

Escambia County School District

Ransom Middle School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	26
Budget to Support Goals	26

Ransom Middle School

1000 W KINGSFIELD RD, Cantonment, FL 32533

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Alphonse Marsh Jr

Start Date for this Principal: 7/30/2018

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	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	50%
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* Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
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 Escambia 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	26

Ransom Middle School

1000 W KINGSFIELD RD, Cantonment, FL 32533

www.escambiaschools.org

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	No	50%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	34%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Escambia 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.

Ransom Middle School believes all students can learn and be successful in middle school. Our purpose is to create a learning environment, which will enable each student to understand that learning is a life long process. The faculty is committed top providing rigorous academic courses that challenge students in order to prepare them for high school, college and the workforce.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Ransom Middle School is to connect teachers and students with a systematic and comprehensive instructional environment that combines rigorous and relevant curriculum. Innovative instructional practices serve as the catalyst in the transition from traditional learning to a student-centered, problem solving, project-driven approach that will carry students well into the next century.

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
Hicks, Kenneth	Dean	Responsible for Environmental section. Work with admin to disaggregate data.to establish goals.
Lipnick, Regina	Principal	Oversee SIP. Delegate SIP responsibilities.
Isphording, Elizabeth	Other	Research Science/Civics Section. Work with admin to disaggregate data.to establish goals
White, Juanda	Assistant Principal	Responsible for math section. Disaggregate data.to establish goals
Bond, Michael	Behavior Specialist	Responsible for special education input and establishing goals for ESE students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/30/2018, Alphonse Marsh Jr

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.*

4

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.*

20

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

74

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,317

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

10

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

17

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	439	444	428	0	0	0	0	1311
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	124	81	78	0	0	0	0	283
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	28	51	48	0	0	0	0	127
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	36	36	0	0	0	0	96
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	51	21	0	0	0	0	105
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	75	97	86	0	0	0	0	258
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	103	91	105	0	0	0	0	299
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	22	43	0	0	0	0	88

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	37	40	35	0	0	0	0	112

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	14	19	3	0	0	0	0	36
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	8	4	0	0	0	0	22

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/30/2021

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	461	441	428	0	0	0	0	1330
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	74	66	0	0	0	0	202
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	33	38	0	0	0	0	93
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	15	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	72	70	0	0	0	0	209
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	79	79	0	0	0	0	220

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	26	50	44	0	0	0	0	120

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	5	20	0	0	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	0	0	0	0	12

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	461	441	428	0	0	0	0	1330
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	74	66	0	0	0	0	202
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	33	38	0	0	0	0	93
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	4	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	12	15	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	72	70	0	0	0	0	209
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	62	79	79	0	0	0	0	220

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	26	50	44	0	0	0	0	120

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	5	20	0	0	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	4	0	0	0	0	12

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				55%	48%	54%	54%	46%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				57%	52%	54%	54%	48%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				52%	45%	47%	46%	44%	47%
Math Achievement				63%	46%	58%	56%	44%	58%
Math Learning Gains				61%	47%	57%	55%	47%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				46%	43%	51%	44%	44%	51%
Science Achievement				58%	43%	51%	54%	48%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				58%	58%	72%	58%	55%	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	51%	42%	9%	54%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	51%	43%	8%	52%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
08	2021					
	2019	63%	50%	13%	56%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	58%	36%	22%	55%	3%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	61%	50%	11%	54%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
08	2021					
	2019	37%	21%	16%	46%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2021					
	2019	58%	42%	16%	48%	10%
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	58%	54%	4%	71%	-13%

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	91%	52%	39%	61%	30%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	91%	47%	44%	57%	34%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

STAR was utilized for Fall, Winter, and Spring for ELA and progress monitoring for 6th, 7th, and 8th. The district quarterly assessments were used for Algebra, science, and social studies progress monitoring. The numbers reflect the membership, students tied to the school during both survey 2 and 3.

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	41.6	38.1	43.5
	Economically Disadvantaged	39.3	36.7	43.0
	Students With Disabilities	6.1	9.1	12.2
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	47.8	61.9	55.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	44.9	60.2	53.1
	Students With Disabilities	23.3	22.0	19.6
	English Language Learners	0	40.0	0

Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	36.7	37.7	36.4
	Economically Disadvantaged	33.0	33.3	31.6
	Students With Disabilities	11.5	10.9	7.3
	English Language Learners	50.0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	49.2	46.8	55.6
	Economically Disadvantaged	42.0	37.4	48.5
	Students With Disabilities	13.0	17.2	25.9
	English Language Learners	33.3	100	100
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students	80.1	55.5	58.7
	Economically Disadvantaged	75.6	48.4	52.2
	Students With Disabilities	55.4	34.3	21.2
	English Language Learners	100	100	100

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	35.5	32.1	34.6
	Economically Disadvantaged	29.6	29.5	29.2
	Students With Disabilities	12.1	19.4	12.9
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	47	39.7	35.9
	Economically Disadvantaged	41.2	36.1	29.8
	Students With Disabilities	20	25	16.7
	English Language Learners	n/a	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	62.1	64.9	53.8
	Economically Disadvantaged	57	57.1	47.2
	Students With Disabilities	32.1	30.3	24.0
	English Language Learners	n/a	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

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	17	23	18	24	32	28	29	34			
ASN	63	75		79	60			100	91		
BLK	33	40	37	33	26	19	28	52	52		
HSP	55	45	20	51	40	42	61	64			
MUL	46	53	30	50	45	33	45	46	69		
WHT	57	53	39	60	47	30	52	63	78		
FRL	47	49	38	48	38	26	38	55	61		
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	20	41	36	30	45	34	37	23			
ASN	77	80		85	80		83		93		
BLK	39	53	45	44	51	37	41	35	96		

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
HSP	57	58		57	50			56			
MUL	56	57	56	60	63	52	54	58	81		
WHT	59	57	54	68	64	51	63	63	89		
FRL	47	52	48	54	56	42	51	47	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	40	35	24	44	42	35	33	69		
ASN	81	67		89	88			83			
BLK	34	50	47	34	45	38	31	44	90		
HSP	46	47	36	51	56		50	27			
MUL	56	55	47	49	54	32	37	67			
WHT	58	54	45	60	57	48	59	61	81		
FRL	45	50	45	46	49	44	42	49	75		

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	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	447
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

English Language Learners	
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	78
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	36
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	47
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	46
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	53
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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

Analysis

Data Analysis

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

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

When comparing across grade levels:

6th grade had higher ELA and Math proficiency scores as compared to 7th & 8th grade.

6th ELA - 41%, 7th ELA-37%, 8th - ELA- 34%

6th Math -55%, 7th Math-51%, 8th - Math - 41%

8th grade had higher ELA proficiency scores for students with disabilities as compared to 6th & 7th grade.

6th grade had higher Math proficiency scores for students with disabilities as compared to 7th and 8th grade.

6th SWD proficiency scores ELA- 9%, Math -22%.

7th SWD proficiency scores ELA- 10%, Math - 19%.

8th SWD proficiency scores ELA -15%, Math - 21%.

When comparing "All Student" proficiency scores with "SWD" proficiency scores;

6th grade had the largest ELA and Math gaps.

6th ELA gap 32%, 7th ELA gap 27%, 8th ELA gap 19%.

6th Math gap 33%, 7th Math gap 32%, 8th Math gap 20%.

For Civics and Science the following data gaps exists between "All Students" and "SWD"

Civics "All students" - 65%. Civics "SWD"- 37%.

Science "All students" -60%. Science "SWD"- 29%

When comparing subgroup data, the largest disparities include:

ELA Achievement -55%. ELA SWD Achievement - 20%. Thirty-five percent difference.

Math Achievement - 63%. Math SWD Achievement - 30%. Thirty-three percent difference.

Social Studies (Civics) Achievement - 58%. Social Studies SWD (Civics) Achievement -23%. Thirty-five percent difference.

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

When comparing the state assessments, the greatest disparities exists for the following areas;

The math lowest 25th percentile is 5% below the state average. School Avg. - 46%. State Avg. - 51%

Social Studies Achievement is 14% below the state average. School Avg. 58%. State Avg. 72%.

All other subject area components are above the state and district average.

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

Contributing factors for math lowest 25th percentile and social studies achievement: Lack of teacher training. Teachers need more PD when developing lesson plans, disaggregating data and developing strategies for the lower 25th percentile and Civics students.

New Actions:

Hire an Rti/MTSS coordinator to work with math teachers and students in small groups.

Have math and civics district specialist meet with core teachers each month, conduct walkthroughs and provide PD for teachers.

Have admin meet with the math and civics district specialist to develop strategies for teachers.

Have admin meet with district data specialist each quarter to disaggregate school data.

Have the district data specialist meet with teachers each quarter to disaggregate school data.

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

The data components that showed the most improvement were:

ELA Lowest 25th Percentile 46% to 52%. Six percent increase.

Math Achievement 56% to 63%. Seven percent increase.

Math Learning Gains 55% to 61%. Six percent increase.

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

Professional development was provided for all math teachers quarterly by district specialists.

Teachers worked with the district data specialist to disaggregate data.

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

Teachers will need professional development on how to implement small group instruction and training on how to disaggregate data.

Teachers will need more time to plan together.

Students need more hands on instruction.

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.

Substitutes will be provided for teacher planning.

District specialists and the Rti/MTSS coordinator will provide teacher strategies for planning and group instruction.

The district data specialist will provide opportunities for teachers to disaggregate data.

Intensive math classes will be provided for each grade level.

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

Ongoing district training will be provided for ESE teachers to work with students with disabilities. (i.e. small group instruction and intensive math training.)

Ongoing training will be provided for the new Rti/MTSS coordinator regarding small group instruction and modeling strategies for teachers.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Achievement in Math has not reached 41% proficiency in the following sub group: Students with Disabilities (Proficiency 30%)

Measurable Outcome: Math proficiency for SWD will go from 30% on the 2021 FSA to 41% or higher on the 2022 FSA. The achievement gap in proficiency between SWD and overall students will decrease by 50%, going from 33 point gap on the 2021 FSA to a 17 point gap or less on the 2022 FSA.

Data from STAR360 and core math unit assessments will be collected, analyzed, and reviewed and broken down by teacher and ESSA groups.

Monitoring: The leadership team will conduct weekly walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of planning, professional development, and remediation. The leadership team will also review school wide data twice a month. The team will meet with the teachers to discuss the data and determine future instructional practices and identify needs for remediation or reteaching opportunities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Juanda White (jwhite1@ecsdfl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Expose students to multiple problem-solving strategies.
Teach students how to use visual representations.
Mathematical Language: Teach clear and concise mathematical language and support students' use of the language to help students effectively communicate their understanding of mathematical concepts.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In analyzing the 2019 FSA data and the current 2020 progress monitoring data:
-Lack of mathematical understanding in order to solve word problems appears to be a hindrance to math proficiency.
According to Improving Mathematical Problem Solving in Grades 4- 8 found on What Works Clearinghouse, explicit word problem instruction proved to have a moderate positive effect on student performance.
-The inability to use and understand mathematical representation appears to be a hindrance to math proficiency.
According to Improving Mathematical Problem Solving in Grades 4-8 found on What Works Clearinghouse, explicit mathematical representation proved to have a strong positive effect size on student performance.
-Lack of precise mathematical language and understanding appears to be a hindrance to math proficiency. According to Assisting Students Struggling with Mathematics: Intervention in the Elementary Grades found on What Works Clearinghouse, explicit mathematical language proved to have a strong positive effect on student performance.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional Development will be provided by the School Leadership Team, District Content Specialist and TSAs. The Professional Development that will be provided will include: Multiple problem solving strategies, use of visual representations, and mathematical language.

Person Responsible Juanda White (jwhite1@ecsdfl.us)

Following Professional Development, the School Leadership team and/or District Mathematics Specialist/ TSA will do class walk-throughs to look for implementation of the professional development and planning and provide feedback to the teachers.

Person Responsible Juanda White (jwhite1@ecsdf1.us)

In-depth coaching will be provided to teachers based on qualitative and quantitative data points. The coaching will be focused around content knowledge, word problems and student discourse. The coaching will be monitored by the School Leadership Team and District Content Specialist to determine the on-going coaching cycle.

Person Responsible Juanda White (jwhite1@ecsdf1.us)

The District and school based leadership team will meet with teachers to discuss FSA and prior year data for overall population and specific subgroups. The leadership team will analyze data metrics from STAR/ district progress monitoring and meet with teachers and students for data chats.

Person Responsible Juanda White (jwhite1@ecsdf1.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Achievement in Civics has been historically below the district and state average in proficiency for the following sub group: Students with Disabilities (23%)

Measurable Outcome:

The achievement gap in proficiency between SWD and overall students will decrease by 50%, going from 35 point gap on the 2021 Civics EOC to 17 point gap or less on the 2022 Civics EOC.

Monitoring:

The data metrics that will be utilized to monitor the Civics goal will be district created probes, unit tests, and quarterly progress monitoring. Administration will conduct weekly walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of planning, professional development, and remediation. Administration and the district content specialist will also review school wide data twice a month. Administration and the district content specialist will meet with the teachers to discuss data and determine future instructional practices and identify needs for remediation or re-teaching opportunities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Regina Lipnick (rlipnick@ecsdfi.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Provide direct and explicit comprehension strategy instruction with Civics text. (strong evidence)

Provide opportunities for extended discussion of text meaning and interpretation. (moderate evidence)

Connect and integrate abstract and concrete representations of concepts in Civics. (Organizing instruction and study)

Students are given multiple opportunities to encounter and use academic vocabulary in natural contexts through listening, reading, speaking, and writing. (Vocabulary for all)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

According to Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices from What Works ClearingHouse, providing direct and explicit comprehension strategies, and opportunities for extended discussion shows positive impact on student achievement.

According to Organizing Instruction and Study to Improve Student Behavior from What Works Clearinghouse, connecting and integrating abstract and concrete representations shows positive impact on student achievement.

According to 10 Key Vocabulary Strategies For All Students from The University of Texas at Austin/The Meadows Center for Preventing Educational Risk, giving multiple opportunities to encounter and use academic vocabulary shows a positive impact on student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Administration will meet with teachers to discuss Civics EOC and prior year data for overall population and specific subgroups. The leadership team will analyze data metrics from progress monitoring, and meet with teachers for data chats.

Person Responsible

Regina Lipnick (rlipnick@ecsdfi.us)

Professional development will include the following: implementation of the Social Studies curriculum which includes comprehension strategies, vocabulary, writing and abstract to concrete representations of concepts in Civics.

Person Responsible Regina Lipnick (rlipnick@ecsdfi.us)

Administration will conduct classroom walks on a weekly basis to monitor the implementation of the professional development and planning outcomes. Administration will provide feedback to teachers and determine coaching support based on the data metrics and classwalks. The team will determine future instructional practices and identify needs for remediation or reteaching opportunities based on the qualitative and quantitative data.

Person Responsible Regina Lipnick (rlipnick@ecsdfi.us)

In-depth coaching will be provided by the district data specialist to teachers based on qualitative and quantitative data points. The coaching will be monitored by the administration.

Person Responsible Regina Lipnick (rlipnick@ecsdfi.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Achievement in ELA has not reached 41% proficiency in the following sub group: Students with Disabilities (Proficiency 20%)

Measurable Outcome: The achievement gap in proficiency between SWD and overall students will decrease by 50%, going from 35 point gap on the 2021 ELA FSA to 17 point gap or less on the 2022 ELA FSA.

Monitoring: The data metrics utilized to monitor the goal will be STAR, district quarterly ELA assessments, and school-based assessments. The leadership team will conduct weekly walkthroughs to monitor the implementation of planning, professional development, and remediation. The leadership team will also review schoolwide data twice a month. The team will meet with the teachers to discuss the data and determine future instructional practices and identify needs for remediation or reteaching opportunities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Regina Lipnick (rlipnick@ecsdfl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Provide explicit vocabulary instruction. (strong evidence)
 Provide direct and explicit comprehension strategy instruction. (strong evidence)
 Provide opportunities for extended discussion of text meaning and interpretation. (moderate evidence)
 Integrate writing and reading to emphasize key writing features. (moderate evidence)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: According to Adolescent Literacy: Effective Classroom and Intervention Practices from What Works ClearingHouse, providing direct and explicit comprehension strategies, and opportunities for extended discussion shows positive impact on student achievement. According to the Teaching Secondary Students to Write Effectively from What Works ClearingHouse, utilizing writing for a variety of purposes shows positive impact on student achievement. According to 10 Key Vocabulary Strategies For All Students from The University of Texas at Austin/The Meadows Center for Preventing Educational Risk, giving multiple opportunities to encounter and use academic vocabulary shows a positive impact on student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Administration will meet with teachers to discuss FSA and prior year data for overall population and specific subgroups. The leadership team will analyze data metrics from STAR, district progress monitoring, My Perspectives, and iLit 45 and meet with teachers and students for data chats.

Person Responsible Regina Lipnick (rlipnick@ecsdfl.us)

Professional development will include the following: implementation of the new ELA curriculum which includes comprehension strategies, vocabulary, writing, and student discourse. PD will also include a co-teaching model for ESE teachers and data analysis to support MTSS.

Person Responsible Regina Lipnick (rlipnick@ecsdfl.us)

Administration will conduct classroom walks on a weekly basis to monitor the implementation of the professional development and planning outcomes. Administration will provide feedback to teachers and determine coaching support based on the data metrics and classwalks.

Person Responsible Regina Lipnick (rlipnick@ecsdfi.us)

In-depth coaching will be provided to teachers based on qualitative and quantitative data points. The coaching will be focused around content knowledge, comprehension strategies, writing integration, and student discourse. The coaching will be monitored by the School Leadership Team and District Data Specialist to determine the on-going coaching cycle.

Person Responsible Regina Lipnick (rlipnick@ecsdfi.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

In comparison to the state, Ransom's discipline data is significantly lower in all categories. Our primary area of concern is total reported suspensions, as we have a slight increase in suspensions from previous years. Ransom Middle is a Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) school. All students review the schoolwide behavior expectations (TIGER Expectations) and the district rights and responsibilities handbook at the beginning of the school year. The TIGER Expectations that all students and staff follow are Taking Responsibility, Instilling Integrity, Going the Extra Mile, Engaging in Learning, and Respecting Others. For overall school behavior, our teachers will work with students on minor behavior concerns within the classroom. They will reach out to parents to involve them in the process as well. The behavior deans trained all teachers on positive classroom management strategies and how to use the minor referral system on the FOCUS portal. For students who receive major discipline referrals, the behavior deans, coaches, and school resource officer will mentor those students in a behavior program. We have schoolwide outdoor field days for students with no major behavior referrals each semester. For students who need extra behavior support, the PBIS coach, the Rtl coordinator, and the behavior coach work closely with students in the Tier 2 and Tier 3 levels. These students have a behavior points tracker (Tiger Tracker) that is filled out by each teacher. These students then meet with their mentors (Rtl coordinator, behavior coach, or PBIS coach) weekly (Tier 2) or daily (Tier 3). At least monthly, all students with Tier 2 or 3 support meet with their mentors and receive prizes based on positive behavior. We also used the Suite360 online program to assign specific intervention modules to students based on their behavior needs. We monitored the intervention success by tracking on any subsequent major or minor referrals for those students.

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.

Ransom Middle is a Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) school. All students review the schoolwide behavior expectations (TIGER Expectations) and the district rights and responsibilities handbook at the beginning of the school year. The TIGER Expectations that all students and staff follow are Taking Responsibility, Instilling Integrity, Going the Extra Mile, Engaging in Learning, and Respecting Others. For academics, we have STAR360 progress awards, which are handed out to qualifying students. For students who need extra support in academic success, we use the PEAK online learning system for course recovery. This program allows students to complete any classes that they had previously not completed successfully. For attendance, we monitor by checking for perfect attendance, including tardies and parent checkouts, using our FOCUS information system. For behavior, we have outdoor field days for students with no major behavior referrals each semester. For students who need extra behavior support, the PBIS coach, the Rtl coordinator, and the behavior coach work closely with students in the Tier 2 and Tier 3 levels. These students have a behavior points tracker (Tiger Tracker) that is filled out by each teacher. These students then meet with their mentors (Rtl coordinator, behavior coach, or PBIS coach) weekly (Tier 2) or daily (Tier 3). At least monthly, all students with Tier 2 or 3 support meet with their mentors and receive prizes based on positive behavior. We also used the Suite360 online program to assign specific intervention modules to students based on their behavior needs. We monitored the intervention success by tracking on any subsequent major or minor referrals for those students.

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

We will continue to implement activities that will build the capacity for meaningful parent/family involvement, and build relationships with the community to improve student academic achievement. The Ransom Middle School faculty and staff feels so strongly about parent communication and involvement that four mornings are set aside for parent conferences. This year, the days will be Monday, Tuesdays, Thursdays, and Fridays. Teachers and guidance counselors will conduct a parent conference with each student's family who desires a conference. Grade reports can be accessed on Focus. In addition, we will continue to host parent/student orientations, parents meetings such as Algebra, National Junior Society, Student Leadership, and FSA nights. We will send out weekly parent call-outs and post news/events on the school Facebook page. We will continue to seek out new partners in education each year. Additionally, we also work with community stakeholders, including our school navigator, CHS, CDAC, RISE, to support our students' social-emotional needs.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00