

Pasco County Schools

River Ridge High School

A word cloud graphic featuring various educational and school improvement terms. The words are arranged in a cluster, with 'students' and 'school improvement' being the largest. Other prominent words include 'learning', 'success', 'teaching', 'relationships', 'leadership', 'growth', 'instruction', 'areas of focus', 'vision', 'collaboration', 'supportive environment', 'resources', 'achievement', 'ambitious', 'analysis', 'college and career', 'Florida', 'mission', 'family and community involvement', 'needs assessment', and 'strategic planning'. The River Ridge High School logo is positioned on the left side of the word cloud. The logo is circular, with a blue background and a yellow sunburst at the top. A white path leads from the bottom towards a graduation cap (mortarboard) at the top.

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	0
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

River Ridge High School

11646 TOWN CENTER RD, New Port Richey, FL 34654

<https://rrhs.pasco.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Toni Zetsche

Start Date for this Principal: 7/25/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	41%
2018-19 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 (59%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (55%) 2014-15: A (65%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* 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 Pasco 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	8
Planning for Improvement	0
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

River Ridge High School

11646 TOWN CENTER RD, New Port Richey, FL 34654

<https://rrhs.pasco.k12.fl.us>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>High School 9-12</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>44%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>19%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	B	B	B

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission is to provide the highest degree of instructional excellence while recognizing the unique needs and developing the abilities of every student. Through the cooperative efforts of family, school, and community, students will prepare to be responsible, productive citizens and life-long learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All our students achieve success in college, career, and life.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Bruno, Ronald	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal
Meek , Jessica	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal
Sullivan, Janene	Assistant Principal	
Lawrence, Danielle	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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	0	0	0	437	404	418	375	1634
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39	65	76	93	273
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	61	58	37	234
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38	81	91	103	313
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	86	93	52	329

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	62	96	85	79	322

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

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

88

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/22/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - 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	
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 or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide 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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	57%	57%	56%	55%	51%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	53%	51%	50%	48%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	41%	42%	38%	39%	41%
Math Achievement	59%	56%	51%	52%	50%	49%
Math Learning Gains	51%	49%	48%	47%	45%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	42%	45%	41%	35%	39%
Science Achievement	74%	70%	68%	74%	65%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	76%	73%	73%	83%	68%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	437 (0)	404 (0)	418 (0)	375 (0)	1634 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	39 ()	65 ()	76 ()	93 ()	273 (0)
One or more suspensions	78 ()	61 ()	58 ()	37 ()	234 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	38 ()	81 ()	91 ()	103 ()	313 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	98 ()	86 ()	93 ()	52 ()	329 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2019	61%	57%	4%	55%	6%
	2018	58%	55%	3%	53%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	53%	53%	0%	53%	0%
	2018	54%	55%	-1%	53%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	73%	68%	5%	67%	6%
2018	65%	65%	0%	65%	0%
Compare		8%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	75%	69%	6%	70%	5%
2018	79%	70%	9%	68%	11%
Compare		-4%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	39%	60%	-21%	61%	-22%
2018	53%	63%	-10%	62%	-9%
Compare		-14%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	72%	62%	10%	57%	15%
2018	63%	60%	3%	56%	7%
Compare		9%			

Subgroup Data

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	33	27	14	28	29	29	43		70	13
ELL											
ASN	60	61		67	53		76	90			

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
BLK	55	55		50							
HSP	55	55	42	40	45	31	67	62		90	42
MUL	48	52		52	52		79	93		94	31
WHT	58	50	42	62	52	50	74	77		84	46
FRL	47	50	45	48	50	44	65	70		83	39
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	27	39	37	23	32	32	28	57		59	13
ASN	63	71		68	31					90	
BLK	18	27		30							
HSP	51	48	56	49	51	20	68	66		80	45
MUL	76	69		71	67		50	85		100	50
WHT	56	51	44	58	52	35	65	80		89	46
FRL	44	47	43	50	45	30	56	72		77	36
2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	22	33	29	33	36	35	56	54		48	38
ASN	60	57		71	56						
BLK	55	36									
HSP	55	55	50	46	49	50	78	76		79	56
MUL	62	67		68	52		79	75		77	30
WHT	55	49	34	52	46	39	75	84		84	55
FRL	45	45	42	49	47	44	69	76		72	39

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	82
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	672
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
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	82
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	68
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	53
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53
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	63
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	60
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	54
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Students in the SWD subgroup showed little achievement gains in ELA. Our lowest quartile students in 10th grade ELA also showed little gains. We believe that new intervention plans coupled with new staff created instability in scheduled interventions.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Algebra scores decreased by 14% from 53 to 39 percent. New staff and student motivation seem to be a contributing factor.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

NA

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Our 9th grade ELA scores were 4% above the district average and 6% above the state average. Our 9th grade PLC was led by a veteran teachers with a strong focus on core actions 1 and 2 and intensive PD focused around the standards.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

EWS data indicates a need for focused attention on attendance as it is directly related to course failures and level 1 assessment scores.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Student learning gains on FSA/ELA will increase by 5% (61% current data). Emphasis on lowest quartile (3% decrease in 2018-2019).
2. Students taking advanced placement coursework will increase by 20% through target conversations and EOS support
3. Geometry state assessment scores increased by 9% from 63% to 72% however, the state assessments will increase for the 2020 school year by 6% increasing to 80%.
4. State assessment scores for the 2019 school year indicate that Algebra 1 proficiency scores dropped 14% from 54% to 40% therefore, Algebra I proficiency scores will increase for the 2020 school year to 55% a 15% increase.
5. Increase staff engagement and collaboration through PLC work that focuses on data analysis