

2013-2014 SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Rutherford High School
1000 SCHOOL AVE
Panama City, FL 32401
850-767-4500

School Demographics

School Type

High School

Title I

No

Free and Reduced Lunch Rate

58%

Alternative/ESE Center

No

Charter School

No

Minority Rate

46%

School Grades History

2013-14

PENDING

2012-13

B

2011-12

C

2010-11

B

2009-10

B

SIP Authority and Template

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

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, as marked by citations to the No Child Left Behind (NCLB) Act of 2001. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or with a grade of F within the prior two years. For all other schools, the district may use a template of its choosing. All districts must submit annual assurances that their plans meet statutory requirements.

This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>. Sections marked "N/A" by the user and any performance data representing fewer than 10 students or educators have been excluded from this document.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	3
Differentiated Accountability	4
Part I: Current School Status	5
Part II: Expected Improvements	24
Goals Summary	30
Goals Detail	30
Action Plan for Improvement	32
Part III: Coordination and Integration	37
Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals	38
Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals	40

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. A corollary at the district level is the District Improvement and Assistance Plan (DIAP), designed to help district leadership make the necessary connections between school and district goals in order to align resources. 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: Current School Status

Part I summarizes school leadership, staff qualifications and strategies for recruiting, mentoring and retaining strong teachers. The school’s Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) is described in detail to show how data is used by stakeholders to understand the needs of all students and allocate appropriate resources in proportion to those needs. The school also summarizes its efforts in a few specific areas, such as its use of increased learning time and strategies to support literacy, preschool transition and college and career readiness.

Part II: Expected Improvements

Part II outlines school performance data in the prior year and sets numeric targets for the coming year in ten areas:

1. Reading
2. Writing
3. Mathematics
4. Science
5. Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM)
6. Career and Technical Education (CTE)
7. Social Studies
8. Early Warning Systems (EWS)
9. Parental Involvement
10. Other areas of concern to the school

With this overview of the current state of the school in mind and the outcomes they hope to achieve, the planning team engages in an 8-Step Planning and Problem-Solving Process, through which they define and refine their goals (Step 1), identify and prioritize problems (barriers) keeping them from reaching those goals (Steps 2-3), design a plan to help them implement strategies to resolve those barriers (Steps 4-7), and determine how they will monitor progress toward each goal (Step 8).

Part III: Coordination and Integration

Part III is required for Title I schools and describes how federal, state and local funds are coordinated and integrated to ensure student needs are met.

Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support Goals

Appendix 1 is the professional development plan, which outlines any training or support needed for stakeholders to meet the goals.

Appendix 2: Budget to Support Goals

Appendix 2 is the budget needed to implement the strategies identified in the plan.

Differentiated Accountability

Florida's Differentiated Accountability (DA) system is a statewide network of strategic support, differentiated by need according to performance data, and provided to schools and districts in order to improve leadership capacity, teacher efficacy and student outcomes. DA field teams collaborate with district and school leadership to design, implement and refine school improvement plans, as well as provide instructional coaching, as needed.

DA Regions

Florida's DA network is divided into five geographical regions, each served by a field team led by a regional executive director (RED).

DA Categories

Traditional public schools are classified at the start of each school year, based upon the most recently released school grades (A-F), into one of the following categories:

- Not in DA – currently A or B with no F in prior two years; all charter schools; all ungraded schools
- Monitoring Only – currently A or B with at least one F in the prior two years
- Prevent – currently C
- Focus – currently D
 - Year 1 – declined to D, or first-time graded schools receiving a D
 - Year 2 – second consecutive D, or F followed by a D
 - Year 3 or more – third or more consecutive D, or F followed by second consecutive D
- Priority – currently F
 - Year 1 – declined to F, or first-time graded schools receiving an F
 - Year 2 or more – second or more consecutive F

DA Turnaround and Monitoring Statuses

Additionally, schools in DA are subject to one or more of the following Turnaround and Monitoring Statuses:

- Former F – currently A-D with at least one F in the prior two years. SIP is monitored by FDOE.
- Post-Priority Planning – currently A-D with an F in the prior year. District is planning for possible turnaround.
- Planning – Focus Year 2 and Priority Year 1. District is planning for possible turnaround.
- Implementing – Focus Year 3 or more and Priority Year 2 or more. District is implementing the Turnaround Option Plan (TOP).

2013-14 DA Category and Statuses

DA Category	Region	RED
Not in DA	N/A	N/A

Former F	Post-Priority Planning	Planning	Implementing TOP
No	No	No	No

Current School Status

School Information

School-Level Information

School

Rutherford High School

Principal

Coy Pilson

School Advisory Council chair

Col. Doyle

Names and position titles of the School-Based Leadership Team (SBLT)

Name	Title
Lin Byrd	CTE Department Head
Victoria Steel	Science Teacher/IB instructor
Jennifer Rogers	Literacy Coach
Sheila Sexton	Social Studies Department Head/IB and AP Social Studies Teacher
Myra Crews	Science Teacher/Chemistry
Coy Pilson	Principal
Beth Patterson	Assistant Principal
Doug Lee	Assistant Principal
Mike Brown	Math Teacher

District-Level Information

District

Bay

Superintendent

Mr. William V Husfelt

Date of school board approval of SIP

12/10/2013

School Advisory Council (SAC)

This section meets the requirements of Section 1114(b)(1), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Membership of the SAC

- Kathy Fontaine Ambassador
- Coy Pilson Principal
- Beth Patterson (Asst. Prin)
- Col. Bill Doyle (SACS Head) Teacher
- Gil Garcia Teacher
- Tom Abbott (Callaway Mayor) Business/Community
- April Henry Parent

Latrina Pasley Parent
Patricia Henry (aunt) Business/Community
Nung Phan Student
Anita Meeks Parent
David Brett Parent
Amanda Stimis Parent
Tasha Duong Student
Janna Mount Educational Support
Denise Hampton Business/Community
Liana Walker Parent
Ray Stanquist Administrative Asst.
Jackie Petty Parent
Tiffany Hampton Business/Community
Jan Dykes Parents
Steven Neely Teacher
Willie Walker Parent
Linda Stiles Navy Liason/ Parent

Involvement of the SAC in the development of the SIP

The SAC's committee meets four times a year. The first meeting is to discuss the school grade and academic performance on the spring EOC's and FCAT. We review the School Improvement Process at the school and how the goals are established for the next school year and we ask them to input and that input is given to the appropriate committee and incorporated where possible in the school improvement plan.

Activities of the SAC for the upcoming school year

1. Recruit new SAC's members at the 9th grade orientation, Open House, friends etc.
2. SAC's members will review the School Improvement Plan in August and their input will be integrated where appropriate into the school improvement plan.
3. Grant approval for School Improvement Funds when they are available (they have not been in the last 2 years). The SAC's team reviews teacher grants for programs and funds those that they believe will benefit the school improvement process. They are usually distributed in \$100.00 increments.
4. The SAC's members are a part of the mid-year data report which includes DEA and retake information for our school. We present the strategies developed for the year and discuss any changes that might need to be made based on data to increase student achievement. The SAC's committee is asked for input and that input is incorporated where appropriate in the mid-year plan. This meeting at the mid-year is very important as we have our school grade information and can work as a team to problem solve on strategies to continue to improve the school as a whole and academic achievement specifically.
5. The SAC's members meet at the end of the year to review how the year has progressed and to make suggestions for the next year to be incorporated into the School Improvement Plan. At this meeting we seek a commitment from the members to attend the following year. We ask for additional areas in which the SAC's members may wish to participate within the school.

Projected use of school improvement funds, including the amount allocated to each project

The school improvement funds are disbursed when available by the committee through a grant system. The teachers may write a grant for up to \$100. to support a school improvement goal. We have not had any funds allocated to our school for two years.

Compliance with section 1001.452, F.S., regarding the establishment duties of the SAC

In Compliance

If not in compliance, describe the measures being taken to comply with SAC requirements

Not Applicable, we are in compliance.

Highly Qualified Staff

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(C) and 1115(c)(1)(E), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Administrators

of administrators

5

receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

Administrator Information:

Coy Pilson

Principal

Years as Administrator: 11

Years at Current School: 1

Credentials

B.A. in History from University of Virginia
 Masters of Teaching from the University of Virginia
 Specialist in Education from Georgetown University
 Ed Leadership K-12

Performance Record

Mr. Pilson came to Rutherford in July 2012 from Mosley High School where he served as an Administrative Assistant for 11/2 years. He has served in two other states (Virginia and California) as an Asst. Principal. Mosley High School was a "B" high school in the 2011-2012 school year. Rutherford was a "C" in the 2011-2012 school year.
 2013
 The school grade is pending. U.S. News and World Reports listed Rutherford High School in the top ten percent of excellent high schools in the state of Florida and the top 7% in the nation.
 School Statistics:

Vera Banks

Asst Principal

Years as Administrator: 18

Years at Current School: 17

Credentials

B.S. in Science Education at Florida State
 MS in Educational Leadership at Florida State
 Specialist in Educational Leadership at West Florida
 Elem. Ed. 1-6
 MG Gen. Science 5-9
 Gifted

Performance Record

2013
 The school grade is pending. U.S. News and World Reports listed Rutherford High School in the top ten percent of excellent high schools in the state of Florida and the top 7% in the nation.
 School Statistics:
 2012
 School grade was a "C."
 Reading: The 9th grade FCAT 2.0 results for reading were 49% (318) of students made proficiency (a 6% reduction in proficiency from the previous year) and in the 10th grade 47% (318) made proficiency (a 1% reduction in the previous year.)
 Writing: Writing scores reflected 74% (245) of students scoring proficient 43% (142) scoring a 3.5 or above and 23% (76) scoring a 4.0 or above.
 Algebra 1: Algebra 1 scores reflected 51% (163) scored a level 3 or above; 11% (35) of the students who took Algebra 1 scored a level 4 or above.
 Geometry: Students were measured in three groups of thirds. The first third being the lowest scorers and the third third being the highest scorers. 1st third – 26%; 2nd third – 42%; 3rd third – 33%. 307 students tested.
 Biology EOC: In the Biology EOC students were measured in three groups of thirds. The 1st third being the lowest scorers and the 3rd third being the highest scorers. Our scores were: 9th grade scores; 1st third – 11%; 2nd third – 35%; 3rd third – 54%; 10th grade scores; 1st third – 47%; 2nd third – 36%; 3rd third – 17%
 2011
 School Statistics: 47% making proficiency in Reading, 47% making LG in Reading, 40% of the lowest 25% making LG in Reading, 78% making proficiency in Math, 75% making LG in Math, 69% of the lowest 25% making LG in Math, White students did meet AYP for 2011 but no other sub groups, 73% Meeting high standards in writing, 69% scored a 4 or above which is up from 64% in 2010 in writing, 42% Making high standards in Science.
 2010
 School Grade B, 50% making proficiency in Reading, 47% making LG in Reading, 44% lowest 25% making LG in Reading, 76% making proficiency in Math, 70% making LG in Math, 52% lowest 25% making LG in Math, 83% making proficiency in Writing, 41% making proficiency in Science
 2009

School Grade C, 51% making proficiency in Reading, 48% making LG in Reading, 44% lowest 25% making LG in Reading; 74% making proficiency in Math, 69% making LG in Math, 75% lowest 25% making LG in Math; 74% making proficiency in Writing, 47% making proficiency in Science 2008

School Grade B, 53% making proficiency in Reading, 56% making LG in Reading, 41% lowest 25% making LG in Reading; 79% making proficiency in Math, 76% making LG in Math, 67% lowest 25% making LG in Math; 47% making proficiency in Writing, 47% making proficiency in Science.

Doug Lee

Asst Principal

Years as Administrator: 5

Years at Current School: 2

Credentials

B.S in Physical Education from the University of West Florida
 Masters of Education from the University of West Florida
 Physical Education 6-12

2013

The school grade is pending. U.S. News and World Reports listed Rutherford High School in the top ten percent of excellent high schools in the state of Florida and the top 7% in the nation.

School Statistics:

2012

School grade was a "C."

Reading: The 9th grade FCAT 2.0 results for reading were 49% (318) of students made proficiency (a 6% reduction in proficiency from the previous year) and in the 10th grade 47% (318) made proficiency (a 1% reduction in the previous year.)

Writing: Writing scores reflected 74% (245) of students scoring proficient 43% (142) scoring a 3.5 or above and 23% (76) scoring a 4.0 or above.

Performance Record

Algebra 1: Algebra 1 scores reflected 51% (163) scored a level 3 or above; 11% (35) of the students who took Algebra 1 scored a level 4 or above.

Geometry: Students were measured in three groups of thirds. The first third being the lowest scorers and the third third being the highest scorers. 1st third – 26%; 2nd third – 42%; 3rd third – 33%. 307 students tested.

Biology EOC: In the Biology EOC students were measured in three groups of thirds. The 1st third being the lowest scorers and the 3rd third being the highest scorers. Our scores were: 9th grade scores; 1st third – 11%; 2nd third – 35%; 3rd third – 54%; 10th grade scores; 1st third – 47%; 2nd third – 36%; 3rd third – 17%

Mr. Lee joined Rutherford High School administrative team at the end of 2011 as an Administrative Assistant. He came from Mosley High School where he served as an Administrative Assistant.

Beth Patterson

Asst Principal

Years as Administrator: 2

Years at Current School: 13

Credentials

B.S. in Public Administration from Auburn University
 Masters in Educational Leadership from Florida State University
 Social Sciences 6-12
 Business 6-12
 Ed. Leadership K-12

Performance Record

2013
 The school grade is pending. U.S. News and World Reports listed Rutherford High School in the top ten percent of excellent high schools in the state of Florida and the top 7% in the nation.
 School Statistics:
 2012
 School grade was a "C."
 Reading: The 9th grade FCAT 2.0 results for reading were 49% (318) of students made proficiency (a 6% reduction in proficiency from the previous year) and in the 10th grade 47% (318) made proficiency (a 1% reduction in the previous year.)
 Writing: Writing scores reflected 74% (245) of students scoring proficient 43% (142) scoring a 3.5 or above and 23% (76) scoring a 4.0 or above.
 Algebra 1: Algebra 1 scores reflected 51% (163) scored a level 3 or above; 11% (35) of the students who took Algebra 1 scored a level 4 or above.
 Geometry: Students were measured in three groups of thirds. The first third being the lowest scorers and the third third being the highest scorers. 1st third – 26%; 2nd third – 42%; 3rd third – 33%. 307 students tested.
 Biology EOC: In the Biology EOC students were measured in three groups of thirds. The 1st third being the lowest scorers and the 3rd third being the highest scorers. Our scores were: 9th grade scores; 1st third – 11%; 2nd third – 35%; 3rd third – 54%; 10th grade scores; 1st third – 47%; 2nd third – 36%; 3rd third – 17%
 2011
 Beth Patterson was appointed to be the Asst. Principal at Rutherford High School. She is Nationally Board Certified teacher at Rutherford High School with 11 years of teaching experience. Nine of those years on the school improvement team as well as other state and district leadership roles.
 District Teacher of the Year 2005
 District History Fair Coordinator 2009 and 2010
 Member of the Gulf Coast Community College Educators Preparatory Institute Board for 4 years.
 School Statistics:
 47% making proficiency in Reading, 47% making LG in Reading, 40% of the lowest 25% making LG in Reading, 78% making proficiency in Math, 75% making LG in Math, 69% of the lowest 25% making LG in Math, White students did meet AYP for 2011 but no other sub groups, 73% Meeting high standards in writing,

69% scored a 4 or above which is up from 64% in 2010 in writing, 42% Making high standards in Science.

2010

School Grade B, 50% making proficiency in Reading, 47% making LG in Reading, 44% lowest 25% making LG in Reading, 76% making proficiency in Math, 70% making LG in Math, 52% lowest 25% making LG in Math, 83% making proficiency in Writing, 41% making proficiency in Science

2009

School Grade C, 51% making proficiency in Reading, 48% making LG in Reading, 44% lowest 25% making LG in Reading; 74% making proficiency in Math, 69%

making LG in Math, 75% lowest 25% making LG in Math; 74% making proficiency in Writing, 47% making proficiency in Science

2008

School Grade B, 53% making proficiency in Reading, 56% making LG in Reading, 41% lowest 25% making LG in Reading; 79% making proficiency in Math, 76% making LG in Math, 67% lowest 25% making LG in Math; 47% making proficiency in Writing, 47% making proficiency in Science.

Ray Stanquist

Asst Principal

Years as Administrator: 0

Years at Current School: 7

Credentials

B.S. in Sports Medicine from the University of West Florida
 Masters in Education Leadership from the University of West Florida
 Biology 6-12
 Educational Leadership K-12
 Nationally Board Certified as an Athletic Trainer

Performance Record

2013
 The school grade is pending. U.S. News and World Reports listed Rutherford High School in the top ten percent of excellent high schools in the state of Florida and the top 7% in the nation.
 School Statistics:
 2012
 School grade was a "C."
 Reading: The 9th grade FCAT 2.0 results for reading were 49% (318) of students made proficiency (a 6% reduction in proficiency from the previous year) and in the 10th grade 47% (318) made proficiency (a 1% reduction in the previous year.)
 Writing: Writing scores reflected 74% (245) of students scoring proficient 43% (142) scoring a 3.5 or above and 23% (76) scoring a 4.0 or above.
 Algebra 1: Algebra 1 scores reflected 51% (163) scored a level 3 or above; 11% (35) of the students who took Algebra 1 scored a level 4 or above.
 Geometry: Students were measured in three groups of thirds. The first third being the lowest scorers and the third third being the highest scorers. 1st third – 26%; 2nd third – 42%; 3rd third – 33%. 307 students tested.
 Biology EOC: In the Biology EOC students were measured in three groups of thirds. The 1st third being the lowest scorers and the 3rd third being the highest scorers. Our scores were: 9th grade scores; 1st third – 11%; 2nd third – 35%; 3rd third – 54%; 10th grade scores; 1st third – 47%; 2nd third – 36%; 3rd third – 17%
 2011
 School Statistics:
 47% making proficiency in Reading, 47% making LG in Reading, 40% of the lowest 25% making LG in Reading, 78% making proficiency in Math, 75% making LG in Math, 69% of the lowest 25% making LG in Math, White students did meet AYP for 2011 but no other sub groups, 73% Meeting high standards in writing, 69% scored a 4 or above which is up from 64% in 2010 in writing, 42% Making high standards in Science.
 2010
 School Grade B, 50% making proficiency in Reading, 47% making LG in Reading, 44% lowest 25% making LG in Reading, 76% making proficiency in Math, 70% making LG in Math, 52% lowest 25% making LG in Math, 83% making proficiency in Writing, 41% making proficiency in Science

2009

School Grade C, 51% making proficiency in Reading, 48% making LG in Reading, 44% lowest 25% making LG in Reading; 74% making proficiency in Math, 69% making LG in Math, 75% lowest 25% making LG in Math; 74% making proficiency in Writing, 47% making proficiency in Science

2008
School Grade B, 53% making proficiency in Reading, 56% making LG in Reading, 41% lowest 25% making LG in Reading; 79% making proficiency in Math, 76% making LG in Math, 67% lowest 25% making LG in Math; 47% making proficiency in Writing, 47% making proficiency in Science.

Instructional Coaches

of instructional coaches

3

receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

Instructional Coach Information:

Jennifer Rogers		
Full-time / School-based	Years as Coach: 3	Years at Current School: 8
Areas	Reading/Literacy	
Credentials	Social Science 6-12, ESE K-12, Elementary Ed, ESOL endorsed, Reading Endorsed, NB-ESE Pre-K thru 12	
Performance Record	<p>2013 The school grade is pending. U.S. News and World Reports listed Rutherford High School in the top ten percent of excellent high schools in the state of Florida and the top 7% in the nation. School Statistics:</p> <p>2012 School grade was a "C." Reading: The 9th grade FCAT 2.0 results for reading were 49% (318) of students made proficiency (a 6% reduction in proficiency from the previous year) and in the 10th grade 47% (318) made proficiency (a 1% reduction in the previous year.) Writing: Writing scores reflected 74% (245) of students scoring proficient 43% (142) scoring a 3.5 or above and 23% (76) scoring a 4.0 or above. Algebra 1: Algebra 1 scores reflected 51% (163) scored a level 3 or above; 11% (35) of the students who took Algebra 1 scored a level 4 or above. Geometry: Students were measured in three groups of thirds. The first third being the lowest scorers and the third third being the highest scorers. 1st third – 26%; 2nd third – 42%; 3rd third – 33%. 307 students tested. Biology EOC: In the Biology EOC students were measured in three groups of thirds. The 1st third being the lowest scorers and the 3rd third being the highest scorers. Our scores were: 9th grade scores; 1st third – 11%; 2nd third – 35%; 3rd third – 54%; 10th grade scores; 1st third – 47%; 2nd third – 36%; 3rd third – 17%</p> <p>2011 Jennifer Rogers was promoted to a district Literacy Coach stationed at Rutherford High School, previously she had been working as a reading teacher at Rutherford High School. Rutherford's statistics for student achievement were: 47% making proficiency in Reading, 47% making LG in Reading, 40% of the lowest 25% making LG in Reading, 78% making proficiency in Math, 75% making LG in Math, 69% of the lowest 25% making LG in Math, White students did meet AYP for 2011 but no other sub groups, 73% Meeting high standards in writing, 69% scored a 4 or above which is up from 64% in 2010 in writing, 42% Making high standards in Science.</p>	

Margo Anderson		
Part-time / District-based	Years as Coach: 2	Years at Current School: 1
Areas	Reading/Literacy	
Credentials	Any degrees, certifications, or endorsements held: M.A. Language and Literature B.A. English Reading Endorsement (last component to be completed Oct 2013) 6-12 Secondary English certification	
Performance Record	Ms. Anderson is highly qualified to work with site-based faculty to build their capacity with instructional and structural practices to facilitate school improvement.	

Alison Colmere		
Part-time / District-based	Years as Coach: 1	Years at Current School: 1
Areas	Rtl/MTSS	
Credentials	B.S in Elementary Education from Florida State University Masters in Reading from Florida State University K-6 Elementary Education ESOL Endorsed 6-12 English K-12 Reading	
Performance Record	Tyndall Elementary School where the school grade for 2012-2013 school year was an A. Ms. Colmere began her new job in July 2013. She is highly qualified to work with site-based faculty to build their capacity with instructional and structural practices to facilitate student supports according to school/district MTSS plans.	

Classroom Teachers

# of classroom teachers	61
# receiving effective rating or higher	61, 100%
# Highly Qualified Teachers	92%
# certified in-field	56, 92%
# ESOL endorsed	6, 10%

reading endorsed

6, 10%

with advanced degrees

19, 31%

National Board Certified

10, 16%

first-year teachers

6, 10%

with 1-5 years of experience

7, 11%

with 6-14 years of experience

14, 23%

with 15 or more years of experience

34, 56%

Education Paraprofessionals

of paraprofessionals

4

Highly Qualified

4, 100%

Other Instructional Personnel

of instructional personnel not captured in the sections above

1

receiving effective rating or higher

(not entered because basis is < 10)

Teacher Recruitment and Retention Strategies

This section meets the requirements of Section 1114(b)(1)(E), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Strategies to recruit and retain highly qualified, certified-in-field, effective teachers to the school, including the person responsible

1. Recruitment: Rutherford targets the hiring of highly qualified teachers by providing a safe and orderly work environment where new teachers are provided with veteran staff as mentors, support in disciplinary and intervention situations with students, time for teacher collaboration, and on-site, job-embedded professional development.
2. Recruitment: Rutherford targets the hiring of highly qualified teachers . This will when appropriate include veteran teachers from other schools. We also utilize the SearchSoft personnel tracking system to review credentials and references on all applicants to ensure the best fit for our school. Teachers are interviewed during the application process.
3. Retention: To prevent teacher turnover, our school will offer once a month meetings for new teachers (0 to 3 years) to discuss areas of concern and individualized support.
4. Retention: Our district provides a teacher induction program that trains new teachers after school on various topics to assist in retaining these teachers.
5. Retention: All of our Alternative Certification teachers are mentored by an district provided

Alternative Certification Instructional Specialist.

6. ESOL Endorsement, Reading Endorsement , and New Teacher Evaluation Training opportunities are provided to all staff members via Bay District initiatives.

7. Department Heads work with all teachers in their department to offer training and support.

Teacher Mentoring Program/Plan

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(D) and 1115(c)(1)(F), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Teacher mentoring program/plan, including the rationale for pairings and the planned mentoring activities

Mentoring Program at Rutherford High School

1. District New Teacher Mentor program: The district has appointed a Teacher of Special Assignment who meets with new teachers once a month to help with State and District requirements. Ex. helps with lesson plans, resources, new teacher orientation paperwork and training required by the state and district. This also includes a new teacher meeting at the district office with informational meetings that cover a broad range of topics from ethical behavior to drug education.

2. Administration Mentoring- To build relationships with our new teachers - Monthly Meetings/ Individual Meetings as required. Model best practices, observations, feedback on practices, assistance with resources and communication.

3. Department Heads Mentoring - As part of the department head's job description, they are role models, mentors, coaches and a support team for members of their departments. Monthly Meetings/ Individual Meetings as required. Model best practices, observations, feedback on practices, assistance with resources and communication.

4. Teacher mentor- Pair up program - each new teacher is paired with another more seasoned teacher to offer one on one support.

Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) / Response to Intervention (RtI)

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(i)-(iv) and 1115(c)(1)(A)-(C), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Data-based problem-solving processes for the implementation and monitoring of MTSS and SIP structures to address effectiveness of core instruction, resource allocation (funding and staffing), teacher support systems, and small group and individual student needs

The MTSS team is supported by small teacher groups to work with students and their progress by sharing DEA data, Class grades, test grades, and writing responses. These small teacher groups will meet once a month by common core subject to discuss student data, coverage of content standards, implementation of common core practices, review strategies and resource sharing. Particular students of concern in terms of attendance, academic progress, and behavior will be discussed and modifications reported/suggested and if appropriate referred to the Child Study Team.

Function and responsibility of each school-based leadership team member as related to MTSS and the SIP

The MTSS team will meet on a monthly basis to review school data from a variety of sources. The MTSS team will evaluate the progress of students identified as Tier II and Tier III students and their progress. The MTSS team will work with the Child Study Team to identify students that may require interventions and begin the implementation stage of the problem solving process as well as working with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS

Systems in place that the leadership team uses to monitor the fidelity of the school's MTSS and SIP

The MTSS team will meet on a monthly basis to review school data from a variety of sources. The MTSS team will evaluate the progress of students identified as Tier II and Tier III students and their progress. The MTSS team will work with the Child Study Team to identify students that may require interventions and begin the implementation stage of the problem solving process as well as working with other school teams to organize/coordinate MTSS

Data source(s) and management system(s) used to access and analyze data to monitor the effectiveness of core, supplemental, and intensive supports in reading, mathematics, science, writing, and engagement

Data sources will include the Discovery Education Assessment (our progress monitoring program) , FCAT, Classworks, Classroom grades, and other data as needed.

Small group meetings with 9th and 10th grade teachers and students. Ex. Algebra 1/Agile Minds, Reading 9th and 10th/Biology etc. AP/IB teachers to focus on students who need additional supports/are struggling. Small group meetings once a nine weeks with Economics/Govt teachers/ Math for college Readiness, English 4, 11th grade math, science, English students to determine progress and concerns. Meet with CTE teachers once a 9 weeks to work on and develop a 5 year plan for expanding our CTE offerings.

Data Boards in the professional development room will be created to show each 9th and 10th grade (and retake) students baseline, mid-year, and readiness before the end of year testing placement individually so that their progress can be visually monitored.

Focus, the district data program allows us the opportunity to run several reports which are discussed with the appropriate groups. This data is discussed at administration meetings, MTSS meetings, SIT Team Meetings, Dept. Head meetings etc.

Attendance every 4 weeks

Discipline every 4 weeks

Teacher grades every 9 weeks

Failures every 9 weeks

Plan to support understanding of MTSS and build capacity in data-based problem solving for staff and parents

Our MTSS Coach will meet with our 9th and 10th grade small group core teachers to discuss support mechanisms and strategies with our teachers. MTSS training for all teachers as a faculty on the foundation of MTSS and how the school will be implementing support structures for our students.

There are state MTSS brochures for parents as well as a parent resource website and families will be notified if their student is new to receiving intensive interventions.

Increased Learning Time/Extended Learning Opportunities

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(ii)(II)-(III), 1114(b)(1)(I), and 1115(c)(1)(C)(i) and 1115(c)(2), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Research-based strategies the school uses to increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum:

Strategy: Before or After School Program

Minutes added to school year: 4,320

Tutoring on Tuesdays and Thursdays for the second 9 weeks of the first semester. History and Science tutoring during scheduled project time periods. Ex. Science Fair and History Fair.

Strategy Purpose(s)

- Instruction in core academic subjects

How is data collected and analyzed to determine the effectiveness of this strategy?

The math teachers keep a list of students attending tutoring and the appropriate focus group (Algebra, Agile Minds, Geometry) and record their grades and note if improving or if more interventions are necessary.

Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?

The teachers/tutors for each class as appropriate. Ex. tutor records attendance and times on Google docs which all teachers can access determine if achievement progress is being made.

Strategy: Summer Program

Minutes added to school year: 960

Rams (Rams Adore Math and Science) program to give forty to 60 local (walking distance) high school students the opportunity to participate in 4 problem solving activities which incorporate math, science, and technology. Each activity will engage students in predictions, scientific methods, application of math and statistical principles, technical writing and end with a parent event where students will showcase the students work and writing. (Four Day stem initiative- with breakfast and lunch provided through the school summer lunch program.)

Strategy Purpose(s)

- Instruction in core academic subjects
- Enrichment activities that contribute to a well-rounded education
- Teacher collaboration, planning and professional development

How is data collected and analyzed to determine the effectiveness of this strategy?

Students will be followed the following year in all of their classes to see what percentage of their grades are C's or above.

Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?

The district science mentor, teachers at Rutherford High School and the Asst. Principal of Curriculum.

Strategy: Weekend Program

Minutes added to school year:

Rams Rock Reading is a program whereby reading teachers with the literacy coach develop targeted reading strategies for students based on the DEA progress monitoring data and classroom experiences/dept. tests given in the areas for which the students are accessed. Ex. informational text. There are two parents meetings at different times to provide information regarding the program. Teachers are given time to call parents in their classes personally to ask for their students participation and to plan novel and engaging activities for the students based on the areas of needed growth.

Strategy Purpose(s)

- Instruction in core academic subjects
- Teacher collaboration, planning and professional development

How is data collected and analyzed to determine the effectiveness of this strategy?

Data is collected by offering this opportunity to all level 1 and level 2 reading students (based on the previous years FCAT data.) These students names and hours of participation are documented along with their previous FCAT score data. Once FCAT data is released for each student who participated in the program the learning gains and students who score proficient are tabulated and those results made available to the school and district.

Who is responsible for monitoring implementation of this strategy?

The Asst. Principal of Curriculum, the Literacy Coach, and the reading teachers forge a team. The AP and Literacy Coach are responsible for the funding, planning, supervising, and data collations of the program. The teachers are responsible for the referrals, phone calls, lessons and encouragement of the students participating in the program.

Literacy Leadership Team (LLT)

Names and position titles of the members of the school-based LLT

Name	Title
Beth Patterson	Asst. Principal
Jennifer Rogers	Literacy Coach
Beth Purser	Social Studies Teacher
Myra Crews	Science Teacher
Telnicial Brown	Reading Teacher
MaryAnne Pomeroy	Reading Teacher
Cindy Biddle	Reading Teacher
Deborah Hudson	Reading Teacher
Millie Carlisle	Reading Teacher
DaShoan Olds	Math Teacher
Bill Doyle	PE/ROTC
Cathy Rutland	English Department Head

Name	Title
Cecilia Leathers	Spanish Teacher
Jessica Griffin	Math Teacher
Doug Lee	Asst. Principal
Coy Pilson	Principal
Ray Stanquist	Administrative Assistant
Ruth Mott	Media Center Coordinator
Sherry Taylor-Butler	ESE Department Head
Steve Neely	Chemistry Teacher

How the school-based LLT functions

The LLT meets monthly to discuss data, implement ideas and programs to promote reading among the students and across the curriculum, and to discuss the literacy standards/strategies for literacy instruction across the curriculum.

Major initiatives of the LLT

1. The Literacy Team will sponsor a book fair at the school and invite local authors to talk to students during Literacy Week. All students are invited.
- 2.. The team will continue to work on increasing the impact and implementation of several programs developed in the previous year (Stop/Drop/Read, FCAT Celebration, Summer Reading List, etc for all students.)
3. The support of RAMS ROCK for targeted students.

Every Teacher Contributes to Reading Instruction

How the school ensures every teacher contributes to the reading improvement of every student

Teachers across the curriculum will have students read in their content area and answer QAR questions. Teachers are required to complete two in a month, note it on their lesson plans and have teacher prompts and student examples available for their evaluating administrator. Four times a year, teachers will have students read and write in their homerooms to district provided prompts. These prompts will be graded by the homeroom teachers and then returned to the appropriate English teacher to edit and rewrite as appropriate. Training will be provided for content area teachers who desire assistance with these reading and writing strategies.

College and Career Readiness

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(B)(iii)(I)(aa)-(cc), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

How the school incorporates applied and integrated courses to help students see the relationships between subjects and relevance to their future

Our school is committed to offering more Career Technical Courses which give students the opportunity to earn Industry Certifications enabling them to apply their education directly to the world of work. These certifications offer students entry level credentials for career areas of their interest. In 2010 Rutherford Academy programs and Career and Technical classes began to have students study for, sit, take and pass Industry Certification exams with positive results. In the Culinary Arts Program, 100 students attempted the ServSafe certification, 94 students passed the exam. A total of 65 students from various business classes passed one or more Adobe Certification Exams. The drafting program had 21 students

pass the AutoCad Certification. The ComTech program integrates English, history and computer courses with focuses on the same topics. (Ex. Students may be studying France in history, while in English look at short stories by a French author and then recreating a map of France or a travel brochure in computers). Our Culinary Arts program feeds directly to the local State College where there is a wonderful Culinary Arts program and Cafe. Our community has a strong "tourism" industry and as a result the "Culinary" programs in our community are important. We have worked on updating our Drafting offerings by bringing in refurbished drafting desks from another school who has chosen to discontinue their drafting program and we have updated our computers and software in this program to meet the changing demands of this career field. We have a need for drafting in our community which is supported by the location of two military bases. Tyndall AFB and the Navy Research Base both utilize engineers and individuals with drafting skills. Our emphasis in math and science is supported by the build-up of this program. We were able to begin our Engineering Academy this year which incorporates science and technology in the 9th grade. In the 10th grade we will be adding geometry to the academy and in the junior and senior year a problem based class focusing on engineering/math/science and technical writing skills. We also began a Health Science Academy which in the 9th grade gives students an introduction into health careers, vocabulary, basic skills (i.e. bed making and germ prevention etc.). This program will continue in years 10 through 12 with additional courses that will enable students to pass a medical related Industry Certification Exam and be eligible to work.

How the school promotes academic and career planning, including advising on course selections, so that each student's course of study is personally meaningful

Guidance works with students on their individual course selection based on career choices. Students choose courses each year and the master schedule is based on those selections and the state requirements. Select students have mentors comprised of community members who visit with them each week to ensure they stay in school and attend to their academics. We have academics that offer Career and Technical components and certification. Colleges, military and community members are invited into the school and students may sign up to have conferences with these representatives.

Elective courses that are offered to students for future employment or job skill training include:

Computing for College and Careers, Culinary Operations I-IV, Television Production I-IV, Marketing I-III, Marketing Co-op, Computer Programming I-III, Computer Applications I-II, Drafting I-III, Web Design I-II, Communication's Technology Academy, Air Force JROTC, and Internships.

Students are encouraged to select these classes through their guidance counselors and homeroom teachers. Students are also exposed to these elective courses throughout the year as the classes participate in school wide activities. Students are recruited yearly to participate in an employment tour around the city to visit the main employers. We encourage the community to come and recruit students for jobs and internships. In addition, seniors have the opportunity to participate in Career Connections sponsored by the local Chamber of Commerce to acquaint students with the employment possibilities and contacts for those in our community.

Strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level

The following is data concerning students who took rigorous course work at RHS.

Percent of 2011 graduates who completed at least one AP, IB, AICE or Dual Enrollment course: 57.5%. Compared to the districts 63.1% and the states 50.0%. Rutherford has established a goal of 80% of our 2013 entering 9th graders to take at least one AP/IB/Dual enrolled course before graduating from high school. Rutherford in cooperation with Everitt Middle school are instituting an MYP program as a part of the IB curriculum of studies which will help prepare all students for rigorous course work. The principal has asked the guidance AP and counselors to direct every student to at least one IB/AP or dual enrolled course before leaving Rutherford High School.

Rutherford High school would like to address one of the major concerns of curriculum when comparing the

Percent of 2011 graduates who completed at least one dual enrollment science course at RHS 0.389% compared to the district 13.4% and state. 4.10%. Rutherford High School was able in the 2012 -2013

school year to offer two dual enrolled English classes (ENC 1101 and ENC 1102) and one dual enrolled science class (General Biology) to students. The Rutherford High School State College approved General Biology Dual Enrolled science teacher transferred. Rutherford is in the process of certifying another science major instructor to be eligible to teach that dual enrolled course through Gulf State College next year. The Rutherford Administration and school leadership team are aware of the need to hire when possible individuals in all areas that have the ability to teach advanced curriculum and especially in science. We hope to meet the state average of approx. 4% of our student body to graduate with at least one dual enrolled class completed in their high school career by 2015. This would mean approximately two additional classes of students (25 per class) in addition to the two English classes offered presently.

Expected Improvements

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(A),(H), and (I), and 1115(c)(1)(A), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Area 1: Reading

Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) - Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 3 on FCAT 2.0, or scoring at or above Level 4 on FAA

Group	2013 Target %	2013 Actual %	Target Met?	2014 Target %
All Students	61%	45%	No	65%
American Indian				
Asian	81%	71%	No	83%
Black/African American	47%	29%	No	52%
Hispanic	66%	38%	No	69%
White	64%	51%	No	68%
English language learners				
Students with disabilities	38%	12%	No	45%
Economically disadvantaged	54%	38%	No	59%

Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	146	45%	65%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	63	20%	45%

Learning Gains

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students making learning gains (FCAT 2.0 and FAA)	142	45%	65%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (FCAT 2.0)	171	54%	65%

Postsecondary Readiness

	2012 Actual #	2012 Actual %	2014 Target %
On-time graduates scoring "college ready" on the Postsecondary Education Readiness Test (P.E.R.T.) or any college placement test authorized under Rule 6A-10.0315, F.A.C.	315	23%	25%

Area 2: Writing

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Florida Comprehensive Assessment Test 2.0 (FCAT 2.0) Students scoring at or above 3.5	107	38%	42%
Florida Alternate Assessment (FAA) Students scoring at or above Level 4	<i>[data excluded for privacy reasons]</i>		0%

Area 3: Mathematics

High School Mathematics

Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs) - Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 3 on EOC assessments, or scoring at or above Level 4 on FAA

Group	2013 Target %	2013 Actual %	Target Met?	2014 Target %
All Students	81%	43%	No	83%
American Indian				
Asian	100%	76%	No	100%
Black/African American	78%	26%	No	81%
Hispanic	78%	47%	No	80%
White	80%	49%	No	82%
English language learners				
Students with disabilities	79%	16%	No	81%
Economically disadvantaged	83%	33%	No	84%

Learning Gains

	2012 Actual #	2012 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students making learning gains (EOC and FAA)		55%	83%
Students in lowest 25% making learning gains (EOC)		48%	81%

Postsecondary Readiness

	2012 Actual #	2012 Actual %	2014 Target %
On-time graduates scoring "college ready" on the Postsecondary Education Readiness Test (P.E.R.T.) or any college placement test authorized under Rule 6A-10.0315, F.A.C.			

Algebra I End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	290	30%	65%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	17	6%	46%

Geometry End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	136	48%	83%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	60	21%	46%

Area 4: Science

Biology I End-of-Course (EOC) Assessment

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students scoring at Achievement Level 3	181	61%	83%
Students scoring at or above Achievement Level 4	56	21%	52%

Area 5: Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM)

All Levels

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target
# of STEM-related experiences provided for students (e.g. robotics competitions; field trips; science fairs)	72		75
Participation in STEM-related experiences provided for students	223	18%	20%

High Schools

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students enrolling in one or more <i>accelerated</i> STEM-related courses	364	29%	33%
Completion rate (%) for students enrolled in <i>accelerated</i> STEM-related courses		37%	39%
Students taking one or more advanced placement exams for STEM-related courses	206	29%	33%
CTE-STEM program concentrators	20		2
Students taking CTE-STEM industry certification exams	195	15%	17%
Passing rate (%) for students who take CTE-STEM industry certification exams		85%	87%

Area 6: Career and Technical Education (CTE)

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students enrolling in one or more CTE courses	195	15%	17%
Students who have completed one or more CTE courses who enroll in one or more <i>accelerated</i> courses	164	13%	15%
Completion rate (%) for CTE students enrolled in <i>accelerated</i> courses		94%	95%
Students taking CTE industry certification exams	195	15%	17%
Passing rate (%) for students who take CTE industry certification exams		85%	87%
CTE program concentrators	34	3%	5%
CTE teachers holding appropriate industry certifications	5	7%	8%

Area 8: Early Warning Systems

High School Indicators

	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students who miss 10 percent or more of available instructional time	10	1%	1%
Students in ninth grade with one or more absences within the first 20 days	34	1%	1%
Students in ninth grade who fail two or more courses in any subject	93	25%	20%
Students with grade point average less than 2.0	174	14%	13%
Students who fail to progress on-time to tenth grade	93	25%	15%
Students who receive two or more behavior referrals	73	5%	4%
Students who receive one or more behavior referrals that leads to suspension, as defined in s.1003.01(5), F.S.	6	3%	3%

Graduation

	2012 Actual #	2012 Actual %	2014 Target %
Students dropping out of school, as defined in s.1003.01(9), F.S.	74	31%	29%
Students graduating in 4 years, using criteria for the federal uniform graduation rate defined in the Code of Federal Regulations at 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b)	239	76%	77%
Academically at-risk students graduating in 4 years, as defined in Rule 6A-1.09981, F.A.C.	49	51%	52%
Students graduating in 5 years, using criteria defined at 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b)	265	78%	79%

Area 9: Parent Involvement

Title I Schools may use the Parent Involvement Plan to meet the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(F) and 1115(c)(1)(G), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

Parental involvement targets for the school

Rutherford High School has initiated several new communication tools to help keep parents/students and all stakeholders up to date on the school, grades, activities, sports etc.

1. Principal Facebook page which updates everyone signed on with information
2. Principal Blog in which he shares upcoming events, educational philosophy, Monday memo's and other information regarding the school.
3. Principal Twitter account where followers are updated regularly regarding school activities
4. Administration/teachers use of Remind 101 to text important information and reminders to students and faculty.
5. Rutherford Web page with links to the above information as well as all activities which are available and regularly updated for parents.
6. Focus program which allows administration and teachers to provide information to parents as soon as they log on.
7. IRIS calls to all parties signed up with school numbers and e-mail addresses to update parents/ students/community.
8. Alumni Page begun this year by the RSGA to coordinate and involve current, past and future endeavors regarding the school and to build school spirit.

Specific Parental Involvement Targets

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
50% of our Parents and students will say we are excellent communicators			

Area 10: Additional Targets

Additional targets for the school

Campus Beautification

Specific Additional Targets

Target	2013 Actual #	2013 Actual %	2014 Target %
To place at least three large pieces of student art around the campus	4		7%
To decorate the front office area with student art work			%
to replace the decayed wooden fencing in the courtyard with shrubbery as a barrier			%

Goals Summary

G1. To improve students levels of proficiency in reading, math, writing, science, and social studies.

Goals Detail

G1. To improve students levels of proficiency in reading, math, writing, science, and social studies.

Targets Supported

- Reading (AMO's, FCAT2.0, FAA, Learning Gains, CELLA, Postsecondary Readiness)
- Writing
- Math (High School, High School AMO's, High School FAA, High School FAA, High School Postsecondary Readiness)
- Algebra 1 EOC
- Geometry EOC
- Social Studies
- U.S. History EOC
- Civics EOC
- Science
- Science - High School
- Science - Biology 1 EOC
- STEM
- STEM - All Levels
- STEM - High School
- CTE

Resources Available to Support the Goal

- DAT grant money from the district, drop out prevention money, and community support in terms of food/prizes/t-shirts
- Newly purchased Informational Text material for all reading teachers to emphasize non-fiction reading and to offer center work options for the reading frameworks.
- IB Resources financial and prof. content area training
- Special Teams like MTSS/RTI/Department Meetings and small group PLC's by specific subjects like Agile Minds, Algebra 1, College Readiness etc.

Targeted Barriers to Achieving the Goal

- Staff comfort with programs and strategies.
- Fidelity of instruction by all Instructors.
- Inequity of expectations across classrooms

Plan to Monitor Progress Toward the Goal

If proficiency levels in reading, math, writing, and social studies are improving then progress towards the goal is being met. However, if proficiency levels are not showing improvement, lesson plans, CWT, QAR's, and department and focus group feedback will be reviewed to identify possible root causes. If concerns are isolated to a classroom, resources and assistance will be provided to that teacher. If data indicates that concern is department wide, additional PD will be provided during the monthly Teacher Collaboration Meetings with coaching follow-up in teacher classrooms. Department and focus meeting data discussions related back to the School Improvement Plan and principal. DEA data will be placed on the data boards in the prof. development room. If proficiency levels are not improving then we will meet in departments and PLC's to develop a plan to address deficiencies.

Person or Persons Responsible

Administrators/department heads/SIP members

Target Dates or Schedule:

After each DEA testing (3 times a year) in Sept, Dec, and March

Evidence of Completion:

Lesson plans monthly, QAR's twice a month, and classroom walk-throughs weekly

Action Plan for Improvement

Problem Solving Key

G = Goal

B = Barrier

S = Strategy

G1. To improve students levels of proficiency in reading, math, writing, science, and social studies.

G1.B1 Staff comfort with programs and strategies.

G1.B1.S1 Provide staff development and coaching.

Action Step 1

Staff development for 6 Traits + writing, FCAT 2.0 writing requirements, Differentiated instruction, collaborative classrooms. and Agile Minds Algebra

Person or Persons Responsible

Principal will secure facilitators

Target Dates or Schedule

September to January (See RHS staff development calendar)

Evidence of Completion

Staff Development Schedule and Aims Sign in sheets

Facilitator:

Administrators

Participants:

Administrators and Faculty

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B1.S1

Evidence of implementation of the PD topics will be monitored in Lesson Plans, classroom walk-throughs and completion of the coaching cycle..

Person or Persons Responsible

Administrators will randomly review lessons plans monthly and conduct classroom walk-throughs on a weekly basis using a customized CWT feedback form.

Target Dates or Schedule

Classroom walk-throughs will be conducted on a weekly basis, lesson plans are reviewed by administrators monthly.

Evidence of Completion

Aims, Sign in Sheets, Lesson Plans and CWT feedback forms.

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B1.S1

QAR's, Focus meetings, Lesson plans

Person or Persons Responsible

Administrators

Target Dates or Schedule

Lesson Plans monthly/classroom walk-throughs weekly/teacher kept student examples of QAR's two times a month

Evidence of Completion

Lesson Plans, Student work, walk-through data collection sheet.

G1.B2 Fidelity of instruction by all Instructors.

G1.B2.S1 Monitor instruction through classroom walk-throughs providing immediate feedback with a classroom through feedback forms.

Action Step 1

Administrators will conduct random, focused walk-throughs

Person or Persons Responsible

Administrators

Target Dates or Schedule

Walk-throughs will be conducted weekly for the entire school year.

Evidence of Completion

Data from the walk-throughs will be collected on a classroom walk-through feedback form. The form identifies evidence of school improvement strategies and other instructional expectations. The feedback form charts the occurrences for each item noted during the CWT.

Facilitator:

Admin/district

Participants:

Administration and classroom teachers

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B2.S1

A report displaying data from the look-fors collected during the CWT's each month will be generated and reviewed by administrators and the Leadership team.

Person or Persons Responsible

Principal

Target Dates or Schedule

the CWT results will be reviewed on a monthly basis.

Evidence of Completion

CWT Feedback chart.

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B2.S1

Evidence of implementation of school improvement strategies will be collected during CWT's. Fidelity of instruction considered on track if at least a 80% of classrooms are observed to be implementing department appropriate school improvement strategies during the CWT's each month.

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration and Literacy Leadership Team

Target Dates or Schedule

Monthly

Evidence of Completion

CWT feedback chart and Leadership Team Meeting Minutes.

G1.B3 Inequity of expectations across classrooms

G1.B3.S1 Create PLC's structures for teachers in Algebra 1, Agile Minds, 10th grade writing, American History, and Biology once a month.

Action Step 1

Once a month teachers in Algebra 1, Agile Minds, 10th grade writing, American History and Biology once a month.

Person or Persons Responsible

Asst. Principal

Target Dates or Schedule

Monthly by schedule

Evidence of Completion

Sign in sheets, agendas, notes,

Plan to Monitor Fidelity of Implementation of G1.B3.S1

Administrator will attend monthly meetings with PLC to insure that professional conversations regarding content area, grades, strategies etc. take place.

Person or Persons Responsible

Administration

Target Dates or Schedule

Monthly by calendar (master calendar)

Evidence of Completion

sign-in sheets, agendas, and notes.

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness of G1.B3.S1

PLC's will look at DEA data in Sept., Dec-Jan, and March to monitor student progress in content area proficiency.

Person or Persons Responsible

Teachers in the PLC

Target Dates or Schedule

After each DEA progress monitoring test.

Evidence of Completion

DEA data and changes if any in instructions that are needed.

Coordination and Integration

This section meets the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(J) and 1115(c)(1)(H), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b).

How federal, state, and local funds, services, and programs are coordinated and integrated at the school

Rutherford High School has few separate monies available to supplement programs and provide student support. Below is the list of funds and the focus on which they will be spent.

1. Rutherford High School has the Free and Reduced Breakfast and Lunch program through the Federal Government that is available to Florida Schools.
2. Job Training is available to students through Coop programs which will serve 70 students this year. The district in cooperation with local businesses annually take groups of interested 11th and 12th graders to different businesses in our community and that initiative is funded through the district.
3. The International Baccalaureate and Advanced Placement programs earn money that is put back into the programs through the purchase of supplies, teacher training, technology, tests, etc.
4. CTE programs work to prepare students in the fields of a Health Science Academy, Culinary Academy, Engineering Academy, Adobe Certifications, and CAD technology programs. These CTE Academies earn moneys for their programs that are used to keep the programs current in terms of technology, resources and support of students mastering their program. Ex. Culinary students planning, preparing, and serving at special events.
5. Our school has an after-school robotics program whereby students engineer a "robot" to complete a task and take that robot to state competition. This program is funded through donations from the community businesses and school sponsored fund raisers.
6. Rutherford has an active Mu Alpha Theta competitive Math program that competes in our region.
7. Rutherford has a Science Club that works with other elementary and middle schools to bring "science alive" and to share their knowledge and passions. This program is funded through club dues and grant funds to buy the materials and pay for the transportation needs of this program.
8. Rutherford High School has \$18,500 in Drop Out Prevention money to support programs, opportunities, professional development, tutoring, summer enrichment, and RAMS Rock Programs. Rutherford applies annually to the district for additional funds targeted for schools with a large population of free and reduced population of students to offer supplementary funding. The program that has been traditionally funded through these funds is the RAM Rocks program. This program requires a grant proposal with research and data be submitted to be approved by the district and moneys released in January to support additional programs to support additional instruction.

Appendix 1: Professional Development Plan to Support School Improvement Goals

This section will satisfy the requirements of Sections 1114(b)(1)(D) and 1115(c)(1)(F), P.L. 107-110, NCLB, codified at 20 U.S.C. § 6314(b), by demonstrating high-quality and ongoing professional development for teachers, principals, and paraprofessionals and, if appropriate, for pupil services personnel, parents, and other staff is being offered to enable all children in the school to meet the State's student academic achievement standards.

Professional development opportunities identified in the SIP as action steps to achieve the school's goals.

G1. To improve students levels of proficiency in reading, math, writing, science, and social studies.

G1.B1 Staff comfort with programs and strategies.

G1.B1.S1 Provide staff development and coaching.

PD Opportunity 1

Staff development for 6 Traits + writing, FCAT 2.0 writing requirements, Differentiated instruction, collaborative classrooms. and Agile Minds Algebra

Facilitator

Administrators

Participants

Administrators and Faculty

Target Dates or Schedule

September to January (See RHS staff development calendar)

Evidence of Completion

Staff Development Schedule and Aims Sign in sheets

G1.B2 Fidelity of instruction by all Instructors.

G1.B2.S1 Monitor instruction through classroom walk-throughs providing immediate feedback with a classroom through feedback forms.

PD Opportunity 1

Administrators will conduct random, focused walk-throughs

Facilitator

Admin/district

Participants

Administration and classroom teachers

Target Dates or Schedule

Walk-throughs will be conducted weekly for the entire school year.

Evidence of Completion

Data from the walk-throughs will be collected on a classroom walk-through feedback form. The form identifies evidence of school improvement strategies and other instructional expectations. The feedback form charts the occurrences for each item noted during the CWT.

Appendix 2: Budget to Support School Improvement Goals

Budget Summary by Goal

Goal	Description	Total
	Total	\$0

Budget Summary by Funding Source and Resource Type

Funding Source	Evidence-Based Program	Total
		\$0
Total		\$0

Budget Details

Budget items identified in the SIP as necessary to achieve the school's goals.

G1. To improve students levels of proficiency in reading, math, writing, science, and social studies.

G1.B1 Staff comfort with programs and strategies.

G1.B1.S1 Provide staff development and coaching.

Action Step 1

Staff development for 6 Traits + writing, FCAT 2.0 writing requirements, Differentiated instruction, collaborative classrooms. and Agile Minds Algebra

Resource Type

Evidence-Based Program

Resource

Funding Source

Amount Needed