

Duval County Public Schools

# Jean Ribault Middle School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>21</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>21</b>

# Jean Ribault Middle School

3610 RIBAUTL SCENIC DR, Jacksonville, FL 32208

<http://www.duvalschools.org/rms>

## Demographics

**Principal: Ronnie Williams**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 6-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: D (38%) 2016-17: C (41%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>21</b>

# Jean Ribault Middle School

3610 RIBAUTL SCENIC DR, Jacksonville, FL 32208

<http://www.duvalschools.org/rms>

## School Demographics

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)  Middle School 6-8	<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>  Yes	<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)  100%
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)  K-12 General Education	<b>Charter School</b>  No	<b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)  95%

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2020-21</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2017-18</b>
<b>Grade</b>		C	C	D

## 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.**

To provide exceptional educational opportunities for every student, everyday.

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

All students are motivated to capitalize on every learning opportunity that will prepare them for high school and beyond.

### 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
Williams, Ronnie	Principal	
Brown, Latoya	Assistant Principal	
Clayton , Trevor	Assistant Principal	
Burroughs, Lakeisha	Instructional Coach	
Moses, Lisa	Instructional Coach	
Hall, Mishel'le	Dean	

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Sunday 7/1/2018, Ronnie Williams

**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.*

6

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

46

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

760

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

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

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	267	241	252	0	0	0	0	760
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	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	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/22/2021

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	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	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	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	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	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	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	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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				26%	43%	54%	25%	42%	53%
ELA Learning Gains				37%	49%	54%	36%	47%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				32%	45%	47%	38%	44%	47%
Math Achievement				39%	49%	58%	35%	46%	58%
Math Learning Gains				45%	50%	57%	43%	50%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	47%	51%	44%	47%	51%
Science Achievement				15%	44%	51%	18%	45%	52%
Social Studies Achievement				66%	68%	72%	42%	82%	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	24%	47%	-23%	54%	-30%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	20%	44%	-24%	52%	-32%
Cohort Comparison		-24%				
08	2021					
	2019	23%	49%	-26%	56%	-33%
Cohort Comparison		-20%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2021					
	2019	36%	51%	-15%	55%	-19%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					

<b>MATH</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
	2019	28%	47%	-19%	54%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				
08	2021					
	2019	30%	32%	-2%	46%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-28%				

<b>SCIENCE</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
08	2021					
	2019	13%	40%	-27%	48%	-35%
Cohort Comparison						

<b>BIOLOGY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2021					
2019					

<b>CIVICS EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2021					
2019	61%	69%	-8%	71%	-10%

<b>HISTORY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2021					
2019					

<b>ALGEBRA EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2021					
2019	63%	57%	6%	61%	2%

<b>GEOMETRY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2021					
2019	89%	61%	28%	57%	32%

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

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

District generated PMA's

Grade 6				
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			

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

Grade 8				
	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
Science	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	32	36	31	37	38	38	39	53			
BLK	24	32	39	28	26	25	23	57	48		
WHT	32	25		43	33						
FRL	21	28	37	25	24	24	23	54	38		
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	29	32	30	42	50	41	19	63			
BLK	25	36	30	38	45	43	12	65	71		
MUL	69	46		50	53						
WHT	52	59		52	43						
FRL	25	36	31	37	44	40	11	65	79		

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	38	50	42	40	49	46	54	55			
BLK	23	35	37	34	42	44	17	41	56		
MUL	42	50		53	50						
WHT	41	44		53	50						
FRL	25	36	39	34	42	46	18	43	62		

**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	33
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	300
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	96%

**Subgroup Data**

**Students With Disabilities**

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
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
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	34
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	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	33
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	30
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?**

We decreased in all content areas except 8th grade Science.

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

All of them. Proficiency and gains are needed in all accountability areas.

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

Effective standards aligned planning, instructional delivery, and assessing student learning.

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

N/A

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

Focus on planning and delivery of instruction aligned to standards.

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

Strategic planning using item specs, ALDs, and vetting curriculum resources.

#### **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.**

District support will aid us better use of instructional tools that will yield desired student outcomes.

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

n/a

## **Part III: Planning for Improvement**

### **Areas of Focus:**



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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Less than 15% of the teachers are utilizing the Learning Arc protocols to align their instruction to the standard. In developing the teachers with implementing standards-based instruction it is important we provide training on how to utilize Learning Arc protocols to decrease the deficit during the 2021-22 school year. This will enable teachers to plan effective lessons using the CGs, item specifications, and ALDS to make sure delivered instruction and learning task are aligned to the standard.

**Measurable Outcome:** 100% of core content teachers will show progress towards fully implementing the Learning Arc protocols during planning, instructional delivery, and assigning task/ assessments. The overall objective is to decrease the deficit in standards-based instruction.

**Monitoring:** This Area of Focus will be monitored through weekly Standards Focused walk-throughs conducted by school administrators.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Ronnie Williams (williamsr9@duvalschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** To deliver standards-based instruction by unpacking standards, utilizing Learning Arc protocols, CGs, item specs, and ALDS.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Jean Ribault Middle School's objective is to ensure students are getting standards-aligned and grade appropriate instruction, so they are prepared to face the assessments designed by the state, along with the following year's progression of standards

**Action Steps to Implement**

Dr. Ronnie Williams (Principal), Ms. Latoya Brown (Asst. Principal), Mr. Clayton (Asst. Principal), Ms. Burroughs (Math Coach) and Mrs. Moses (Reading Coach) will Facilitate Professional Development for teachers during Pre-Planning on the Learning Arc.

**Person Responsible** Ronnie Williams (williamsr9@duvalschools.org)

Administrators and Coaches will provide continuous support during weekly PLC time in planning standards based instruction utilizing the Learning Arc for each standard.

**Person Responsible** Ronnie Williams (williamsr9@duvalschools.org)

Continue to conduct Standards -Based walkthroughs with administration and academic coaches weekly (minimum of 5 per administrator weekly).

**Person Responsible** Ronnie Williams (williamsr9@duvalschools.org)

Analyze Standards Walkthrough Tool observational data generated through walkthroughs to determine next steps of support for core content teachers.

**Person Responsible** Ronnie Williams (williamsr9@duvalschools.org)

Provide instructional support via coaching cycle to identified teachers in the specific areas of need for standards based instruction.

**Person Responsible** Ronnie Williams (williamsr9@duvalschools.org)

Utilize Title 1 funds to purchase an additional Math and Science instructor to improve student achievement in these accountability areas. In addition, provide a substitute for the full-time classroom when teachers are absent.

**Person Responsible** Ronnie Williams (williamsr9@duvalschools.org)

Purchase supplemental standards-aligned materials to assist both struggling learners and proficient students in core classes.

**Person Responsible** Ronnie Williams (williamsr9@duvalschools.org)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** The focus of PLC is collaborative lesson planning through professional development on standards driven instruction, utilizing learning arc protocols, and how it impacts student learning. Through classroom observations 75% of core teachers were consistently aligning standards to what was being taught.

**Measurable Outcome:** 100% of our core teachers will collaborate weekly in PLCs with coaches and administrators planning for standards based lessons/instruction using the Learning Arc Framework.

**Monitoring:** PLCs will be driven by DCPS approved form # 5 (Planning Agenda) and attendance of all teachers will be monitored by school administration.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Ronnie Williams (williamsr9@duvalschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** This will be reflected in instructional delivery and student mastery of the standards.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Students will be provided with standards driven instruction to close the student achievement gaps and promoting standards mastery for adequate student progression on state assessments.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Facilitate Professional development during PLCs and Early Release days on Effective Lesson Planning utilizing Learning Arcs, ALDs, CGs, and Item Specifications.

**Person Responsible** Ronnie Williams (williamsr9@duvalschools.org)

Coach and Administrator Walkthroughs to provide support in the implementation and delivery of the standards driven lesson plans developed.

**Person Responsible** Ronnie Williams (williamsr9@duvalschools.org)

Provide intense support to the teachers that are struggling with lesson planning and utilizing standards to drive instruction through coaching cycles.

**Person Responsible** Ronnie Williams (williamsr9@duvalschools.org)

Utilize Title 1 funds to hire a Math and Reading coach to support teachers implementing standards-based planning and instruction. In addition, coaches will conduct push-ins/pullouts of targeted students for differentiated/small group instruction.

**Person Responsible** Ronnie Williams (williamsr9@duvalschools.org)

**#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Decreasing the amount of referrals with a focus on Level 2 referrals. Level two referrals account for 51% of the referrals at Jean Ribault Middle School. Level 2 referral recipients are typically repeat offenders and normally have a consequence of In School Suspension or Out of School Suspension removing the students from their learning environment.

**Measurable Outcome:** The number of Level 2 referrals will decrease to 30% or below.

**Monitoring:** Discipline data will be discussed and used to create a Plan of Action and Milestones (POAM) on a monthly basis during Leadership Team meetings.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Ronnie Williams (williamsr9@duvalschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Adequate restorative practices will be implemented with the objective to decrease referrals and eliminate repeat offenders. The PBIS Team will implement positive behavior incentives classroom wide as well as school wide on a bi-weekly and monthly basis.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** The combination of Restorative justice practices and positive behavior incentives fosters a positive culture and climate within the school building when implemented by administration, teachers and students.

**Action Steps to Implement**

PBIS Team implementation facilitated by Assistant Principal Trevor Clayton and the Deans.

**Person Responsible** Trevor Clayton (claytont1@duvalschools.org)

Leadership Team will conduct initial PBIS meeting during pre-planning to recruit members for PBIS Team.

**Person Responsible** Trevor Clayton (claytont1@duvalschools.org)

Use Restorative Justice practices with fidelity to address undesired student behavior.

**Person Responsible** Trevor Clayton (claytont1@duvalschools.org)

Hire an additional Dean to assist with minimizing behavior concerns and reducing the number of referrals while improving overall student behavior building-wide.

**Person Responsible** Ronnie Williams (williamsr9@duvalschools.org)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safe-schools-for-alex.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.

N/A

### 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.

Jean Ribault Middle School encourages a positive culture through many facets. Through implementation of the PBIS plan, monthly incentives are presented to the faculty and staff for their job of excellence. Students are rewarded with similar opportunities through bi-weekly and monthly celebratory incentives. In working with external entities , such as Achievers For Life, Communities and Schools, and City Year, Jean Ribault Middle School commits to working within and alongside the community. Parent community nights, Data-and-Dine sessions, food drives, Thanksgiving basket donations, and coat drives are implemented to help foster a positive school culture and environment with our stakeholders in mind.

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

There are internal (students and teachers) and external (community members and parents) stakeholders that work collaboratively to improve all aspects of Ribault Middle School.

### 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	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>