Roulhac Middle School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Roulhac Middle School

1535 BRICKYARD RD, Chipley, FL 32428

http://rms.wcsdschools.com

Demographics

Principal: Nancy Holley

Start Date for this Principal: 10/13/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	86%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	[Rachel Heide](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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 Washington 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

Roulhac Middle School

1535 BRICKYARD RD, Chipley, FL 32428

http://rms.wcsdschools.com

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	Yes	78%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	23%

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 Washington 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.

Roulhac Middle School is dedicated to providing knowledge for school success, lifelong learning, and the skills necessary for students to cope with adolescence. Through involvement of school and community, Roulhac Middle School will provide a positive and orderly environment for all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Roulhac Middle School is committed to providing the services and support our students need to become respectful, responsible, and successful citizens.

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
Holley, Nancy	Principal	
Pritchard, Delanie	School Counselor	
Malloy, LaJuana	Teacher, ESE	
Whitson, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	
Moore, Amanda	Teacher, K-12	
Craft, Lindsay	Teacher, K-12	
Sowell, Pamela	Instructional Coach	
Carter, Jesse	Assistant Principal	
Mathis, Greg	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 10/13/2020, Nancy Holley

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

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

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	86%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (55%) 2015-16: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	[Rachel Heide](#)
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	145	158	149	0	0	0	0	452
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	26	44	0	0	0	0	98
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	5	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	6	4	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	23	17	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	25	16	0	0	0	0	54

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	14	21	16	0	0	0	0	51

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	4	1	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	5	0	0	0	0	10

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 10/13/2020

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	149	161	163	0	0	0	0	473
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	18	20	0	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	5	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	28	42	0	0	0	0	102

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	8	12	14	0	0	0	0	34

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	149	161	163	0	0	0	0	473
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	18	20	0	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	5	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	4	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	28	42	0	0	0	0	102

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	8	12	14	0	0	0	0	34

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	56%	52%	54%	48%	42%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	53%	54%	50%	43%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	44%	47%	34%	30%	44%
Math Achievement	61%	57%	58%	54%	50%	56%
Math Learning Gains	64%	59%	57%	62%	53%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	51%	51%	54%	38%	50%
Science Achievement	49%	49%	51%	43%	42%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	75%	75%	72%	78%	67%	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	58%	52%	6%	54%	4%
	2018	52%	51%	1%	52%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	48%	47%	1%	52%	-4%
	2018	50%	47%	3%	51%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
08	2019	57%	55%	2%	56%	1%
	2018	61%	52%	9%	58%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	66%	55%	11%	55%	11%
	2018	61%	56%	5%	52%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	62%	57%	5%	54%	8%
	2018	58%	55%	3%	54%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
08	2019	23%	39%	-16%	46%	-23%
	2018	49%	39%	10%	45%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-26%				
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	46%	46%	0%	48%	-2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	54%	45%	9%	50%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	67%	-67%	67%	-67%
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	73%	72%	1%	71%	2%
2018	68%	67%	1%	71%	-3%
Compare		5%			
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	78%	49%	29%	61%	17%
2018	92%	56%	36%	62%	30%
Compare		-14%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	29	48	39	33	59	53	28	60			
BLK	33	44	43	42	56	42	15	70			
HSP	61	76		72	65						

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
MUL	69	75		73	67						
WHT	59	55	43	63	65	59	54	76	71		
FRL	47	54	49	52	62	57	43	70	70		

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	20	37	39	28	48	42	24	28			
BLK	34	47	54	35	54	54	38	42			
HSP	68	75		68	80						
MUL	56	56		59	65						
WHT	57	58	43	67	72	53	56	72	69		
FRL	43	50	48	51	62	51	49	60	60		

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	5	20	19	17	52	47	13	42			
BLK	29	35	26	32	48	31	32	74			
HSP	38	41		31	47						
MUL	47	53		60	67						
WHT	52	54	37	59	65	64	48	79	64		
FRL	40	43	30	44	57	52	38	75	67		

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	533
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44

Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	69
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	71
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	61
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	56
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 25th Percentile - lack of direct reading instruction through intensive reading classes may have contributed, however over the course of two years we increased from 34% to 46%.

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

Math Learning Gains - it dropped 5%, but is still above the state average,

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 Learning Gains is 7% above the state average.

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

Social Studies (Civics EOC) went from 69% to 75%.

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

Attendance is our greatest area of concern. 22% of our students are below the 90% attendance level.

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

1. 8th Grade Math
2. Overall school attendance
3. ELA lowest 25th percentile
4. Science achievement level
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our master schedule includes seven intensive reading classes taught by reading endorsed teachers specifically designed to close the achievement gap for our lowest 25% students who are enrolled.
Measurable Outcome:	56% of our ELA lowest quartile will obtain a learning gain in the 20-21 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Intensive reading classes with specific standards taught by reading endorsed teachers will target individual needs using the progress monitoring results to identify deficits in ELA.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The criteria used in selecting this strategy were the number of students that scored a level one or two on the ELA FSA. Our teachers will be using Florida standards resources from CPALMS, iXL, and progress monitoring results to create individual learning plans for each student.

Action Steps to Implement

Reading endorsed teachers will teach the direct instruction necessary for students to improve in individual areas of need based on progress monitoring results and past FSA scores.

Person Responsible	Nancy Holley (nancy.holley@wcsdschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We made two new hires in the area of math that will make a huge impact in the teaching and learning of our math learning gains and overall 8th grade math scores.

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.

A positive school climate exists when all stakeholders feel valued and respected. It can significantly increase and contribute to an effective teaching and learning environment by improving communication with ALL stakeholders, supporting ALL students academically, and encouraging respectful and caring relationships throughout the school. A significant focus of our school improvement plan is to strengthen the ability of all staff to effectively use culturally responsive strategies and equitable practices for communicating high expectations, develop
positive and compassionate relationships, and offer differentiated and diversified curriculum for all students. The development and implementation of culturally responsive teaching and of equitable practices that engage students will result in increased exposure to rigorous and relevant tasks in the classroom at an appropriate grade level, the development of school-wide culture and climate, and an overall decline in the achievement gap. The focus will be to intentionally build positive relationships with families by providing effective communication and access to academic tools. We will work to increase the amount of family and community engagement opportunities, increased SAC participation, and the addition of business and community partners. Extracurricular and grade level instructional leaders will work to create opportunities for student voice on school-wide culture and climate to be increased and valued. We will expand the utilization of restorative practices to improve student recognition and the reinforcement of positive behavior.

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: ELA	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00