Mattie V Rutherford Alt Ed Center

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Mattie V Rutherford Alt Ed Center

1514 HUBBARD ST, Jacksonville, FL 32206

http://www.duvalschools.org/mvr

Demographics

Principal: Sadie Milliner Smith

Start Date for this Principal: 6/28/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School 4-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative 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)	
School Grades History	2020-21: No Grade 2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval 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.](http://www.floridacims.org)

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Mattie V Rutherford Alt Ed Center

1514 HUBBARD ST, Jacksonville, FL 32206

http://www.duvalschools.org/mvr

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)
Combination School 4-8	No	%

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

School Grades History

Year

Grade

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Duval 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.

The mission of Mattie V. Rutherford Alternative Middle School is to provide our students with a holistic and supportive educational experience. We are committed to helping our students achieve the highest level of academic, behavioral, and socio-emotional functioning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Students will leave Mattie V. Rutherford with the capacity to be successful in any middle or high school.

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
Milliner Smith, Sadie	Principal	Mrs. Milliner-Smith is responsible for the oversight of curriculum, instruction, assessment and day-to-day operation of the school. She developes school-wide goals with the faculty that are aligned with school's strategic plan. She uses student achievement data to assist faculty with creating student's academic growth plans. Mrs. Milliner-Smith conduct classroom walkthroughs, and facilitate parent meetings regarding the school's academic progress.
Kelly, Kacy	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Kacy Kelly-Williams is the department head for ELA/Reading. She will distribute instructional materials and information to teachers, assist with facilitating professional development, and analyzing student data to provide support to the ELA/Reading teachers to enhance students' academic performance.
Walker, Joann	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Walker is the department head for Social Studies. She will distribute instructional materials and information to teachers, assist with facilitating professional development, and analyzing student data to provide support to the Social Studies teachers to enhance students' academic performance.
Robinson, Carla	Teacher, K-12	Ms. Robinson is the department head for Math. She will distribute instructional materials and information to teachers, assist with facilitating professional development, and analyzing student data to provide support to the Math teachers to enhance students' academic performance.
Griffin, Albert	Dean	Mr. Albert Griffin will monitro students discipline data, referrals, facilitate SEIR Team Meetings, and support new teachers with implementing a discipline plan.
Sowers, William	Teacher, K-12	Mr. Sowers is the department head for Science. He will distribute instructional materials and information to teachers, assist with facilitating professional development, and analyzing student data to provide support to the Science teachers to enhance students' academic performance.
Denson-Butler, Alfreda	Teacher, ESE	Ms. Denson-Butler is the Exceptional Student Education Department chair. She will ensure that ESE support faciitator are providing support their respective content areas, provide support to teachers by providng data points and effective strategies to meet the needs of students with disabilities.
Mosley, Jerome	Assistant Principal	Dr. Mosley, Assistant Principal will facilitate/lead instructional PLC for teachers, and assist in managing the discipline process for students He will monitor, evaluate and support the Social Studies and Math Content areas teachers. He will facilitate all parent engagement meetings and activities as well as conduct emergency and safety drills for the school. . .

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/28/2021, Sadie Milliner Smith

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

0

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

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

16

Total number of students enrolled at the school

97

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

1

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

3

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	5	17	23	0	0	0	0	45
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	19	0	0	0	0	37
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	17	23	0	0	0	0	45
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	14	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	22	0	0	0	0	43
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	13	14	0	0	0	0	32

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	5	17	23	0	0	0	0	45

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	5	0	2	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	1	4	0	0	0	0	9

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/28/2021

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	1	3	6	45	50	0	0	0	0	105
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	3	2	20	25	0	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	2	3	20	20	0	0	0	0	46

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	1	0	4	12	24	0	0	0	0	41
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	13	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	13	0	0	0	0	25
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	13	18	0	0	0	0	35

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	1	0	4	12	24	0	0	0	0	41

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	3	4	3	0	0	0	0	10
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					54%	61%		51%	60%
ELA Learning Gains					56%	59%		53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile					53%	54%		50%	52%
Math Achievement					57%	62%		57%	61%
Math Learning Gains					57%	59%		55%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile					52%	52%		50%	52%
Science Achievement					50%	56%		52%	57%
Social Studies Achievement					76%	78%		78%	77%

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**
04	2021					
	2019	0%	52%	-52%	58%	-58%
Cohort Comparison						
05	2021					
	2019	0%	50%	-50%	56%	-56%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2021					
	2019	8%	47%	-39%	54%	-46%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2021					
	2019	2%	44%	-42%	52%	-50%
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
08	2021					
	2019	3%	49%	-46%	56%	-53%
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
04	2021					
	2019	0%	64%	-64%	64%	-64%
Cohort Comparison						
05	2021					
	2019	0%	57%	-57%	60%	-60%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2021					
	2019	7%	51%	-44%	55%	-48%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2021					
	2019	15%	47%	-32%	54%	-39%
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
08	2021					
	2019	3%	32%	-29%	46%	-43%
Cohort Comparison		-15%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2021					
	2019	0%	49%	-49%	53%	-53%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	6%	40%	-34%	48%	-42%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

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	19%	69%	-50%	71%	-52%
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	0%	57%	-57%	61%	-61%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The school used the Progress Monitoring Data for the Fall, Winter and Spring to as tool to monitor data.

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	100%	25%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	100%	100%	
	Students With Disabilities	100%	100%	
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	100%	100%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	100%	100%	
	Students With Disabilities	100%	100%	
	English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	100%	100%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	100%	100%	
	Students With Disabilities	100%	100%	
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	100%	100%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	100%	100%	
	Students With Disabilities	100%	100%	
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	100%	100%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	100%	100%	
	Students With Disabilities	100%	100%	
	English Language Learners			

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	100%	100%	100%
	Economically Disadvantaged	100%	100%	100%
	Students With Disabilities	100%	100%	100%
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	33%	66%	75%
	Economically Disadvantaged	100%	100%	180%
	Students With Disabilities	100%	100%	20%
	English Language Learners			

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	18%	24%	33%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	14%	100%	44%
	English Language Learners	100%	100%	100%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	49%	43%	33%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	14%	25%	49%
	English Language Learners	46%	46%	30%
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	83%	60%	37%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	60%	74%	16%
	English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	18%	24%	33
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	14.2%	100%	44%
	English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	50%	43%	35%
	Economically Disadvantaged			30%
	Students With Disabilities	46%	46%	
	English Language Learners			
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	56%	35%	18%
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	33%	16%	100%
	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
			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
			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

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		
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students		N/A
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target		
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency		
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index		
Total Components for the Federal Index		
Percent Tested		

Subgroup Data

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?

There students performed the lowest in Math and ELA across grade levels.

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

7th Grade ELA was 2% and 8th Grade Ela decrease from 22% to 3% proficient on FSA during the 2018-19

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 factors for low performance are: High mobility rate by students, lack of rigorous instructional delivery. The teachers will receive professional development to increase the rigor of instructional delivery.

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

Civic 2018 - 0%
2019 -19% t
2021 - 21%

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

The school added an experience Civics teacher that understood how to aligned student tasks to the standards.

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

The teachers will receive professional development on how to assess standards and create standard based assessments in Civics

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 will receive professional development on how to create lesson plans that provide rigorous instructional delivery.

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

The administrative team will conduct weekly walkthroughs to observe the validity of teaching and learning in the class and provide teacher feedback, as well as provide an opportunity for teachers to collaborate during PLC.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Improve standards-based instruction by utilizing standard Walkthrough Focus Tool to ensure teachers are producing standards unpacking standards by creating learning arcs with aligned tasks.
Measurable Outcome:	Using the Learning Arc, a vast majority of our teachers will implement standard aligned assessments.
Monitoring:	The administrative team will conduct weekly walkthrough and provide teachers with feedback, and professional development during PLC.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sadie Milliner Smith (milliner-s@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilize professional learning communities and common planning processes to improve teachers' abilities to provide effective standards-based instruction in the core areas.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	As expressed in the Opportunity Myth, if teachers are implementing standards aligned tasks and assessments, students will be able to successfully master grade course standards.

Action Steps to Implement

Facilitate professional development on standard and task alignment b using the Arc in PLC.

Person Responsible	Sadie Milliner Smith (milliner-s@duvalschools.org)

Paraprofessionals - Title 1 funds will utilize to provide to provide additional professional which will be used to provide small group instruction and support to improve student achievement.

Person Responsible	Sadie Milliner Smith (milliner-s@duvalschools.org)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	MVR will focus on creating a positive behavior intervention support plan to provide a supportive environment for all students. The 5 Essentials Survey during the 2020-2021 school year indicated an overall weak response to supportive environment.
Measurable Outcome:	To ensure a safe learning environment, the school will implement a Positive Behavior Intervention and Supportive Plan that will aid in decreasing the number of referrals.
Monitoring:	The Positive Behavior Intervention Support Team will access student referral data to provide feedback to support the teachers.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Albert Griffin (griffina@duvalschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The Positive Behavior Intervention Support Team will develop a school-wide positive behavior plan that will teach students effective ways to resolve conflict.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	As expressed in the 5 Essentials Survey, in a school with a supportive environments, students feel safe in and around the school. Utilizing Restorative Practices will reduce the number of incidences and increase the positive culture on our campus.

Action Steps to Implement

The PBIS Team will meet to develop the PBIS Plan to include:
Tier 1 community Building Circles
Tier 2 Restorative Conferences
Tier 3 Circle of Support and Accountability

Person Responsible	Albert Griffin (griffina@duvalschools.org)

All staff will be trained on Calm Classroom Strategies to help teachers and students develop self-awareness, mental focus and inner calm.

Person Responsible	Barbara Battle (battleb@duvalschools.org)

The faculty will be trained on how to implement the PBIS Plan.

Person Responsible	Albert Griffin (griffina@duvalschools.org)

The PBIS Team will meet monthly to collect and analyze referral data to identify where additional support is needed.

Person Responsible	Sadie Milliner Smith (milliner-s@duvalschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on 2021-22 data, ELA was identified as a critical need. Students at our school need support with learning the foundational skills of how to read and also understanding the content they are reading. As an Area of Focus, student success in ELA progress will also increase student achievement in other subject areas. o The percentage of students in grades 3-5, below Level 3 on the 2021 statewide, standardized English Language Arts assessment are as follows: 5th grade is 100%. o The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2020-2021 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized grade 3 English Language Arts assessment is as follows: 1st - 80% and 2nd - 73%
Measurable Outcome:	K-5 data: *Increase percentage of K-2 students scoring "At Grade Level" or above by 3-4 percentage points. Decrease number of "Below Grade Level" students by 3-4 percentage points. *Increase percentage of 3 -5 grade students scoring Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized English Language Arts assessment by 3-4 percentage points. Decrease number of "Below Grade Level" students by 3- 4 percentage points.
Monitoring:	Our school leadership team, district content specialist support, and Supplemental Instructional APs will review ELA data from district assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sadie Milliner Smith (milliner-s@duvalschools.org) Data Driven Lesson Planning: Understanding where students are with mastery of standards, using data from informal and formal assessments, planning clear objectives, implementation, and checking for understanding when lesson planning.
Evidence-based Strategy:	Small Group/Differentiated Instruction: Based on data, breaking groups of students into smaller groups to ensure Tier II support is given. Not all students are on the same level, but all standards must be mastered. Small group instruction will allow teachers to meet students at their level to support their needs. Progress Monitoring: Ensuring whole group lessons, interventions, and assessments are done with fidelity. Checking effectiveness from student data.

Instructional Reviews with Action Plans: Collecting data from classrooms in real time and providing immediate
and clear feedback for teachers and school leadership teams to work together to ensure effectiveness.

Data-driven Lesson Planning: Effective lesson planning requires teachers to determine three essential
components such as the objective, the implementation, and a reflection. https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/howto-plan-effective-lessons

Small Group/Differentiated Instruction: Small group instruction is the key to data-driven results and is the
gateway to meeting the needs of all learners. https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/turn-small-reading-groups-intobig-wins

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Progress Monitoring: Student progress monitoring helps teachers evaluate how effective their instruction is,
either for individual students or for the entire class. https://www.ascd.org/el/articles/how-student-progressmonitoring-improves-instruction

Instructional Reviews with Action Plans: The implementation review is a plan designed to 1) recognize
accomplishments, 2) track actions, 3) measure implementation impact, 4) evaluate the plan, 5) determine next
steps. It may be used by the school alone or with the assistance of the support lead. https://institutionalresearch.syr.edu/what-we-do/student-ratings/creating-an-action-plan/action-plan-teachingstrategies

Action Steps to Implement

Ensure teachers are equipped and comfortable with all four strategies listed above. Professional Development
during Early Release Days and Common Planning will be essential for Leadership to support teachers. Based
on observational data and teacher feedback, PD topics will be set before each Early Release and Common
Planning.

Person Responsible | Sadie Milliner Smith (milliner-s@duvalschools.org)

During Common Planning and individual teacher data chats, specific data pertaining to ELA reading and student success will be discussed and analyzed to ensure we are monitoring progress.

Person Responsible | Sadie Milliner Smith (milliner-s@duvalschools.org)

Give immediate feedback on any observations/walkthroughs conducted by state support, school leadership,
district content specialists, and district leadership.

Person Responsible | Sadie Milliner Smith (milliner-s@duvalschools.org)

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.

Our school leadership team will address all remaining schoolwide improvement priorities by:
1. Provide professional development on implementing school-wide discipline plan.
2. Collaborate with teachers and support specialist to ensure provide support to our Tier 2 and Tier 3 teachers.
3. Improve parent engagement by offering virtual opportunities to engage with teachers in lieu of face-to-face meetings.

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.

A Positive Behavior Interventions and Support Model (PBIS) will continue to be implemented during 2021-22 school year. All parents will attend an orientation session prior to enrolling into Mattie V. Rutherford Alternative Middle Education Center. in order for students to be successful, all parents and students will receive vital information regarding the academic programs, code of coduct, and school-wide expectations. Our Parent Liaison will meet with parents monthly to build a supportive opportunities for parents to connect with the school. The school has a partnership with Girls Matters to provide social and emotional support to our female students. The PBIS Team will build school culture by rewarding students for behavior/social and academic achievment. Students who receives zero referrals during their 45 day assignment, and earn an A/B Honor Roll will receive recognition through the morning announcments, and pizza party wth the principal.

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

All parents are invited to participate in the completion of the Parent Family and Engagement Plan, and attend monthly meetings. Parents are encouraged to visit the Parent Resource Room to get information on how to support their child in middle school. Teachers and support staff will receive training regarding the PBIS Plan for the upcoming year.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				$30,520.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	150-Aides	0061 - Mattie V Rutherford Alt Ed Ctr	Title, I Part A		$26,190.00
		Notes: Paraprofessional				
	6100	160-Other Support Personnel	0061 - Mattie V Rutherford Alt Ed Ctr	Title, I Part A		$4,280.42
		Notes: Parent Liaison				
	5100	510-Supplies	0061 - Mattie V Rutherford Alt Ed Ctr	Title, I Part A		$49.58
		Notes: Supplies				
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports				$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$0.00
					Total:	$30,520.00