**Dixie District Schools** 

# **Ruth Rains Middle School**



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## **Table of Contents**

| School Demographics            | 3  |
|--------------------------------|----|
|                                |    |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4  |
|                                |    |
| School Information             | 7  |
|                                |    |
| Needs Assessment               | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement       | 18 |
| <u> </u>                       |    |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 21 |
|                                |    |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 0  |

## **Ruth Rains Middle School**

981 SE 351 HWY, Cross City, FL 32628

http://www.dixie.k12.fl.us

## **Demographics**

Principal: Jamie Martin Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

|   | •  |
|---|--|
| 2019-20 Status<br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File)  | Middle School<br>5-7   |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| 2020-21 Title I School  | Yes  |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)   | 100%   |
| 2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History   | 2018-19: C (52%)<br>2017-18: C (50%)<br>2016-17: I (%)   |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info  | ormation*  |
| SI Region   | Northeast  |
| Regional Executive Director   | Cassandra Brusca   |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle   | N/A  |
| Year  |  |
| Support Tier  |  |
| ESSA Status   |  |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For   | or more information, click here.   |

#### **School Board Approval**

This plan is pending approval by the Dixie 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 <a href="https://www.floridacims.org">www.floridacims.org</a>.

#### **Purpose and Outline of the SIP**

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

## **Table of Contents**

| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4  |
|--------------------------------|----|
| School Information             | 7  |
| Needs Assessment               | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement       | 18 |
| Title I Requirements           | 0  |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 0  |

## **Ruth Rains Middle School**

981 SE 351 HWY, Cross City, FL 32628

http://www.dixie.k12.fl.us

#### **School Demographics**

| School Type and Gi<br>(per MSID |          | 2020-21 Title I School | Disadvar | 1 Economically<br>ntaged (FRL) Rate<br>orted on Survey 3) |
|---------------------------------|----------|------------------------|----------|---|
| Middle Sch<br>5-7               | nool     | Yes                    |          | 100%  |
| Primary Servio<br>(per MSID I   | • •      | Charter School         | (Repor   | <b>9 Minority Rate</b> ted as Non-white n Survey 2)       |
| K-12 General E                  | ducation | No                     |          | 16%   |
| School Grades Histo             | ry       |                        |          |   |
| Year                            | 2020-21  | 2019-20                | 2018-19  | 2017-18   |
| Grade                           |          | С                      | С        | С   |

#### **School Board Approval**

This plan is pending approval by the Dixie 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 <a href="https://www.floridaCIMS.org">https://www.floridaCIMS.org</a>.

#### **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.

The mission of RRMS is to instill in our students the skills that will enable them to become productive citizens in a global society. The RRMS staff will be positive role models of these skills and always pursue what's best for each and every student. We will continue to enhance the culture and atmosphere here at RRMS and work together to make things possible for students and staff.

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

Ruth Rains Middle School is dedicated to the education of the total child. RRMS, in partnership with families and community, will provide relevant educational opportunities and maintain high academic expectations for a diverse community of learners.

#### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

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

| Name                    | Position<br>Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|-------------------------|------------------------|---|
| Martin,<br>Jamie        | Principal              | Jamie Martin is the principal. He is also a member of RRMS SAC team. He leads meetings with leadership teams to review progress towards the goals of the school and provides input to the RRMS School Improvement Plan.   |
| Lord,<br>Chasity        | Assistant<br>Principal | Chasity Lord is the assistant principal. She attends SAC meetings and other school department meetings. She provides input to RRMS School Improvement Plan.   |
| Kight, April            | Instructional<br>Coach | April Kight is the instructional/ reading coach. She is a member of the SAC team. She attends school department meetings, provides input to the School Improvement Plan, as well as assists with writing the SIP. She also leads the departments in professional development. |
| Walker,<br>Tonya        | Teacher,<br>K-12       | Tonya Walker is a 6th grade ELA teacher. She attends SAC meetings and school department meetings and provides input to the SIP. She is also the 6th garde department chair.   |
| Whittington,<br>Richard | Teacher,<br>K-12       | Richard Whittington is the 6th and 7th grade Health teacher. He attends SAC meetings and school department meetings and provides input for SIP.   |
| Lundy, Erin             | School<br>Counselor    | Erin Lundy is the guidance counselor. She meets with teachers and students to monitor all student progress within the school. She attends SAC Meetings and provides input to the School Improvement Plan.   |

#### **Demographic Information**

#### Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Jamie Martin

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.

1

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.

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

30

Total number of students enrolled at the school

486

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

4

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

**Demographic Data** 

#### **Early Warning Systems**

#### 2021-22

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

| Indicator  | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |     |     |     |   |   |    |    |    |       |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator  | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5   | 6   | 7   | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 151 | 155 | 180 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 486   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70  | 84  | 103 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 257   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7   | 1   | 18  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 26    |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 58  | 9   | 5   | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 72    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7   | 12  | 35  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 54    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36  | 23  | 29  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 88    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31  | 26  | 43  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 100   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 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                            |   |   |   |   |   | G  | rade | Lev | el |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|------|-----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                            | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6    | 7   | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOLAT |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 | 15   | 35  | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 77    |

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

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |    |    |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|----|----|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| illuicator                          | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 2  | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 11 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 31    |

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

Thursday 9/23/2021

#### 2020-21 - As Reported

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

| Indicator                                 | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator                                 | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled               | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 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                            |   |   |   |   |   | Gr | ade | e Le | evel |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|------|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                            | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6   | 7    | 8    | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0   | 0    | 0    | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

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

| Indicator                           |   |   |   |   |   | Gr | ade | e Le | vel |   |    | Grade Level |    |       |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|-----|---|----|-------------|----|-------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| indicator                           | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6   | 7    | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11          | 12 | Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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  | 0   | 0    | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0           | 0  |       |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

#### 2020-21 - Updated

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

| Indicator                                 | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |     |     |     |   |    |    |    |       |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| mulcator                                  | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6   | 7   | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled               | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 163 | 175 | 150 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 488   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85  | 104 | 95  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 284   |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 48  | 67  | 58  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 173   |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15  | 47  | 32  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 94    |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14  | 33  | 6   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 53    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35  | 59  | 44  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 138   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49  | 59  | 56  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 164   |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |    | Total |    |       |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|----|-------|----|-------|
| Indicator                            |             | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7  | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11    | 12 | TOLAT |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 43 | 43 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 118   |

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

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |   |    |    | Total |       |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|---|----|----|-------|-------|
| Indicator                           |             | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12    | Total |
| 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 | 4 | 5 | 12 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 21    |

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

#### **School Data Review**

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

| Sahaal Grada Component      |        | 2021     |       |        | 2019     |       | 2018   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| School Grade Component      | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             |        |          |       | 48%    | 48%      | 54%   | 48%    | 48%      | 53%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       | 52%    | 52%      | 54%   | 52%    | 52%      | 54%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       | 44%    | 44%      | 47%   | 50%    | 50%      | 47%   |
| Math Achievement            |        |          |       | 45%    | 45%      | 58%   | 36%    | 36%      | 58%   |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       | 58%    | 58%      | 57%   | 42%    | 42%      | 57%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       | 52%    | 52%      | 51%   | 44%    | 44%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         |        |          |       | 38%    | 38%      | 51%   | 45%    | 45%      | 52%   |
| Social Studies Achievement  |        |          |       | 67%    | 67%      | 72%   | 76%    | 76%      | 72%   |

#### **Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments**

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-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 05         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Con | nparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 06         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 54%    | 54%      | 0%                                | 54%   | 0%                             |
| Cohort Con | nparison | 0%     |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 07         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 42%    | 42%      | 0%                                | 52%   | -10%                           |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -54%   |          |                                   |       |                                |

|            |          |        | MATH     | I                                 |       |                                |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade      | Year     | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 05         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Cor | nparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 06         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 42%    | 42%      | 0%                                | 55%   | -13%                           |
| Cohort Cor | nparison | 0%     |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 07         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|            | 2019     | 43%    | 43%      | 0%                                | 54%   | -11%                           |
| Cohort Cor | nparison | -42%   |          |                                   |       |                                |

|            | SCIENCE  |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Grade      | Year     | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05         | 2021     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|            | 2019     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cohort Com | nparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|      |        | BIOLO    | GY EOC                      |       |                          |
|------|--------|----------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2021 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2019 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
|      |        | CIVIC    | S EOC                       |       |                          |
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2021 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2019 | 65%    | 65%      | 0%                          | 71%   | -6%                      |

|      |        | HISTO    | RY EOC                      |       |                          |
|------|--------|----------|-----------------------------|-------|--------------------------|
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2021 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2019 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
|      |        | ALGE     | BRA EOC                     |       |                          |
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2021 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2019 | 87%    | 54%      | 33%                         | 61%   | 26%                      |
|      |        | GEOME    | TRY EOC                     |       |                          |
| Year | School | District | School<br>Minus<br>District | State | School<br>Minus<br>State |
| 2021 |        |          |                             |       |                          |
| 2019 | 0%     | 45%      | -45%                        | 57%   | -57%                     |

## **Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments**

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

i-Ready (5th, 6th, 7th)

|                       |  | Grade 5 |        |        |
|-----------------------|--|---------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/%<br>Proficiency                  | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students                             | 49      | 63     | 88     |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged               | 36      | 59     | 83     |
| ,                     | Students With Disabilities               | 19      | 25     | 26     |
|                       | English Language<br>Learners             | NA      | NA     | NA     |
|                       | Number/%<br>Proficiency                  | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students                             | 53      | 85     | 128    |
| Mathematics           | Economically Disadvantaged               | 50      | 76     | 128    |
|                       | Students With Disabilities               | 32      | 32     | 38     |
|                       | English Language<br>Learners             | NA      | NA     | NA     |
|                       | Number/%<br>Proficiency                  | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students                             | NA      | NA     | NA     |
| Science               | Economically Disadvantaged               | NA      | NA     | NA     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities               | NA      | NA     | NA     |
|                       | English Language<br>Learners             | NA      | NA     | NA     |
|                       |  | Grade 6 |        |        |
|                       | Number/%<br>Proficiency                  | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students                             | 28      | 35     | NA     |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged               | 25      | 28     | NA     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities               | 27      | 20     | NA     |
|                       | English Language<br>Learners             | 0       | 100    | NA     |
|                       | Number/%<br>Proficiency                  | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|                       | All Students                             | 25      | 40     | NA     |
| Mathematics           | Economically Disadvantaged Students With | 19      | 32     | NA     |
|                       | Disabilities                             | 8       | 20     | NA     |
|                       | English Language<br>Learners             | 100     | 100    | NA     |

|  |                              | Grade 7 |        |        |
|--|------------------------------|---------|--------|--------|
|  | Number/%<br>Proficiency      | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|  | All Students                 | 26      | 32     | NA     |
| English Language<br>Arts   | Economically Disadvantaged   | 25      | 27     | NA     |
|  | Students With Disabilities   | 14      | 15     | NA     |
|  | English Language<br>Learners | 0       | 0      | NA     |
|  | Number/%<br>Proficiency      | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|  | All Students                 | 14      | 21     | NA     |
| Mathematics  | Economically Disadvantaged   | 13      | 19     | NA     |
|  | Students With Disabilities   | 7       | 13     | NA     |
|  | English Language<br>Learners | 0       | 0      | NA     |
|  | Number/%<br>Proficiency      | Fall    | Winter | Spring |
|  | All Students                 | NA      | NA     | NA     |
| Civics   | Economically Disadvantaged   | NA      | NA     | NA     |
| \text{\frac{\text{\tin}\exititt{\text{\tin}}}\\ \text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\ti}\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\texi}\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\texi}\text{\text{\texi}\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\text{\texi}\text{\texi}\text{\texit{\ | Students With Disabilities   | NA      | NA     | NA     |
|  | English Language<br>Learners | NA      | NA     | NA     |

## Subgroup Data Review

|           |             | 2021      | SCHOO             | DL GRAD      | E COMF     | PONENT             | S BY SI     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2019-20 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2019-20 |
| SWD       | 29          | 43        | 32                | 20           | 29         | 18                 | 30          | 41         |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 37          | 48        | 42                | 41           | 37         | 50                 |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 50          | 44        |                   | 44           | 17         |                    |             | 60         |              |                         |                           |
| MUL       | 57          | 46        |                   | 43           | 31         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 50          | 47        | 38                | 49           | 38         | 35                 | 51          | 74         | 81           |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 43          | 45        | 28                | 41           | 34         | 33                 | 47          | 68         | 84           |                         |                           |
|           |             | 2019      | SCHO              | DL GRAD      | E COMF     | ONENT              | S BY SI     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2017-18 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2017-18 |
| SWD       | 23          | 42        | 39                | 23           | 47         | 49                 | 19          | 34         |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 33          | 42        |                   | 33           | 50         | 50                 | 17          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 38          | 50        |                   | 29           | 41         |                    |             | 40         |              |                         |                           |
| MUL       | 56          | 56        |                   | 61           | 71         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |

|   |             | 2019      | SCHO              | DL GRAD      | E COMF     | PONENT             | S BY SU     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
|---|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups                                 | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2017-18 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2017-18 |
| WHT                                       | 49          | 53        | 46                | 46           | 59         | 54                 | 39          | 70         | 65           |                         |                           |
| FRL                                       | 44          | 49        | 42                | 41           | 56         | 56                 | 35          | 62         | 56           |                         |                           |
| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |             |           |                   |              |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2016-17 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2016-17 |
| SWD                                       | 19          | 42        | 42                | 23           | 46         | 38                 | 27          | 52         |              |                         |                           |
| BLK                                       | 19          | 59        | 82                | 17           | 32         | 27                 | 17          | 80         |              |                         |                           |
| HSP                                       | 38          | 21        |                   | 25           | 36         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| MUL                                       | 75          | 55        |                   | 50           | 18         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| WHT                                       | 49          | 53        | 47                | 37           | 44         | 46                 | 48          | 74         | 59           |                         |                           |
| FRL                                       | 45          | 50        | 49                | 34           | 41         | 41                 | 43          | 75         | 46           |                         |                           |

## **ESSA Data Review**

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

| ESSA Federal Index  |     |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  |     |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 51  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 1   |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency |     |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 461 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 9   |
| 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% |     |
| English Language Learners   |     |
|   |     |

| 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% |     |

| 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%            |     |
| 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%                      |     |
| 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%     |     |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 43  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                          | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%                   |     |
| Multiracial Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   | 44  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                       | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%                |     |
| 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%           |     |
| 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%                      |     |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 47  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% |     |

#### **Analysis**

#### **Data Analysis**

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

#### What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Our school bottom quartile learning gains in math decreased tremendously. ELA bottom quartile learning gains also decreased. Our social studies and science achievement have shown growth.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Our greatest need for improvement is to move our bottom quartile learning gains in Math.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Some of the contributing factors for this need was lack of focus/priority and not the right teacher for remediation. Some actions being taken include prioritizing small group group instruction for these bottom quartile students via MTSS/RTI using evidence based curriculum and/or learning strategies, as well as data chats with math teachers to assist in targeting academic and instructional needs among this group.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Our most improved area was science achievement.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Contributing factors include an instructional push targeting science standards through focusing on standards based instruction as largely determined by studying content focus analysis data for the 5th grade science EOC. Identifying focus standards and having data chats across multiple grade-levels to determine areas of focus also played a major role, as did the incorporation of Edusmart and Study Island for students practice, standards based mini assessments and progress monitoring.

#### What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

We need to continue identifying focus standards across grade-levels and incorporating standards based instruction in all content areas, Also focus on providing small group instruction via MTSS/RTI, and incorporating evidence based instructional strategies, regularly, especially when stardards are not mastered within specific student groups..

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Opportunities to develop and improve classroom management will be provided to all faculty members, as it is our belief that without appropriate organization and structure learning will be greatly hindered. We will provide B.E.S.T. standards training in both ELA and Mathematics, along with various technology training opportunities to support continuous engaging, multisensory classroom instructional opportunities. We will also provide support to develop teachers within their academic content areas through regular incorporation of Professional Learning Community opportunities.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Additional professional development may be provided based on needs as determined by student data analysis, in an effort to continue promoting growth among faculty from both a professional and an academic standpoint.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:** 

#### #1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus **Description and** Rationale:

The following subgroups failed to meet the overall ESSA subgroup federal index: black /African American students (38%), Hispanic students (40%), and SWD (35%).

-increase ESSA subgroup federal index of black/African American students from 38%

Measurable

to 41%

-increase ESSA subgroup federal index of Hispanic students from 40% to 43% Outcome:

-increase ESSA subgroup federal index of SWD's from 35% to 41%

These areas of focus will be monitored through iReady, subgroup data for both ELA and Mathematics, as well as through EWS data, including course failures, attendance,

Monitoring: and grades.

Person

responsible for monitoring

April Kight (aprilkight@dixie.k12.fl.us)

outcome:

Strategy:

Evidence-based

Evidence based programs/strategies include i-Ready, small group instruction via MTSS/RTI, scaffolding and questioning. There is reliable evidence to indicate these

programs/strategies have a positive effect on student achievement.

The rationale for the selected evidence based strategies follows:

Rationale for

small group instruction (.47 - Hattie's)

Evidence-based MTSS/RTI (1.29 - Hattie's) Strategy:

scaffolding (.82 - Hattie's) questioning (.48 - Hattie's)

#### **Action Steps to Implement**

Provide students time within their academic schedule to work on i-Ready (with fidelity). This time must include small group instruction for target students who demonstrate an academic need based on student data.

Person Responsible

Chasity Lord (chasitylord@dixie.k12.fl.us)

Analyze student data and place students in RTI with qualified teacher.

Person

Responsible

April Kight (aprilkight@dixie.k12.fl.us)

Provide teachers with a variety of academic materials that will allow for student remediation as needed.

Person

Responsible

April Kight (aprilkight@dixie.k12.fl.us)

Train teachers (as needed) on evidence based strategies, with a primary focus on the evidence-based strategies mentioned above.

Person

Responsible

April Kight (aprilkight@dixie.k12.fl.us)

Adminstration conducts walkthroughs to monitor fidelity of instruction.

Person

Responsible

Jamie Martin (jamiemartin@dixie.k12.fl.us)

Coaches provide guidance, PD, and coaching as needed based on students data and administration walkthrough data.

Person Responsible

April Kight (aprilkight@dixie.k12.fl.us)

#### #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus
Description and
Rationale:

Based on 2021 FSA Math scores the learning gains dropped 21% points from 58% to 37%, while bottom quartile learning gains dropped 18% points from 52%

to 34%.

**Measurable** -Increase math learning gains from 37% to 50%.

Outcome: -Increase bottom quartile math learning gains from 34% to 50%.

Math learning gains and math bottom quartile learning gains will be monitored

through i-Ready diagnostic data and i-Ready standards mastery data.

Person responsible

for monitoring outcome:

Chasity Lord (chasitylord@dixie.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based** 

Strategy:

Evidence based programs/strategies include i-Ready, small group instruction,

MTSS/RTI, scaffolding and questioning.

The rationale for the selected evidence based programs and/or strategies follows:

i-Ready (promising evidence)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

-small group instruction (.47 - Hattie's)

-MTSS/RTI (1.29 - Hattie's) -scaffolding (.82 - Hattie's)

questioning (.48 - Hattie's)

#### **Action Steps to Implement**

Build Math RTI time into the Master Schedule (MTSS or PARCAR class) designed for students in Tier 2 & Tier 3 for Math.

Person Responsible Chasity Lord (chasitylord@dixie.k12.fl.us)

Analyze student data and place students in RTI with qualified teacher.

**Person Responsible** April Kight (aprilkight@dixie.k12.fl.us)

Provide students with time to work on iReady. Also include small group instruction during MTSS?RTI to focus on Math deficiencies. Small group instruction will include the evidence based strategies scaffolding and questioning.

**Person Responsible** Chasity Lord (chasitylord@dixie.k12.fl.us)

Provide opportunities for after school tutoring in Math.

**Person Responsible** Jamie Martin (jamiemartin@dixie.k12.fl.us)

Teacher reassesses mid and end of year via i-Ready diagnostics, and periodically via i-Ready standards mastery assessments, making changes based on student data as needed.

**Person Responsible** Chasity Lord (chasitylord@dixie.k12.fl.us)

Administration conducts walkthroughs to monitor fidelity of instruction.

**Person Responsible** Chasity Lord (chasitylord@dixie.k12.fl.us)

Math lead/mentor teacher coaches and offers guidance as needed based on student data and administration walkthroughs.

**Person Responsible** Chasity Lord (chasitylord@dixie.k12.fl.us)

### **Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

Using the <u>SafeSchoolsforAlex.org</u>, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

According to data on the Safe Schools portal our overall ranking was #480 out of 553 middle/ junior high schools in the state. We ranked very high in suspensions(#529 out of 553), drug/ public order incidents(#507 out of 553) and violent incidents(#457 out of 553) in 2019. We are taking great measure to reduce these numbers and improve our overall ranking. Our methods of improvement include: consistent, strategic establishment of positive relationships with ALL students and regular reinforcement of behavioral expectations (TEACH, REHEARSE, REINFORCE). In addition a positive reinforcement system to reward desirable behavior is in place, and frequent, positive communication (phone calls, letters, conferences, face-to-face, Class DOJO, etc.) is encouraged between the school and families.

#### 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.

Our school is addressing the need to build a positive school culture and environment in many ways. This year we have implemented the following:

- \*Create a culture of success unify teachers and students with one goal to be successful.
- \*Cultivate meaningful parent involvement by building relationships with parents via phone calls home, dojo, notes, emails and/or face to face meetings.
- \*Set consistent discipline goals and follow them schoolwide.
- \*Build character and trust in students, while also holding the student accountable for their actions thus lowering the number of referrals by grade level schoolwide.
- \*Engage students in meaningful ways that lead to benefits both socially and academically.
- \*Create traditions that are fun for students and teachers by having reward parties to celebrate successes in the classroom, by both grade level as well as schoolwide.

# Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Our faculty and staff works diligently daily promoting a positive culture and environment at RRMS.

- \*Teachers plan lessons that help students reach academic goals, while also keeping them interested and engaged in the academic process.
- \*Lunchroom workers provide students with nutritious meals at breakfast and lunch with a positive attitude

that makes students feel welcomed and encouraged.

\*Bus drivers transport students to and from school in a timely, safe manner, in support of the school's bell schedule.

\*Our SAC committees role is to help strategize ways to reduce behavioral incidents by acknowledging and rewarding positive behavior via setting behavioral goals and purchasing rewards for students who meet the behavioral goals