

Volusia County Schools

River Springs Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement | 17 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 23 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

River Springs Middle School

900 W OHIO AVE, Orange City, FL 32763

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/riverspringsmiddle/pages/default.aspx>

Demographics

Principal: Thomas Vaughan W

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2011

| | |
|--|--|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Middle School 6-8 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2019-20 Title I School | No |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 89% |
| 2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: C (52%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southeast |
| Regional Executive Director | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield |
| 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 Volusia County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement | 17 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

River Springs Middle School

900 W OHIO AVE, Orange City, FL 32763

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/riverspringsmiddle/pages/default.aspx>

School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Middle School 6-8 | No | 63% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 36% |

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia 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.

At River Springs Middle School, all students will move forward career and college ready.

Provide the school's vision statement.

River Springs Middle School will provide an inclusive school community committed to academic excellence.

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 |
|--------------------|---------------------|---|
| Gotlib, Stacy | Principal | Facilitate school leadership meetings, facilitate data analysis in PLC's, monitor SIP progress |
| Marchione, Lauren | Instructional Coach | Facilitate data analysis during PLC's, monitor SIP progress, participate in school leadership meetings, provide professional learning and support for teacher-led small group instruction |
| Beery, Brenda | Assistant Principal | Facilitate data analysis during PLC's, monitor SIP progress, participate in school leadership meetings |
| McLeod, Debbie | Teacher, K-12 | Mixed media teacher, monitor SIP progress, participate in school leadership meetings |
| Mohr, Jennifer | Teacher, K-12 | Math Teacher, facilitate data analysis during PLC's, monitor SIP progress, participate in school leadership meetings |
| Parker, Susan | Teacher, K-12 | Science Teacher, facilitate data analysis during PLC's, monitor SIP progress, participate in school leadership meetings |
| Harper, Jacob | Teacher, K-12 | Social Studies teacher, facilitate data analysis during PLC's, monitor SIP progress, participate in school leadership meetings |
| Ezell, Candace | Assistant Principal | Facilitate data analysis during PLC's, monitor SIP progress, participate in school leadership meetings |
| Fratus, Melissa | Assistant Principal | Facilitate data analysis during PLC's, monitor SIP progress, participate in school leadership meetings |
| Robertson, Trish | Teacher, K-12 | Science teacher, facilitate data analysis during PLC's, monitor SIP progress, participate in school leadership meetings |
| Hurtado, Jose | Teacher, ESE | ESE teacher, facilitate data analysis during PLC's, monitor SIP progress, participate in school leadership meetings |
| Darby, John | Instructional Media | Media/DLTL teacher, facilitate data analysis during PLC's, monitor SIP progress, participate in school leadership meetings |
| Salisbury, Shannon | Dean | Dean of Student Relations, facilitate data analysis during PLC's, monitor SIP progress, participate in school leadership meetings |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2011, Thomas Vaughan W

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.*

55

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

20

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

77

Demographic Data

| | |
|--|--|
| 2020-21 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Middle School 6-8 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2019-20 Title I School | No |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 89% |
| 2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: C (52%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southeast |
| Regional Executive Director | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield |

| | |
|--|------|
| 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 | 360 | 374 | 375 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1109 | |
| 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 | 11 | 7 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 3 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 55 | 71 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 196 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 58 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 208 | |

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 | 15 | 7 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|---|----|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 2 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 | |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/28/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|------|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 436 | 430 | 381 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1247 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 49 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 148 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 11 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | |
| 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 | 100 | 131 | 121 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 352 | |

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 | 19 | 22 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | |

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Prior Year - Updated

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|------|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 436 | 430 | 381 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1247 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 54 | 49 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 148 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 11 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | |
| 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 | 100 | 131 | 121 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 352 | |

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 | 19 | 22 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 | |

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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 | 52% | 51% | 54% | 51% | 51% | 52% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 48% | 51% | 54% | 49% | 53% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 37% | 42% | 47% | 37% | 40% | 44% |
| Math Achievement | 56% | 54% | 58% | 59% | 53% | 56% |
| Math Learning Gains | 47% | 51% | 57% | 51% | 53% | 57% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 39% | 42% | 51% | 40% | 42% | 50% |
| Science Achievement | 60% | 58% | 51% | 64% | 59% | 50% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 72% | 71% | 72% | 72% | 71% | 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 | 52% | 50% | 2% | 54% | -2% |
| | 2018 | 51% | 48% | 3% | 52% | -1% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 47% | 47% | 0% | 52% | -5% |
| | 2018 | 47% | 47% | 0% | 51% | -4% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 52% | 50% | 2% | 56% | -4% |
| | 2018 | 53% | 56% | -3% | 58% | -5% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 5% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2019 | 52% | 48% | 4% | 55% | -3% |
| | 2018 | 59% | 49% | 10% | 52% | 7% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 07 | 2019 | 51% | 47% | 4% | 54% | -3% |
| | 2018 | 46% | 44% | 2% | 54% | -8% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -8% | | | | |
| 08 | 2019 | 17% | 29% | -12% | 46% | -29% |
| | 2018 | 34% | 37% | -3% | 45% | -11% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -17% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -29% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2019 | 58% | 57% | 1% | 48% | 10% |
| | 2018 | 62% | 60% | 2% | 50% | 12% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |
| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 69% | 68% | 1% | 71% | -2% |
| 2018 | 63% | 66% | -3% | 71% | -8% |
| Compare | | 6% | | | |
| 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 | 82% | 54% | 28% | 61% | 21% |

| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2018 | 93% | 57% | 36% | 62% | 31% |
| Compare | | -11% | | | |
| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019 | 90% | 55% | 35% | 57% | 33% |
| 2018 | 95% | 55% | 40% | 56% | 39% |
| Compare | | -5% | | | |

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 | 14 | 35 | 34 | 20 | 32 | 30 | 23 | 37 | 50 | | |
| ELL | 25 | 41 | 36 | 34 | 45 | 46 | 24 | 50 | 67 | | |
| ASN | 54 | 46 | | 75 | 50 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 31 | 35 | 28 | 36 | 35 | 22 | 40 | 50 | | | |
| HSP | 46 | 48 | 43 | 47 | 48 | 53 | 57 | 68 | 68 | | |
| MUL | 61 | 62 | 27 | 55 | 31 | | 43 | 82 | | | |
| WHT | 55 | 49 | 37 | 61 | 49 | 38 | 64 | 75 | 85 | | |
| FRL | 42 | 45 | 36 | 45 | 44 | 38 | 48 | 62 | 75 | | |
| 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 | 15 | 29 | 29 | 23 | 40 | 33 | 31 | 25 | 50 | | |
| ELL | 16 | 41 | 42 | 31 | 51 | 38 | 27 | 39 | | | |
| ASN | 48 | 68 | | 81 | 82 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 31 | 34 | 24 | 36 | 39 | 29 | 52 | 44 | 75 | | |
| HSP | 46 | 49 | 50 | 53 | 57 | 45 | 55 | 62 | 62 | | |
| MUL | 59 | 48 | | 71 | 45 | | | 57 | | | |
| WHT | 55 | 48 | 35 | 64 | 51 | 45 | 68 | 67 | 79 | | |
| FRL | 43 | 45 | 38 | 51 | 49 | 42 | 57 | 56 | 69 | | |
| 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 | 9 | 29 | 29 | 17 | 34 | 31 | 18 | 34 | | | |
| ELL | 15 | 38 | 39 | 28 | 38 | 36 | 47 | 40 | 50 | | |
| ASN | 57 | 35 | | 78 | 61 | | 80 | | 100 | | |
| BLK | 37 | 46 | 41 | 39 | 43 | 33 | 44 | 58 | 55 | | |
| HSP | 44 | 53 | 42 | 51 | 47 | 42 | 60 | 70 | 54 | | |
| MUL | 54 | 46 | 27 | 51 | 51 | | 67 | 80 | 71 | | |
| WHT | 54 | 49 | 35 | 62 | 53 | 39 | 66 | 74 | 74 | | |

| 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 |
| FRL | 40 | 46 | 37 | 48 | 47 | 40 | 53 | 67 | 57 | | |

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 | 54 |
| 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 | 42 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 535 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 10 |
| Percent Tested | 98% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|-----|
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 30 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 2 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 41 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| 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 | 56 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Black/African American Students | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 35 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 53 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Multiracial Students | |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 52 |
| 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 | 54 |
| 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 | 48 |
| 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 lowest quartile demonstrated the lowest performance. Contributing factors include the number of new teachers and teacher vacancies.

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

Math learning gains showed the greatest decline from the previous year. During the 2018-2019 school year, due to health issues, there was a serious attendance issue for one of our pre-algebra teachers. There were also new teachers and vacancies in the Math department.

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.

Math lowest quartile showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average. There were serious attendance issues for one of our pre-algebra teachers during the 2018-2019 school year due to health issues. We also had new teachers and vacancies in the Math department.

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

The data components that showed the most improvement were 7th grade Civics and Middle School Acceleration. The Civics teachers collaborated during PLC sessions to develop standards-based lessons and assessments. Civics bootcamps were provided to 7th grade students. More offerings for high school credit attributed to the Middle School Acceleration data.

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

A potential area of concern is the number of students scoring a level 1 on the state-wide assessments.

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

1. ELA Learning Gains of the Lowest 25%
2. Mathematics Learning Gains of the Lowest 25%
3. Social Emotional Learning

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: ELA Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% impacts student learning as the sub-group of the student population who may need the highest levels of intervention to improve their state-wide assessment scores. Our data showed that only 37% of our lowest quartile students made learning gains on the 2019 ELA FSA.

Measurable Outcome: Increase ELA Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% from 37% to 45%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Stacy Gotlib (sjgotlib@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Utilize teacher-led small groups, both in person and virtually, with respect to CDC guidelines.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Small Group Instruction has a .49 effect size according to John Hattie. FL Center for Reading Research (FCRR) and Just Read Florida recommend small group instruction to help differentiated core instruction and provide intervention for struggling students in a timely manner.

Action Steps to Implement

Review Lowest Quartile Data to finalize master schedule focused on proper placement of students for ESE and ESOL support.

Person Responsible Stacy Gotlib (sjgotlib@volusia.k12.fl.us)

PLC's will choose/develop common formative and summative assessments.

Person Responsible Lauren Marchione (lemarchi@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Once a month during PLC's, Data Chats will be focused on reviewing student groupings and planning for interventions including our ESSA subgroups (ESE and African American).

Person Responsible Stacy Gotlib (sjgotlib@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Identify model classrooms for learning walks.

Person Responsible Stacy Gotlib (sjgotlib@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct learning walks during small group instruction that adheres to CDC guidelines.

Person Responsible Stacy Gotlib (sjgotlib@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitor small group instruction that adheres to CDC guidelines through ongoing Administrative walkthroughs and feedback.

Person Responsible Stacy Gotlib (sjgotlib@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Coach will utilize coaching cycles to support teacher growth in small group instruction that adheres to CDC guidelines.

Person Responsible Lauren Marchione (lemarchi@volusia.k12.fl.us)

SLT members will conduct monthly progress monitoring meetings to review data and support services to plan instruction.

Person Responsible Stacy Gotlib (sjgotlib@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitor learning walk data and provide feedback to teachers through PLC's.

Person Responsible Stacy Gotlib (sjgotlib@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct Collaborative Planning sessions quarterly focused on developing teacher knowledge and skills in standards-based instruction to meet the needs of all students including our ESSA subgroups (ESE and African American).

Person Responsible Stacy Gotlib (sjgotlib@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Plan and Implement Small Group Instruction both in person and virtually, with respect to CDC guidelines.

Person Responsible Stacy Gotlib (sjgotlib@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Plan and implement differentiated instruction.

Person Responsible Lauren Marchione (lemarchi@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Plan, implement, and monitor differentiation and engagement strategies while maintaining social distance.

Person Responsible Stacy Gotlib (sjgotlib@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Effective Progress Monitoring with Brick & Mortar and Volusia Live students.

Person Responsible Stacy Gotlib (sjgotlib@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Differentiated Instruction strategies will be taught to teachers during Coaching Cycles, Professional Learning Communities and Faculty Meetings.

Person Responsible Lauren Marchione (lemarchi@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Small group teaching strategies will be taught to teachers during Coaching Cycles, Professional Learning Communities and Faculty Meetings.

Person Responsible Lauren Marchione (lemarchi@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Math Learning Gains of the Lowest 25% impacts student learning as the sub-group of the student population who may need the highest levels of intervention to improve their state-wide assessment scores. Our data showed that only 39% of our lowest quartile students made learning gains on the 2019 Math FSA.

Measurable Outcome: Increase Math Learning Gains of the lowest 25% from 39% to 49%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Brenda Beery (blbeery@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Utilize teacher-led small groups, both in person and virtually, with respect to CDC guidelines.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Small Group Instruction has a .49 effect size according to John Hattie. According to Cohen et.al, highly effective Math instructional strategies involve partner and small group discussions and teacher prompting and modeling of meta-cognitive questioning. According to Rimm-Kaufman, La Paro, Downer & Pianta, research also states that students show higher behavioral engagement when the teacher is present, versus when they are left to work on their own.

Action Steps to Implement

Review lowest quartile data to finalize master schedule focused on proper placement of students for ESE and ESOL support.

Person Responsible Brenda Beery (blbeery@volusia.k12.fl.us)

PLC's will choose/develop common formative and summative assessments.

Person Responsible Lauren Marchione (lemarchi@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct PLC's on a monthly basis that include data chats focused on reviewing student groupings and planning for interventions including our ESSA subgroups (ESE and African American).

Person Responsible Brenda Beery (blbeery@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Identify model classrooms for learning walks.

Person Responsible Brenda Beery (blbeery@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct learning walks during small group instruction that adheres to CDC guidelines.

Person Responsible Brenda Beery (blbeery@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitor small group instruction that adheres to CDC guidelines through ongoing Administrative walkthroughs and feedback.

Person Responsible Brenda Beery (blbeery@volusia.k12.fl.us)

SLT members will conduct monthly progress monitoring meetings to review data and support services to plan instruction.

Person Responsible Stacy Gotlib (sjgotlib@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitor learning walk data and provide feedback to teachers through PLC's.

Person Responsible Lauren Marchione (lemarchi@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Conduct Collaborative Planning sessions monthly focused on developing teacher knowledge and skills in standards-based instruction to meet the needs of all students including our ESSA subgroups (ESE and African American).

Person Responsible Brenda Beery (blbeery@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Plan, implement, and monitor differentiation and engagement strategies while maintaining social distance.

Person Responsible Lauren Marchione (lemarchi@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Effective Progress Monitoring with Brick & Mortar and Volusia Live students.

Person Responsible Brenda Beery (blbeery@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Differentiated Instruction strategies will be taught to teachers during Coaching Cycles, Professional Learning Communities and Faculty Meetings.

Person Responsible Lauren Marchione (lemarchi@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Small group teaching strategies will be taught to teachers during Coaching Cycles, Professional Learning Communities and Faculty Meetings.

Person Responsible Lauren Marchione (lemarchi@volusia.k12.fl.us)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Increase in Social Emotional Learning based on the need for a decrease in discipline referrals and understanding of our students' needs to more effectively impact their learning.

Measurable Outcome: Decrease referrals by 5%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Shannon Salisbury (sjsalisb@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Utilizing restorative practices and implementing SEL instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: According to Casel, Social Emotional Learning helps children and adults understand and manage emotions, set and achieve positive goals, feel and show empathy for others, establish and maintain positive relationships, and make responsible decisions.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide strategies for students to resolve conflicts.

Person Responsible Trae Weiss (tmweiss@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Identify model classrooms to allow teachers to observe effective classroom management strategies.

Person Responsible Shannon Salisbury (sjsalisb@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Identify students receiving the most discipline referrals and developing action plans to support those students.

Person Responsible Shannon Salisbury (sjsalisb@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Guidance will implement structured curriculum modules for SEL.

Person Responsible Shannon Salisbury (sjsalisb@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitor progress of identified students during bi-weekly Guidance Roundups (PLC).

Person Responsible Shannon Salisbury (sjsalisb@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Use Restorative Practices to provide strategies for students to resolve conflicts.

Person Responsible Shannon Salisbury (sjsalisb@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Administration and teachers will demonstrate flexibility with instruction, expected outcomes, and heightened emotional states of their peers and students.

Person Responsible Shannon Salisbury (sjsalisb@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Restorative Practice trainings will be conducted during Coaching Cycles, Professional Learning Communities, and Faculty Meetings.

Person Responsible Candace Ezell (clezell@volusia.k12.fl.us)

SEL instruction components will be taught to teachers during Coaching Cycles, Professional Learning Communities and Faculty Meetings.

Person Responsible Shannon Salisbury (sjsalisb@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

River Springs Middle School will address the area of concern of the number of students scoring a level 1 on the state-wide assessments by elevating the capacity in which students make an internal investment in their educational growth, utilizing research-based practices that follow state adopted standards within a specific content area, and by providing timely and targeted feedback that is actionable to build teachers' capacity to influence student achievement within an area of practice.

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.

River Springs Middle School creates engagement opportunities for faculty and staff that demonstrate both appreciation for their pursuit of high levels of student achievement and the importance of fostering a culture that celebrates each student as an individual. Common Planning, Professional Learning Communities and Academic Coaching are essential practices utilized to help build positive, collaborative relationships on campus amongst teachers as well. Family and community involvement play a large role in the academic success of the students who attend River Springs Middle School. River Springs Middle School engages both families and the community at large by hosting special events that celebrate achievement of the school's students and the creative outlets produced by sports, clubs and electives. Local businesses such as Texas Roadhouse help to celebrate the achievement of students by offering both donations as incentives to be utilized as a means to recognize student achievement, as well as hosting school spirit nights where a portion of the proceeds are provided to the school to make a monetary donation to assist in finding unique ways to engage students in an effort to maximize student achievement.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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