)
4. Collaborative Culture: Increase student achievement with focus on Students with Disabilities (SWD) specifically Social Behavioral Program reducing SBP ODRs and increase student proficiency on FSA/EOC, Quarterly Assessments by 5%, as evidenced by blended learning standards-based teaching strategies, PBIS strategies, implementing a 6 Level System and trauma informed care.

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

### **Areas of Focus:**

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**  
 High Impact Instruction:  
 In evaluating our data, we want to see continued increase in learning gains in all content areas, especially for SWD. Based on stakeholder feedback through CNA and BPIE, we believe our work during the last 2 years on PLC Q1 and Q2 with a focus on essential standard identification, instruction, and monitoring through CFA's is at a well developed level in all PLC's. We will continue to provide support on Q1 and Q2, but stakeholders are now asking for more PD on Q3 and Q4 as we dive deeper into intervention and enrichment planning to extend learning.

**Overall Data Strengths Summary:**  
 -EWS: High Percentage of students on track with attendance and discipline  
 -Gallup: Increase in all areas including employee and student engagement  
 -Quarterlies: Advanced ELA (6th), Advanced US History, Advanced Science for all students outperformed the district and last year's result  
 -Above 90% in Promotion Status for each grade level  
 -IPG: 100% Core Action 1  
 -SBP referrals have decreased by 24% from last year to this year due to tightened level system, individualized behavior plans and incentives, and PLC collaboration by staff

**Measurable Outcome:** 100% of PLCs/teachers will intentionally plan, deliver literacy-rich lessons that are aligned to the rigor of the standards, and monitor student mastery of the essential standards as evidenced by FSA/EOC, Quarterly Assessments, CFAs and IPG walk through.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Angie Murphy (amurphy@pasco.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**  
 Focus priority days and what they might look like school-wide within PLCs for particular standard/learning goal.; All Advanced 6th grade and 7th grade course work (mindset, differentiation); increase focus on engagement strategies (CASEL Practices, Core Action 2/3)  
 • Book Study with 7th grade teachers – Detracking for Excellence and Equity & 6th grade and interested staff Shift This! Shifting from compliance to learning (Baumaister) and additional training UDL, differentiation for all learners (Opportunity Myth)  
 • Leadership Team will be reading and reflecting on Leading with Intention: 8 Areas of Reflection and Planning in Your PLC at Work (summer and through out year)  
 • Continue with Core Action 2 through mini-workshops to increase opportunities for staff showcasing of questioning techniques and student collaboration opportunities.  
 • Refine PLC Notebooks in Sharepoint including documents, articles, and videos from Solution Tree  
 • Focus PD and PLC conversations on PLC Q3 and Q4.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**  
 In evaluating our data, we want to see continued increase in learning gains in all content areas, especially for SWD. Based on stakeholder feedback through CNA and BPIE, we believe our work during the last 2 years on PLC Q1 and Q2 with a focus on essential standard identification, instruction, and monitoring through CFA's is at a well developed level in all PLC's. We will continue to provide support on Q1 and Q2, but stakeholders are now asking for more PD on Q3 and Q4 as we dive deeper into intervention and enrichment planning to extend learning.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. PLC's will plan instructional units, and create CFA's based on essential standards and level of rigor. PLCs will implement the TTAC throughout the year.
2. Teachers will collaborate on essential standards, expected outcomes, and reflect on data with students through posted learning targets, student-friendly scales, reflection/feedback forms and conferencing.
3. Every lesson will include opportunities for students to read, write, think and talk using grade-level text and research-based best practices.
4. PLCs will analyze quarterly data utilizing the Quarterly Data Chat Protocol, implement a school-wide data tracker using comprehension checks and Achieve 3000 monthly checks.
5. After an assessments, PLCs will determine to whom, how, when and what TIER 2 interventions will be provided and document in their PLC notebooks.
6. Professional Development will focus on implementing the TTAC, CA 2 and using Unify/Zipgrade to pull and analyze data based on essential standards for intervention and enrichment.

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

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**

At the end of the 2018-19 SY, 112 students needed promotion recovery. A significant number of students are meeting standard expectations on quarterly checks, district finals, and other benchmark assessments. We used that data to drive the focus in 2019-2020 SY in PLCs to ensure that lesson planning, instructional planning and assessment was more closely aligned to the rigor of standards and that grading practices continued to transition to standards based grading with increased opportunities for Second Chance Learning to demonstrate mastery.

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

-EWS: Course performance varies from progress reports to report cards (high off track at mid-check – Quarter 3)  
 -FSA: SWD (ELA 18%, Math 31%) and Black (ELA 27%, Math 38%) Achievement is below 41%  
 -Quarterlies: 8th Grade Math, Science, ELA below district averages; SWD making growth but lack proficiency  
 -Majority of students in Intensive Reading and Course Recovery are SWD/504  
 -SWDs (212): This group has historically lagged behind other groups in proficiency/made strides in learning gains in school-wide FSA learning gains and on 6th and 7th grade quarterly checks. In math, proficiency has decreased in FSA math but learning gains increased and on 6th and 7th grade quarterly checks. Did not meet the ESSA proficiency requirements 2019 (41%) This group is also off track in discipline (mainstream students account for 2 of the 27 students off track) due to SBP program however there are have been major decreases in the number of referrals in the program.  
 FRL/ED (607): At Risk for course performance/discipline, FSSA science proficiency low  
 Black (30): At Risk for discipline, FSA ELA and FSSA science proficiency low  
 Hispanic (157): Majority on track in all areas for EWS, FSA ELA L25% low  
 ELL/LEP (20): Majority on track in all areas for EWS, FSA ELA achievement low  
 -Above 90% in Promotion Status for each grade level

**Measurable Outcome:**

• Data Driven Decisions: Second Chance Learning/Preparation Opportunities, alignment of standards-based instruction, intervention and assessment will result in a decrease of the number of students earning a “D” or “F” by 5% (from quarter to quarter per year) based on myEWS and myStudent data.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Danielle White (dmwright@pasco.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

• Data Driven Decisions: Deepen understanding of SCLO and the difference between re-takes and re-learning based on standards. Explore school-wide alternative academic intervention options and aligning interventions to embedded instruction. Look deeper into the use of Knight Time of daily intervention for how it can be used more effectively school-wide.  
 • Continue with Core Action 2/3 work, PLC-focus modeling  
 -Question sequencing/intentionally planned questions  
 -Intentional Engagement and Collaboration strategies  
 -Transition from teacher moves to student actions to enhance and deepen teacher understanding through IPG and classroom modeling  
 • PLC Planning Time: Continue with essential standards work, CFAs, include SCLO/Tier 2 intervention  
 -Refine PLC Notebooks in Sharepoint – utilize weekly (how to use and expectations

session)

-Intentionally planned questioning, engagement/collaboration in the way of teacher actions vs. student actions (Core Action 2/3) and using student work to reinforce the purpose of lesson

-Focus on PLC Questions 3 and 4 (before the assessment)

**Rationale**

**for**

**Evidence-based**

**Strategy:**

Teachers will need to receive PD and coaching on how to determine will, skill, and enrichment needs. Teachers will then need the resources listed above to provide interventions and enrichment opportunities through flexible scheduling.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Full grade-level teams will meet bi-weekly to collect, analyze and build support plans for at risk and off-track students based on all factors. PLCs will meeting weekly to analyze data to build in supports through "Knight Time" intervention and in class means.
2. Build understanding of SCLO, standards recovery, and alternative assessment through PR and sharing effective strategies within PLCs and GLTs.
3. Weekly Student Success Team meetings and bi-weekly MTSS meetings to engage in problem solving cycle and monitor lowest 35% with SIT team.
4. Quarterly data chats with students and MTSS members to build relationships and review academic/behavioral data and goal setting. Communicate outcomes with stakeholders.
5. Monthly whole-school lessons on executive functioning, character ed, and mindfulness.

**Person**

**Responsible**

Danielle White (dmwright@pasco.k12.fl.us)

**#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**

While we did have a reduction in ODR's from 2018 to 2019 SY's, there is still concern about the amount of instructional time lost due to disruption, processing, and consequences related to the ODR's. Also, there is concern from all stakeholders, evidenced in the Gallup and other sources, that behaviors resulting in ODR's maybe due to a disconnect between expectations, understanding of trauma, SEL practices, and relationship building. We need to utilize the the Clifton Strengths, SEL trainings, trauma informed care, PBIS rewards system, and TIERS of intervention to clarify expectations, build relationships, and implement restorative practices.

**Area of**

**Focus**

Staff, and Student Engagement Data (Gallup and other engagement data)

**Description and**

-Areas of strength are: I know what is expected of me at work. (4.18 +.21), In the last six months, someone at

**Rationale:**

work has talked to me about my progress. (3.73 +.26)

-Areas for growth are: At work, my opinion seems to count. (3.18) I have the materials and equipment I need to do my work right. (3.31)

Briefly discuss student engagement strengths and areas for growth

-Areas of strength are: The adults at my school care about me. (3.92), My teachers make me feel my schoolwork is important. (4.03)

-Areas for growth are: At school, I get to do what I do best every day. (3.52) I have fun at school. (3.38)

**Measurable Outcome:**

- Collaborative Culture: Increase student and staff engagement by fostering a “Culture of Caring” within the RRMS community as evidenced by a decrease in the number of students earning ODRs by 5% based on myEWS and myStudent data.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Alex Astone (aastone@pasco.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

- Collaboration: Deepen Strengths work with staff and PLCs through coaching sessions, explore use of strengths work with students to determine their talents and what they are best at, continue building collective commitments to promote value that all students can learn at a high level with the right supports (mindset) through heterogenous groups of students.
- Trauma Informed Care Training for All Staff
- SBP support with integration of ELA (current) and Math through Pasco eSchool to provide supports in implementation both with technical (myStudent/myLearning platforms) and instructional practices
- PBIS build “pillars of support” beyond guiding coalition
- Strengthen the purpose and practices in Knight Time: structures, monitoring, school-wide intervention days, develop academic ATS with zero tolerance for failure (RTI at Work)
- Implementation of a mentor program with student and adult mentors.
- Explore Parent Conference Nights in to build relationships with families.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

While we did have a reduction in ODR's from 2018 to 2019 SY's, there is still concern about the amount of instructional time lost due to disruption, processing, and consequences related to the ODR's. Also, there is concern from all stakeholders, evidenced in the Gallup and other sources, that behaviors resulting in ODR's maybe due to a disconnect between expectations, understanding of trauma, SEL practices, and relationship building. We need to utilize the the Clifton Strengths, SEL trainings, trauma

informed care, PBIS rewards system, and TIERS of intervention to clarify expectations, build relationships, and implement restorative practices.

### Action Steps to Implement

1. School-wide behavior intervention plan with on-ramps for team-based decision-making will focus on how to exhibit the Knightly Values, restorative practices and mindfulness including Royal Rewards for on track and students making growth in academics, behavior, and attendance.
2. Behavior Intervention Team will be created with SST and behavior specialist to address students with multiple early warning risk factors.
3. "Knight Time" lessons to focus on mindfulness and character education.
4. Engage staff in PD on strengths and how to use their own and understand other's within PLCs.
5. Use "Principal's Weekly Message" and Staff S'more to communicate with stakeholders on multiple social media platforms and update stakeholders on progress towards SIP goals, staff and student accomplishments/highlights, and other important information.

**Person Responsible** Alex Astone (aastone@pasco.k12.fl.us)



**#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Date review of course performance, standardized tests, quarterly checks, IRLA, Achieve 3000, and ODR's, indicates a need for more specialized PD in the area of understanding and assisting SWD academically and behaviorally. Data indicated that SWD are lagging behind their peers in mainstreamed and self contained classes.

- SWDs (212): This group has historically lagged behind other groups in proficiency/made strides in learning gains in school-wide FSA learning gains and on 6th and 7th grade quarterly checks. In math, proficiency has decreased in FSA math but learning gains increased and on 6th and 7th grade quarterly checks. Did not meet the ESSA proficiency requirements 2019 (41%) This group is also off track in discipline (mainstream students account for 2 of the 27 students off track) due to SBP program however there are have been major decreases in the number of referrals in the program.
- FRL/ED (607): At Risk for course performance/discipline, FSSA science proficiency low
- Black (30): At Risk for discipline, FSA ELA and FSSA science proficiency low
- Hispanic (157): Majority on track in all areas for EWS, FSA ELA L25% low
- ELL/LEP (20): Majority on track in all areas for EWS, FSA ELA achievement low

**Measurable Outcome:** Collaborative Culture: Increase student achievement with focus on Students with Disabilities (SWD) specifically Social Behavioral Program reducing SBP ODRs and increase student proficiency on FSA/EOC, Quarterly Assessments by 5%, as evidenced by blended learning standards-based teaching strategies, PBIS strategies, implementing a 6 Level System and trauma informed care.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Kevin Kolean (kkolean@pasco.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** We will utilize PBIS strategies, team teach and assessment cycle, PLC questions, SEL and trauma informed care training.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Date review of course performance, standardized tests, quarterly checks, IRLA, Achieve 3000, and ODR's, indicates a need for more specialized PD in the area of understanding and assisting SWD academically and behaviorally. Data indicated that SWD are lagging behind their peers in mainstreamed and self contained classes.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Teacher PLC's will plan instructional units, create common formative/summative assessments based on essential standards and level of rigor. PLCs will implement the TTAC multiple times throughout a quarter.
2. Teachers will share standards, expected outcomes, and student data with students through posted learning targets and scales, reflection forms/conferences.
3. Read, write, think, talk opportunities will be included in every lesson, everyday using grade level texts and research based strategies.
4. PLC members will analyze quarterly check data using the Data Chat Protocol.
5. After assessments, PLCs will determine who, how, when an what materials will be used for TIER 2 remediation and SCLO.
6. PD will focus on building expertise in standards-based grading and assessment, utilizing APEX for SCLO, differentiated instruction and SEL strategies.
7. SBP community building and continuity of expectations, levels ad interventions for all will be implemented.

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



## Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

**An area of concern continues to be the number of suspensions, for all students, including SWD and black students. The School leadership team will continue to explore alternatives to suspension and implementing SEL practices will be priorities for 2020-21.**