James S. Rickards Middle School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

James S. Rickards Middle School

6000 NE 9TH AVE, Oakland Park, FL 33334

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Jorge Gurreonero

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2013

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: C (42%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Broward County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

James S. Rickards Middle School

6000 NE 9TH AVE, Oakland Park, FL 33334

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	Yes	69%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	87%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Broward County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission as educational leaders is to individualize our educational process in order to expose learners to literacy, technology, self-awareness, and problem-solving skills as we embrace the whole child.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision as an educational institution is to cultivate diverse learners who are physically, socially, and mentally prepared to become college and career ready global 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 Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Collado, Washington	Principal	
Drake, Kwan	Assistant Principal	
Sheffield, Claire	Assistant Principal	
Clarke, Tirza	School Counselor	
Alexis, Marjorie	School Counselor	
Fokes, Alecia	Math Coach	
Tierney, Brook	Reading Coach	
Santiago, Jose	Teacher, ESE	
Rolle , Roshekia	Assistant Principal	
Brandford, Marcia	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/1/2013, Jorge Gurreonero

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.*
1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

52

Total number of students enrolled at the school

810

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

17

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

14

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	291	362	332	0	0	0	0	985
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	120	91	0	0	0	0	294
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	12	11	11	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	97	160	82	0	0	0	0	339
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	70	66	0	0	0	0	166
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	65	92	97	0	0	0	0	254
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	83	99	101	0	0	0	0	283
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	142	214	197	0	0	0	0	553
Retained 2021	0	0	0	0	0	0	71	126	1	0	0	0	0	198
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	140	214	176	0	0	0	0	530

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 10/1/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	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	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				43%	57%	54%	41%	57%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				51%	57%	54%	53%	57%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				37%	48%	47%	45%	50%	47%
Math Achievement				42%	60%	58%	46%	60%	58%
Math Learning Gains				48%	58%	57%	54%	59%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	49%	51%	45%	50%	51%
Science Achievement				35%	49%	51%	34%	52%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				75%	71%	72%	63%	72%	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-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	32%	57%	-25%	54%	-22%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	45%	55%	-10%	52%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-32%				
08	2021					
	2019	42%	59%	-17%	56%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2021					
	2019	35%	58%	-23%	55%	-20%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	38%	53%	-15%	54%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				
08	2021					
	2019	23%	45%	-22%	46%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2021					
	2019	32%	43%	-11%	48%	-16%
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC						
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**	
2021						
2019						

CIVICS EOC						
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**	
2021						
2019	71%	71%	0%	71%	0%	

HISTORY EOC						
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**	
2021						
2019						

ALGEBRA EOC						
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**	
2021						
2019	89%	61%	28%	61%	28%	

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	94%	56%	38%	57%	37%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady,

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	38/18.5%	41/18.4%	0/0.0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	29/17.9%	32/18.2%	0/0.0%
	Students With Disabilities	3/7.5%	1/2.0%	0/0.0%
	English Language Learners	0/0.0%	0/0.0%	0/0.0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	37/15.4%	4/18.3%	0/0.0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	28/14.4%	34/18.0%	0/0.0%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0.0%	2/3.8%	0/0.0%
	English Language Learners	1/4.8%	2/9.1%	0/0.0%

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	6	16	22	6	17	22	7	12			
ELL	23	28	29	14	16	23	5	30	31		
BLK	26	26	19	12	14	22	18	27	38		
HSP	31	33	32	18	13	24	20	34	36		
MUL	29	35		19	11						
WHT	45	40	50	30	13	14	41	52	52		
FRL	30	28	24	16	12	21	20	34	40		
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	18	36	30	16	35	38	14	38			
ELL	29	46	36	30	42	42	17	68	69		
ASN	56	59		56	47						

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
BLK	38	52	42	31	38	31	31	69	71		
HSP	41	49	34	43	50	47	28	75	84		
MUL	50	44		47	29						
WHT	55	56	32	58	59	55	59	78	86		
FRL	40	50	36	40	47	40	32	73	83		

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	18	43	38	20	43	44	18	39			
ELL	17	45	42	27	47	37	23	42			
ASN	50	44		76	82						
BLK	34	50	55	40	51	44	22	66	78		
HSP	41	51	37	44	54	46	34	60	79		
MUL	40	55		47	74		42				
WHT	54	60	45	57	56	43	48	67	74		
FRL	39	52	47	43	54	47	32	63	78		

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	27
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	7
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	246
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	85%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	14
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	22

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	22
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	27
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	24
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	37
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	25
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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?

Students with Disabilities showed the lowest performance on the most recent math and ELA state assessments 2019-2020. Contributing factors to last year's low performance included but are not limited to: additional one-to-one supported needed to meet IEP goals for SWD. Professional development needed for differentiated instruction and meeting the instructional needs of SWD. Teachers interventions for students needed to be better aligned to meet IEP goals. Students also show a trend for being in the lowest 25% in previous assessment years.

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

Students with Disabilities showed the greatest decline in Math Achievement and Learning gains. The factor that contributed to this decline was a need for additional one-to-one support for SWD subgroup who encompass the lowest 25% in performance on state assessment.

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

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to state average is Math achievement.
State Achievement: 58 School Achievement: 42. Factors that contributed to this gap there was a need for ongoing progress monitoring of mastery of standards and a need for standard-based planning and instruction.

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

The data component showed the most improvement was the Civics EOC assessment school wide achievement score. Students received additional instructional support in preparation for Civics EOC assessment. Students participated in two-week EOC preparation After-School Camp. Civics teachers continued progress monitoring for mastery of standards throughout the year.

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

Paired students specifically with teachers to best meet the needs of our ESLS learners. Also with the learning strategies and skills class offered in each grade level we were able to focus the Civics attention to

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

Implemented inclusive scheduling for ESLS students across all grade levels. This allows for the support facilitator in each grade level to support the students who have clustered areas of need in regard to their IEP.

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.

Teachers during preplanning work were trained in ready the IEP and understanding the meaning of the various accommodations that are listed on student's IEPs. Additionally, Monthly grade level meetings with support team during PD time to interact and engage with Support Facilitators on strategies and skills to support.

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

Inclusive scheduling, learning strategies and skills class and specific scheduling for hand scheduling students with teachers to best meet their needs.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Addressing the Needs of SWD through Standards-Based Planning and Data Driven Instruction. According to ESSA data Students with Disabilities have a proficiency of 28%. An analysis of the data reveals a need for more in-depth standards-based planning and data driven instruction with an emphasis on SWD interventions, accommodations, and meeting IEP goals
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 2021-2022 school year Students with Disabilities will increase their overall proficiency by 14% on state assessments to 42%, which is slightly above the Federal Index.
Monitoring:	Students are monitored weekly in the learning strategies classes and bi-monthly during push-in's to classroom. ESLS Department with the classroom teacher tracks the students learning through Rocket Talks with the student and the administrator of the grade level.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Claire Sheffield (claire.sheffield@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Using weekly PLC's in ESE Department and content area teachers to collaboratively address the needs of SWD and lowest 25% in performance.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The focus of PLC's include teachers and support staff working together in creating standards-based lessons, sharing best practices, analyzing student assessment data, and formulating plans for enrichment/remediation. Teachers and support facilitators are better aware of student mastery of standards throughout the year.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Other specifically relating to Literacy Learning Gains in the lowest 25%	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to state assessment data in 2019-2020 37% of students at Rickards Middle School showed learning gains on the ELA FSA in the lowest 25%.
Measurable Outcome:	The percentage of SWD students who achieve a learning gain will increase from 37% to 45% by the end of May 2022, as measured by the ELA portion of the FSA.
Monitoring:	Teachers will monitor this in the classroom through rocket talks with students and data collection from the new curricular materials. The data that is assessed using the read 180 diagnostic and the ELA diagnostic will also assist in progress monitoring throughout the year. Teachers will also have Quarterly Rocket Talks with teachers regarding student progress and areas that still need improvement.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Claire Sheffield (claire.sheffield@browardschools.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Quarterly Rocket Talks (Data chats) with teachers regarding their students by class period. Teachers are responsible for entering developmental scale scores (DSS) into literacy data base and "projecting" the DSS score need to make a learning gain on the 2020 FSA. Students are also scheduled by reading level grades 6-8 and supplemental resource purchased for implementation within intensive reading classes.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Read 180 is an evidence based strategy that uses data driven individualized instruction based on reading level and is researched based to increase student reading Lexile level. The criteria used to make this determination was the number of students scheduled intensive reading and the effectiveness of Read 180.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, 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.

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.

School Culture is the customs, arts, social institutions, and achievements of a nation, people, or other social group. Here at Rickards, we take extreme pride in the various cultures that constitute who we are and through assorted efforts, we honorably recognize them all.

To embrace these cultures, we host the "Rockets Tour Around the World" which allows the community to have an opportunity to stamp their Rockets Passport while enjoying cultural sights, sounds and cuisine. The room is filled with family and friends representing their heritage by dressing in their cultural attire or their respected flag colors. The Bilingual/ESOL Department also provides parents with information about the various services and programs that are available for English Language Learners, multilingual families, and schools in Broward County. In addition, on every Tuesday night, our ESOL population and their families are welcomed to receive inciteful information on the imperativeness of academic involvement.

Social Emotional Learning (SEL)

Ms. Sasha Azouth Teacher and Equity Liaison, is being recognized for continuously leading our SEL Team and fostering school unification. Ms. Morris and her SEL team members have implemented the Bridg-it application to enhance school unity, Rockets pride, and great positivity. The Bridg-it application has created opportunities for staff and students.

Ms. Sasha Azouth, with extreme innovation, began the school year with the Bridg-It shout out competition. The shout out competition allowed students to send daily recognitions via the Bridg-It app to their peers or staff members. These motivational messages, happy birthday notes, or encouraging words were an amazing platform for school engagement in which the 8th graders reigned with 4,661 shout outs. Bridg-it also improves social health and wellness for us all especially the students.

The SEL team, has many more events underway to sustain an exceptional level of social health and wellness unquestionably. A few examples of these events include "the fruit of the month" an engaging educational activity that will raise awareness to the entire Rickards family of healthier dining options on a monthly basis promoting nutrition and wellness. Ms. Morris is undoubtedly deserving of this recognition, as she leads our school into a vibrant future with the utmost positivity, pride and passion.

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

Parent participate in parent teacher conferences, curricular nights and monthly PTSA and SAC meetings. Community partners working with Athletics Department for fundraising opportunities for the school as a whole. Local companies share donations with iZone to promote positive culture. Think before your post and dating matters are other curriculums that we have implemented through our peer counseling classes.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Literacy Learning Gains in the lowest 25%	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**