



---

## 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>22</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>23</b>

# Rutherford High School

1000 SCHOOL AVE, Panama City, FL 32401

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

**Principal: Robert Mitchell**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2011

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<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: C (44%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (46%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Rachel Heide</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	N/A
<b>Support Tier</b>	N/A
<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 was approved by the Bay County School Board on 10/13/2020.

## 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>23</b>

# Rutherford High School

1000 SCHOOL AVE, Panama City, FL 32401

[ no web address on file ]

## 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)
High School 6-12	Yes	100%
<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	58%

## 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>	C	C	C	C

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Bay County School Board on 10/13/2020.

## 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.**

##### Mission Statement

The mission of Rutherford 6-12 School is to meet the diverse needs of all students by providing challenging, rigorous and relevant curriculum in an engaging, caring, and positive learning environment. To this end, all Rutherford staff, in cooperation with parents and community, will challenge all students to act with honesty and integrity as they develop a natural curiosity for the world around them and become productive, responsible, and accountable members of society in pursuit of excellence.

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

##### Vision

We at Rutherford believe that:

All students can learn, achieve and succeed. Students, teachers, and staff are entitled to a safe, clean environment conducive to teaching and learning. Teachers, administrators, parents, students and the community share the responsibility for advancing the school's mission.

Offering a challenging, relevant curriculum that involves all students will prepare them to succeed in a global, multicultural society. Maintaining partnerships with parents, community agencies, and local businesses will enhance the total educational experience.

Students benefit from a small community of learners and educators committed to professional growth, educational innovation, and technological advancement. All stakeholders are responsible for nurturing an environment of mutual trust and respect. Students who are "at risk" and need support are provided that environment by each teacher in each subject.

### 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
Pilson, Coy	Principal	
Banks, Andrea	Assistant Principal	
Mcpherson, Corrie	Teacher, K-12	
Carlisle, Millie	Teacher, ESE	
Harris, Alicia	School Counselor	
Gall, Margot	School Counselor	
Henry, Teresa	Teacher, K-12	
Addison, Sharee	Attendance/Social Work	
Threath, Jasmine	Teacher, K-12	
Robertson, Marly	Teacher, K-12	
Bryant, Angela	Teacher, K-12	

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Friday 7/1/2011, Robert Mitchell

**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.*

7

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

103

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners*



(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (44%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (46%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Rachel Heide</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	N/A
<b>Support Tier</b>	N/A
<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	202	205	144	235	212	189	139	1326
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	21	145	34	33	27	6	330
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	47	79	60	72	36	32	9	335
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	1	6	25	19	12	72
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	9	6	17	49	40	18	151
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	60	55	36	60	59	63	43	376
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	65	42	56	45	42	32	363
	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	80	65	54	74	63	58	32	426

**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	13	32	21	3	69
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	6	9	14	28	15	8	90

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Wednesday 7/29/2020

**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	223	172	180	246	252	162	196	1431
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	53	78	77	86	62	80	508
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	0	3	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4	15	20	18	7	80
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	66	67	57	99	63	61	499

**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	33	25	33	28	63	43	45	270

**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	1	1	2	12	13	11	5	45
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	11	4	15	19	12	14	84

**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	223	172	180	246	252	162	196	1431
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	72	53	78	77	86	62	80	508
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	3	0	3	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	4	15	20	18	7	80
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	66	67	57	99	63	61	499

**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	33	25	33	28	63	43	45	270

**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	1	1	2	12	13	11	5	45
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	11	4	15	19	12	14	84

**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	39%	57%	56%	37%	52%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	37%	49%	51%	33%	44%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	21%	35%	42%	30%	35%	41%
Math Achievement	33%	58%	51%	37%	58%	49%
Math Learning Gains	43%	53%	48%	52%	50%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	50%	45%	43%	48%	39%
Science Achievement	54%	74%	68%	53%	68%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	65%	76%	73%	66%	77%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey								
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

**Grade Level Data**

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	41%	58%	-17%	55%	-14%
	2018	33%	54%	-21%	53%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		41%				
10	2019	32%	53%	-21%	53%	-21%
	2018	43%	52%	-9%	53%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						

<b>BIOLOGY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	59%	71%	-12%	67%	-8%
2018	40%	64%	-24%	65%	-25%
Compare		19%			
<b>CIVICS EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019					
2018					
<b>HISTORY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	66%	74%	-8%	70%	-4%
2018	61%	73%	-12%	68%	-7%
Compare		5%			
<b>ALGEBRA EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	39%	64%	-25%	61%	-22%
2018	30%	64%	-34%	62%	-32%
Compare		9%			
<b>GEOMETRY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2019	31%	62%	-31%	57%	-26%
2018	40%	62%	-22%	56%	-16%
Compare		-9%			

**Subgroup Data**

<b>2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2017-18</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2017-18</b>
SWD	11	26	17	21	35	29	8	36		80	17
ELL	19	22	18	14	54						
ASN	47	40		55	64		75			90	44
BLK	26	28	18	25	38	36	30	56		72	15
HSP	18	27	10		29	38				67	
MUL	34	45		50	71		54	70		89	41
WHT	53	45	29	40	45	48	67	70		78	39
FRL	34	33	19	31	44	39	47	60		71	27

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	11	34	28	16	39	48	17	45		74	4
ELL	29	18		25							
ASN	67	64		50				60		82	
BLK	20	31	24	18	42	52	19	38		73	29
HSP	29	28		26	50		42	55		69	36
MUL	33	49		35	43		62	65		77	30
WHT	50	52	45	45	54	50	50	70		76	47
FRL	31	41	30	29	43	50	36	53		66	40
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	10	22	18	15	50	45	42	39		54	21
ASN	67	45		68	85		58	88		94	81
BLK	25	28	16	22	48	44	29	50		77	38
HSP	31	37	42	47	54		53	75		93	43
MUL	34	30		46	59		82	75		89	63
WHT	42	35	42	41	47	36	62	71		80	52
FRL	27	29	29	29	46	42	43	62		73	47

**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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	498
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	31
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	2
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	59
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	34
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	30
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Multiracial Students	
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	51
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	42
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.

In comparing school data from year to year, it is noticeable that the lowest 25th percentile decreased in ELA Achievement. There was also a 5% decrease in Math Learning Gains with the lowest 25th percentile. This data trend shows that emphasis was not placed on students who made up the lowest 25th percentile of the student population. Contributing factors, such as student placement, scheduling challenges, and the ELA Curriculum with many adjustments could have impacted these findings. Another contributing factor could have been the absence of identifying students within the lowest 25th percentile and providing intensive supports to help them show mastery of the grade level standards in ELA and Math.

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

More than five identified subgroups showed a decrease in the percentage of learning gains or achievement in ELA, Math, Graduation and Acceleration. The most alarming is the students with disabilities. According to the subgroup data, these students showed a decrease in all content areas, which speaks to possible ineffective, less rigorous instructional delivery in all content areas, with the use of specific accommodations.

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

The Lowest 25th percentile in ELA showed the greatest gap in achievement as compared to the state averages. This is evident when comparing year to year also. There was a 21 point difference in one year and 14 point difference in the other. Together, the ELA Lowest 25th percentile showed a decrease by 35 points, which presents the lowest achievement area from all subgroups. This could have been the inconsistency in some courses using Achieve 3000, others using components of the ELA pacing guide, and some not exposing students to higher-order thinking questioning format in preparation for the state assessment.

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

Science achievement as observed in the comparison data from school, district, and state. The data indicates an increase of 13 points in Science Achievement. This was the greatest amount of growth seen in all data displays. Currently, the school data shows a difference of 20 points when compared to the district and 14 points difference when compared to the state, which gives an overall increase from the previous year where the school was 26 points from the district and state. There are many things that could have contributed to this spike in performance. One major factor to acknowledge



would be the alignment between the Science Pacing Guides and the scheduling of science assessments, used by the entire department. The results of the common assessments were shared among science team members, which was much different than previous years.

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

After entering and reviewing the data from the EWS, the area of most concern is the number of students scoring a Level 1 on statewide assessments. There are a total of 499 students in this category. The cohort groups that are most alarming at the 11th and 8th grade groups. This is relevant to the projected graduation rates because 63 students are now a part of the senior class, who scored a Level 1 on statewide assessments. As many requirements are factored into graduation, the number of current seniors not meeting mastery of the grade level standards, as measured on the FSA, will need multiple opportunities and interventions to meet testing requirements. Another concern would also be the (67) 8th grade students, who are now considered to be the 9th grade cohort group being strategically scheduled into courses that would help them pass statewide assessments.

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

1. Supporting teachers and students in accelerated learning (due to the loss of instruction from the COVID pandemic)
2. Vertical and horizontal alignment for grades 6th-12th
3. Alignment of student services/supports and utilization of the mental health triad team
4. Academic and social-emotional supports for all subgroups
5. Increasing graduation rates and students meeting mastery of grade level standards

**Part III: Planning for Improvement**

**Areas of Focus:**

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

In order to ensure students are exposed to a guaranteed and viable curriculum, teachers need time to collaborate and create common lessons and analyze common assessment data. Utilizing the PLC time to plan lessons and reflect on assessment data will help boost student achievement.

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Action Steps:

1. Teachers collaborate bi-weekly in the PLC process to plan common lessons.
2. Teachers participate in data chats with their PLC team and administration to analyze common assessment data.
3. After data analysis is complete, teams will plan for reteaching and remediation.
4. Cycle repeats
5. The students in the SWD subgroup have been identified and supported through inclusion this year. These students will receive additional classroom supports from an ESE certified teacher and have the opportunity to interact with their peers in an inclusive classroom setting. ESE teachers and ESE paraprofessionals have receive training on inclusion education and keep track on student interventions through a daily tracking system. Students of concern are reported to our Inclusion Coordinator and additional supports are provided to the students in need.

**Measurable Outcome:**

If teachers engage in quality professional development, collaborate, develop higher order standards-based lessons and increase active engagement, then student learning gains will increase in reading, writing, and literacy across the disciplines. Our goal is to improve in the areas of proficiency and learning gains by at least 5 percentage points in ELA FSA and Math EOC scores and increase proficiency in Biology and the 8th grade Science FSA, as well as, U.S. History and Civics by focusing on developing a guaranteed and viable curriculum, sound lessons and infusing literacy in all content areas. Additionally, our goal is to improve proficiency and learning gains by 5% in the SWD subgroup in all tested subject areas.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Andrea Banks (banksae@bay.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Embed collaboration in PLC teams to plan standards-based instruction, create common lessons, analyze student work/common assessments, and reflect on teaching.  
 -Continue to incorporate the Fundamental 5 components of quality instruction into teaching practice and include literacy in all content areas (Think, Read, Write, Discuss) and begin incorporating WICOR strategies.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Students need to be exposed to the same content regardless of what class the students are enrolled. By teachers working collaboratively in PLC teams and utilizing the district created pacing guides, students should have the access to a guaranteed and viable curriculum.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Teacher training for WICOR strategies
2. Implementing WICOR strategy and/or F5 literacy strategies
3. Reflect upon strategies implemented.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Our graduation rate continues to steadily decline from year to year. Our goal is to implement preventive strategies such as MTSS 6th-12th, monthly GAT meetings, and utilizing our graduation coach to coach students at risk of not graduating with their cohort group.

**Measurable Outcome:** If collaborative data teams analyze multiple data sources, provide quality feedback to students and implement appropriate remediation and enrichment strategies, then we will see a decrease in the percentage of D's and F's, improved attendance, and an increase in the number of students graduating from high school in four years. Our goal is to improve the graduation rate by at least 5 percent.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Andrea Banks (banksae@bay.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**  
 Strategies  
 -Monthly GAT AND MTSS meetings- This team consists of guidance counselors, administration, and the school graduation coach. This team analyzes student data and develops plans for at-risk students to help ensure they graduate with their cohort group. -Weekly Problem-Solving PLCs to analyze student discipline, attendance, etc.  
 -Provide PERT Prep Boot Camp sessions during lunch and after school for student who have not earned a concordant score for the Algebra 1 EOC.  
 -Provide ACT/SAT practice through our Applied Communications classes for students who need a concordant score in reading.  
 -Provide instructional support in the reading and math classes to assist in remediation of students

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Our graduation continues to decline from year to year. Our goal is to improve the graduation rate by implementing MTSS 6th-12th grades and utilizing our graduation coach to assist students at risk for graduating with their cohort.

**Action Steps to Implement**

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

**#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline**

Last year, we saw an influx of negative behaviors and a dramatic increase in discipline referrals. We feel it is largely due to the impact of Hurricane Michael and from the trauma that students face day to day. We hope to implement a school-wide mentoring program and work collaboratively with the mental health triad team to help ensure students receive the supports they need to be successful.

**Action Steps:**

1. Embed the "RAMS Way" in all classrooms and create a common language for all faculty, staff and students on campus (Tier 1 MTSS)
2. The student services team will provide guidelines to teachers on referring students to the Student Services Team for additional support (counseling, wraparound services, etc). Teachers use the spreadsheet to refer students of most concern
3. Problem-Solving PLC team meets bi-weekly to analyze academic and attendance data. Team members are responsible for mentoring students weekly and documenting student progress
4. Discipline reports are analyzed month to month and shared with all staff members.
5. PBIS data is used to determine the students who are in need of additional support for minor classroom infractions (parent conferences, counseling, meet with an admin, etc).
6. The mental health team will assist with mentoring, restorative practices, and CICO with students with a high number of referrals.

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

**Measurable Outcome:**

Focusing on the effects of trauma impacting adolescents, there is an increased need for supports at secondary multi-tiered levels addressing behavior. Utilizing a SEL curriculum framework to meet the needs of specific subgroups of students, RHS will reduce the number of discipline referrals by at least 10% by implementing a school-wide mentoring program for at-risk students, providing BDS 360 lessons through Critical Thinking period, conducting restorative practices in the classroom and in small groups, and utilizing the supports provided by the mental health triad team. This will build the emotional muscle of struggling students, leading towards a successful educational experience.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Andrea Banks (banksae@bay.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

- Strategies**
- Implementation of the PBIS program- PBIS is a program that helps schools manage student behavior - reducing classroom disruption, office referrals, and tardiness. PBIS supports all positive behavior reinforcement programs, allowing teachers and administrators to award points for positive student activity and participation.
  - Utilization of hall monitors
  - Social Emotional Learning Curriculum for all students (Merrell’s Strong Teens Curriculum)
  - Trauma-Informed Care training for all teachers
  - BDS 360- a program that will allow students to turn discipline into a learning

opportunity with a conduct and behavior curriculum for students.  
-Problem-Solving PLCs- teams of teachers will work collaboratively to track and mentor at-risk students and work closely with the district MTSS team on interventions to help these students be successful.  
-Supports from Mental Health Triad team

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Having accountability is crucial to a student's success at school. Our goal by implementing a school-wide mentoring program and utilizing the supports from the mental health triad team is to help provide students a trusted adult on campus that they can turn to in times of crisis. Our hope is to help educate the "whole child"..academically, socially, and emotionally.

#### Action Steps to Implement

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

#### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

**The school leadership team will meet monthly to review PLC minutes, EWS data and school improvement goals and analyze progress and set goals for improvement. Leadership team members will work collaboratively with their team members to ensure the mission and vision of the school is being carried out in their departments.**

#### **Strategies**

- Monthly GAT AND MTSS meetings-** This team consists of school counselors, administration, and the school graduation coach. This team analyzes student data and develops plans for at-risk students to help ensure they graduate with their cohort group.
- Weekly Problem-Solving PLCs** to analyze student discipline, attendance, etc.
- Provide PERT Prep Boot Camp sessions** during lunch and after school for student who have not earned a concordant score for the Algebra 1 EOC.
- Provide ACT/SAT practice** through our Applied Communications classes for students who need a concordant score in reading.
- Provide instructional support** in the reading and math classes to assist in remediation of students
- Grade Acceleration opportunities** for middle school students who have been retained 2 or more times.

**3. Focusing on the effects of trauma impacting adolescents, there is an increased need for supports at secondary multi-tiered levels addressing behavior. Utilizing a SEL curriculum framework to meet the needs of specific subgroups of students, RHS will reduce the number of discipline referrals by at least 10% by implementing a school-wide mentoring program for at-risk students. This will build the emotional muscle of struggling students, leading towards a successful educational experience.**

#### **Strategies**

- Implementation of the Hero program-** Hero is a program that helps schools manage student behavior - reducing classroom disruption, office referrals, and tardiness. Hero supports all positive behavior reinforcement programs, allowing teachers and administrators to award points for positive student activity and participation.
- Utilization of hall monitors**
- Social Emotional Learning Curriculum** for all students (Merrell's Strong Teens Curriculum)
- Trauma-Informed Care training** for all teachers
- BDS 360-** a program that will allow students to turn discipline into a learning opportunity with a conduct and behavior curriculum for students.
- Problem-Solving PLCs (for academics)-** teams of teachers will work collaboratively to track and mentor at-risk students and work closely with the district MTSS team on interventions to help these students be successful.

## **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.

Parents and stakeholders are invited and encouraged to join the School Advisory Council (SAC) at orientation and the Title 1 Annual Meeting./Open House. The results from the Title 1 Spring Survey are tallied and shared with faculty and staff before writing the Parent Family Engagement Plan. Input from SAC members (teachers and parents) is used to plan, update and improve our PFEP. Rutherford offers many parent events during the school year to help build the school to home connection. Rutherford also reaches out to the community stakeholders to invite participation in our school improvement efforts; such as mentoring, contribution of resources, and volunteering to improve our facilities.

**Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

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

**Part V: Budget**

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Collaborative Planning	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Graduation	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>