

Volusia County Schools

River Springs Middle School



2022-23 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	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

River Springs Middle School

900 W OHIO AVE, Orange City, FL 32763

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/riverspringsmiddle/pages/default.aspx>

Demographics

Principal: Thomas Vaughan W

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2011

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	89%
2021-22 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	2021-22: C (50%) 2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TSI
* 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 Volusia 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	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

River Springs Middle School

900 W OHIO AVE, Orange City, FL 32763

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/riverspringsmiddle/pages/default.aspx>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Middle School 6-8	No	89%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	43%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		B	B

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia 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.

At River Springs Middle School, all students will move forward career and college ready.

Provide the school's vision statement.

River Springs Middle School will provide an inclusive school community committed to academic excellence.

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Gotlib, Stacy	Principal	
Fratus, Melissa	Assistant Principal	
Ezell, Candace	Assistant Principal	
Carignan, Tim	Assistant Principal	
Whited, Brandon	Dean	
Marchione, Lauren	Instructional Coach	
Parker, Susan	Teacher, K-12	
Hurtado, Jose	Teacher, K-12	
Beckman, Amy	Teacher, K-12	
Cleavenger, Cynthia	Teacher, K-12	
Brawner, Jessie	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2011, Thomas Vaughan W

Number of teachers with a 2022 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 2022 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.*

38

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

77

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,250

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

18

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

15

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	412	396	463	0	0	0	0	1271
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	97	108	132	0	0	0	0	337
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	76	100	0	0	0	0	274
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	25	43	0	0	0	0	87
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	81	30	12	0	0	0	0	123
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	116	134	158	0	0	0	0	408
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	127	124	172	0	0	0	0	423
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	43	30	52	0	0	0	0	125

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	129	108	127	0	0	0	0	364

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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	18	6	7	0	0	0	0	31
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	6	0	0	0	0	16

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 6/3/2022

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	423	389	474	0	0	0	0	1286
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	79	105	0	0	0	0	264
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	11	16	0	0	0	0	40
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	14	24	0	0	0	0	65
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	39	20	0	0	0	0	94
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	99	100	138	0	0	0	0	337
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	116	117	128	0	0	0	0	361
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	18	30	0	0	0	0	75

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	62	77	70	0	0	0	0	209

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	24	14	4	0	0	0	0	42
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	7	0	0	0	0	18

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	423	389	474	0	0	0	0	1286
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	80	79	105	0	0	0	0	264
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	11	16	0	0	0	0	40
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	14	24	0	0	0	0	65
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	39	20	0	0	0	0	94
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	99	100	138	0	0	0	0	337
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	116	117	128	0	0	0	0	361
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	18	30	0	0	0	0	75

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	62	77	70	0	0	0	0	209

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	24	14	4	0	0	0	0	42
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	4	7	0	0	0	0	18

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	48%	45%	50%				52%	51%	54%
ELA Learning Gains	45%						48%	51%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%						37%	42%	47%
Math Achievement	45%	31%	36%				56%	54%	58%
Math Learning Gains	46%						47%	51%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%						39%	42%	51%
Science Achievement	50%	46%	53%				60%	58%	51%
Social Studies Achievement	69%	49%	58%				72%	71%	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	2022					
	2019	52%	50%	2%	54%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	47%	47%	0%	52%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
08	2022					
	2019	52%	50%	2%	56%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	52%	48%	4%	55%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019	51%	47%	4%	54%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
08	2022					
	2019	17%	29%	-12%	46%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	58%	57%	1%	48%	10%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	69%	68%	1%	71%	-2%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	82%	54%	28%	61%	21%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	90%	55%	35%	57%	33%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	17	35	35	17	35	36	28	31	36		
ELL	28	43	36	23	37	38	32	38	53		
ASN	58	68		58	63						
BLK	35	41	36	27	38	31	29	69	50		
HSP	41	41	42	36	44	57	37	65	63		
MUL	62	39		41	38		60	67	62		
WHT	51	47	34	51	47	46	57	72	70		
FRL	41	43	35	38	44	41	41	63	63		
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	34	34	21	31	30	11	39	56		
ELL	22	36	32	20	28	30	12	49	53		

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
ASN	33	40		50	62				91		
BLK	29	35	29	29	30	29	27	50	63		
HSP	36	47	38	36	34	28	29	50	57		
MUL	56	39		43	33			62	73		
WHT	53	46	29	52	34	30	61	68	73		
FRL	39	42	31	39	34	29	40	54	67		

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	14	35	34	20	32	30	23	37	50		
ELL	25	41	36	34	45	46	24	50	67		
ASN	54	46		75	50						
BLK	31	35	28	36	35	22	40	50			
HSP	46	48	43	47	48	53	57	68	68		
MUL	61	62	27	55	31		43	82			
WHT	55	49	37	61	49	38	64	75	85		
FRL	42	45	36	45	44	38	48	62	75		

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	44
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	496
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	37
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	62
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	53
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	45
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

The following data trends emerged as we looked at our school-wide data:

- Low percentage of proficiency in ESSA subgroups
- African American subgroup went up to 40%
- Low 8th grade Math scores on FSA
- SWD stayed the same since last year (30%)
- ELL went up (43%)

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The following data components show the greatest need for improvement:

- 8th grade Pre-Algebra (12%) FSA
- 8th grade EOC science (48%)
- Math achievement overall in grades 6-8
- 7th grade Math and ELA
- 8th grade ELA (44%)
- No Learning gains in ELA across the board and in our SWD ESSA subgroup

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 factor #1 - 8th grade Science loss of content from 6th grade due to our school's implementation of the Instructional Continuity Plan

Action- 7th and 8th grade teachers should use focus questions from prior year's curriculum to establish student understanding, all science teachers use standards tracker.

Contributing factor #2 - long term sub in 8th grade Pre-Algebra and 7th grade Math, new teachers took over after, little training available for new teachers hired after the start of the school year.

Action - hired more experienced teachers, more consistent PLC teaming to help provide new teachers with experienced colleagues who can act as another resource for development, more support from School Based Induction Team for new teachers hired.

Contributing factor #3 - students not taking advantage of accommodations offered

Action- continue collaborative structures training, student led goal setting and data tracking

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

According to our FSA and EOC scores, we saw improvements in:
6th grade math (+9 change)

Civics (+6 change).

Math school-wide Learning Gains increased 12 points school-wide

Math school-wide Lowest Quartile students improved 15 points.

Social Studies Achievement in our school grade increased 7 points.

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

Contributing factor #1 - AVID

Action - Last year, our school-wide approach to install core AVID techniques (even in non-AVID classes) helped install student advocacy and student-driven data analysis of their own work,

Contributing factor #2 - Professional Learning Communities

Action - a dedicated Civics PLC whose walk-through data indicated high alignment to content standards with intensive data focus

Contributing factor #3 - Teacher Clarity in Math

Action - teacher-driven work with installing processes where students are made aware of what they are learning and how they have met the success criteria in Math classrooms.

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

The following strategies need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning:

Science, Civics and Math Boot Camps

Utilization of new AVID tutors

Middle School Interdisciplinary Teams

ESE Accommodations training for staff

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.

We will focus our professional learning toward the following areas:

Middle School Interdisciplinary Teams

Multi-Tiered System of Supports

ESE Accommodations

AVID strategies

PBIS training

Student engagement

Teacher clarity

Focused PLC-led Data Dives

Utilization of district support plans in content areas

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

Stock take meetings, where information is shared using a more organized format;

Development of teacher leaders by creating a second AVID team to serve our seventh grade;

Middle School Interdisciplinary Teams, a process by which students are divided into teams with common teachers, who will organize interdisciplinary curriculum, communicate student progress to families and advocate for each student on campus.

Team Time, where students can participate in non-curriculum studies and have additional time for enrichment/remediation;

Swamp Time, an on-going initiative where select early-release Wednesdays are utilized for enrichment and remediation;

Advancement Via Individual Determination (AVID), a nationally-acclaimed program designed to boost

student interest and success probability in post-secondary opportunities;

Teacher Clarity, another on-going initiative where teachers use academic language to inform students what they are learning, why it is important, and how students know that they have mastered the content.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

This area of focus was derived after looking at our school's 5-year comparison of statewide assessment data and our comparison scores to other schools in the school/district/state.

Our selection of this Area of Focus aligns with the following goals of our District Strategic Plan:

- Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning every day,
- Goal 2: Recruit, retain, and develop high-quality staff, and
- Goal 4: Ensure resources and operational processes are strategically aligned

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Students in math will increase their math achievement proficiency rating by 6%, from 45 to 51 on the Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST)/Coordinated Screening and Progress Monitoring (CSPM) System.

Additionally, we will show 45% overall student proficiency on our benchmark-aligned, district-provided interim math assessments.

Finally, at least 75% of math teachers will have walk-through evidence of implementing elements pertaining to the use of differentiated instruction.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Teachers will complete data analysis based on our benchmark-aligned, district-provided interim math assessments in their professional learning communities (PLCs).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Melissa Fratus (mmfratus@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Our school will ensure that all of our students receive differentiated instruction in their math classes.

Differentiated instruction is a teaching approach that tailors instruction to all students' learning needs. Every student has the same educational objective. But instruction differs according to the interests, preferences, skills, and challenges of each learner.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

The Florida Inclusion Network recommends differentiated instruction as a pro-active response to learning needs shaped by mindset. It is used by teachers to meet a diverse range of student needs.

Differentiated instruction takes multiple approaches to content, process, product, and environment to produce a student-centered blend of whole-class, group, and individual instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Review assessment data to ensure that students are placed appropriately in the correct level math class

Person Responsible

Melissa Fratus (mmfratus@volusia.k12.fl.us)

analyzing data to determine student effectiveness

Person Responsible Lauren Marchione (lemarchi@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitor <strategy> via ongoing administrative walk-throughs to provide feedback

Person Responsible Melissa Fratus (mmfratus@volusia.k12.fl.us)

collaborate with district curriculum specialist to attend PLCs, perform classroom observations, provide feedback, and review planning, interventions, remediation plans, and focused data chats

Person Responsible Melissa Fratus (mmfratus@volusia.k12.fl.us)

monitor teacher participation in PLCs to develop and monitor smart goals.

Person Responsible Melissa Fratus (mmfratus@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: This area of focus was derived after looking at both our school grade and our ESSA data, which indicated that our SWD ESSA Subgroup scored 30, and only made moderate progress from year-over-year.

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Our selection of this Area of Focus aligns with the following goals of our District Strategic Plan:
 Goal 1: Engage all students in high levels of learning every day.
 Goal 2: Recruit, retain, and develop high-quality staff.
 Goal 3: Provide a safe, healthy, and supportive environment.
 Goal 5: Strengthen communications and community engagement.

Measurable Outcome: Our ESSA Report Card will show a grade of at least 42.

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Additionally, we will show individual student growth on our benchmark-aligned, district-provided interim assessments of at least 5% per student.
 Finally, at least 75% of core teachers will implement elements of small-group instruction.

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. As a school, we will track the following:
 Teacher training and expectation compliance
 Student assessment data with PLCs
 Evidence of these supports implemented.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Candace Ezell (clezell@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. Our school will ensure that our ESSA SWD subgroup students participate in a Small-Group Review prior to teacher, county, and state assessment.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for Based on this need, we want students to have multiple interactions with the content in core classrooms. Small-group review is a technique that can support curriculum lessons, lectures, and other classroom settings. Students collaborate with a support teacher in groups that are less than the entire class, encouraging one another to think critically, understand the material, and apply it to practical problems. Students, especially those with disabilities, have shown to learn best when accessing the material multiple times in multiple different formats and settings.

selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Training and administration of expectations for staff will be handled by our ESE Assistant Principal

Person Responsible Candace Ezell (clezell@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Record keeping, documentation, and ensuring compliance will be handled by our ESE Department Chair

Person Responsible Jose Hurtado (jhurtado@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Monitoring of interim assessment data, and communicating student needs will be handled by our Academic Coach.

Person Responsible Lauren Marchione (lemarchi@volusia.k12.fl.us)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

River Springs Middle School creates engagement opportunities for faculty and staff that demonstrate both appreciation for their pursuit of high levels of student achievement and the importance of fostering a culture that celebrates each student as an individual. Common Planning, Professional Learning Communities and Academic Coaching are essential practices utilized to help build positive, collaborative relationships on campus amongst teachers as well.

Family and community involvement play a large role in the academic success of the students who attend River Springs Middle School. River Springs Middle School engages both families and the community at large by hosting special events that celebrate achievement of the school's students and the creative outlets produced by sports, clubs, and electives.

We are increasing community involvement by opening our school for more parent nights. Our PBIS system have replaced our positive behavior referrals by giving students in-class incentives for good behavior. We have also increased our students' access to field studies.

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

Our school's Parent-Teacher-Student Association (PTSA) which will be utilized to celebrate the achievement of the school by offering both increased business partner presence, as well as hosting school spirit nights to assist in finding unique ways to engage students in an effort to maximize student

achievement.

Our School Advisory Council is also used to solicit and retain community and stakeholder development.