

Clay County Schools

Rideout Elementary School



2019-20 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
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Rideout Elementary School

3065 APALACHICOLA BLVD, Middleburg, FL 32068

<http://roe.oneclay.net>

Demographics

Principal: Trisha Stewart

Start Date for this Principal: 8/28/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
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)	52%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: B (59%) 2014-15: B (59%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* 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 Clay 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

Rideout Elementary School

3065 APALACHICOLA BLVD, Middleburg, FL 32068

<http://roe.oneclay.net>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	No	56%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	29%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Clay 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 increase the academic performance of all students. RideOut Elementary, working in conjunction with all stakeholders, will provide a public education experience that is motivating, challenging, and rewarding for all children. Based on the premise that all students can learn, our teachers will provide opportunities for each child to experience maximized academic success within a safe and inviting environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

RideOut Elementary School exists to prepare life-long learners for personal success in a global and technologically advanced society.

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
Marks, Kim	Principal	The principal will be responsible for providing leadership in the development or revision and implementation of the school improvement plan.
Petelli, Treena	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal will be responsible for providing leadership in the development or revision and implementation of the school improvement plan.
Barnett, Tara	Teacher, K-12	The school leadership team will analyze data to identify barriers and implement improvement steps that will increase student achievement.
Repper, Nicholas	Teacher, ESE	The school leadership team will analyze data to identify barriers and implement improvement steps that will increase student achievement.
Shepherd, Kathryn	Teacher, K-12	The school leadership team will analyze data to identify barriers and implement improvement steps that will increase student achievement.
Burrell, Tara	Teacher, K-12	The school leadership team will analyze data to identify barriers and implement improvement steps that will increase student achievement.
Toney, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12	The school leadership team will analyze data to identify barriers and implement improvement steps that will increase student achievement.
Johnson, Victoria	Teacher, K-12	The school leadership team will analyze data to identify barriers and implement improvement steps that will increase student achievement.
Erwin, Denise	Teacher, K-12	The school leadership team will analyze data to identify barriers and implement improvement steps that will increase student achievement.
Hawkins, Karen	Teacher, K-12	The school leadership team will analyze data to identify barriers and implement improvement steps that will increase student achievement.

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	61	61	57	62	68	49	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	443
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

42

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/28/2019

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	
One or more suspensions	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	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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	

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	70%	65%	57%	65%	62%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	71%	62%	58%	64%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	54%	53%	58%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	70%	70%	63%	60%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	68%	66%	62%	49%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	56%	51%	47%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	67%	65%	53%	47%	55%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Number of students enrolled	61 (0)	61 (0)	57 (0)	62 (0)	68 (0)	49 (0)	85 (0)	443 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	1 ()	0 ()	2 ()	3 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	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)	1 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	3 (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
03	2019	71%	68%	3%	58%	13%
	2018	60%	68%	-8%	57%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	85%	64%	21%	58%	27%
	2018	62%	62%	0%	56%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		23%				
Cohort Comparison		25%				
05	2019	57%	62%	-5%	56%	1%
	2018	49%	59%	-10%	55%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
06	2019	67%	64%	3%	54%	13%
	2018	65%	63%	2%	52%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		18%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	75%	71%	4%	62%	13%
	2018	49%	70%	-21%	62%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		26%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	74%	69%	5%	64%	10%
	2018	70%	66%	4%	62%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		25%				
05	2019	50%	64%	-14%	60%	-10%
	2018	62%	65%	-3%	61%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-20%				
06	2019	81%	70%	11%	55%	26%
	2018	62%	68%	-6%	52%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		19%				
Cohort Comparison		19%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	63%	63%	0%	53%	10%
	2018	64%	64%	0%	55%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						

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	45	60	52	45	60	60	39				
BLK	50	65		50	58						
HSP	74	89		71	74						
MUL	89	67		89	75						
WHT	70	69	47	71	69	64	67				
FRL	63	66	54	60	60	57	59				
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	40	35		31	41	25	53				
BLK	42	61		58	67						
HSP	57	54		71	77		58				
MUL	75	54		81	79						
WHT	61	55	38	59	62	50	70				
FRL	52	50	49	56	65	61	56				
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	54	62	55	45	48	50					
BLK	45	64		62	62						
HSP	67	67		57	53						
MUL	71	91		82	55						
WHT	66	61	55	58	46	36	51				
FRL	57	57	53	51	38	29	42				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	66
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	461
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	52
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	56
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	77
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	80
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	
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	65
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	60
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.

The data shows that the lowest performance was the ELA Lowest 25th Percentile. The factors were achievement gaps still existing with the lowest quartile. RideOut Elementary has a large population of ESE students which makes up a large percentage of our lowest quartile.

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

We improved in all areas. There was no data decline.

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.

Our school achievement was higher than all state averages.

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

The data shows that our ELA Learning Gains increased by 15 percentage points. ELA Achievement increased by 10 percentage points. The implementation of intentional small group instruction, the non-fiction texts from Achieve 3000 were utilized, Scholastic News and after school tutoring was done.

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

The data in the EWS data indicates potential areas of concern for the students who scored a Level one on their statewide assessments and another potential area of concern is attendance.

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

1. Increase lowest quartiles proficiency in Reading
2. Increase lowest quartiles proficiency in Math
3. Improve 5th grade science scores
4. Improve attendance rate
5. Implement more SEL strategies

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title	Lowest Quartile for Reading
Rationale	We will continue to look at reading needs across the curriculum. Reading effects all subject areas and it is an area of need at our school. Overall our lowest 25th percentile of students averaged 56% in ELA. We will continue to close these gaps and improve teacher capacity to increase these student's achievement levels.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If teachers identify their lowest quartile from the beginning of the school year and provide interventions during small group instruction then we want to increase our scores on the Florida State Assessment from 56% to 57%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kim Marks (kimberly.marks@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	We will implement more intentional small group instruction,utilize the i-Ready toolbox and Achieve 3000 to assist with differentiating instruction based on student needs. We will also provide teachers with professional development on deeper instruction that will in turn teach students how to develop academic ownership.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	i-Ready and Achieve 3000 group students based on their performance and provide interventions specifically for them. The programs identify the areas of need for students and then equips teachers with resources to assist students. Guiding students to take ownership of their own academics provides an intrinsic motivation to do their best work.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implementing Intentional, Differentiated Small Group Instruction 2. Providing Professional Development on Achieve 3000 3. Providing Professional Development on the i-Ready Toolbox 4. Professional Development on high expectations, strong instruction, deep engagement and grade appropriate assignments 5. Providing Continual Feedback to reinforce small-group instruction
Person Responsible	Kim Marks (kimberly.marks@myoneclay.net)

#2	
Title	Lowest Quartile for Math
Rationale	The school's scores increased from 50% in 2018-19 to 59% in 2019-20. Although we saw an increase, we need to improve achievement in this area.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	We plan on monitoring and analyzing i-Ready data to utilize the small group information provided by the program. We will provide guidance and feedback for teachers on their use of the i-Ready toolbox resources so they can purposefully implement these in small groups.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kim Marks (kimberly.marks@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	Establishing intentional small group instruction using i-Ready groupings and teacher input allows for interventions in student's areas of need. We will also provide teachers with professional development on deeper instruction that will in turn teach students how to develop academic ownership.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Research shows that implementing small group instruction in the classroom will increase student achievement. Identifying areas of need in the classroom and working with students in intentional small groups can benefit all students. Teaching students to develop academic ownership will assist with student's overall success because they will acquire the intrinsic motivation to want to do their best and be able to track their own progress.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Implementing Intentional, Differentiated Small Group Instruction 2. Providing Professional Development on i-Ready data analysis 3. Providing Professional Development on the i-Ready Toolbox 4. Professional Development on high expectations, strong instruction, deep engagement and grade appropriate assignments 5. Providing Continual Feedback to reinforce small-group instruction
Person Responsible	Kim Marks (kimberly.marks@myoneclay.net)

#3	
Title	Attendance Rates
Rationale	Attendance rates have a direct impact on student achievement. The more the students are here the more they are exposed to the academics they need to be successful. We are continuously striving for better attendance rates to increase student achievement and to develop the whole student socially and emotionally.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	If we continue to provide positive reinforcements for students who regularly attend school and look deeper into why students are habitually absent then we want our attendance rate to increase from 96.45% to 97.45%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kim Marks (kimberly.marks@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	We are recognizing students for being Ready, On-time and Engaged during the morning announcements. We are checking attendance percentages every 20 days and recognizing classes on every grade level that have the highest attendance rate. We are actively contacting parents if a student misses more than 2 days from school. We are establishing a SUCCESS team to provide even more positive reinforcements for attending school and looking deeper into why a student maybe habitually absent.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We are recognizing students that are attending school on a regular basis in order to encourage students that may be on the list for early warning signs for attendance. Our SUCCESS team will be looking even deeper into why a student is habitually absent to see if there are other influences causing the absenteeism.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Continue to look at attendance data to identify students with attendance early warning signs 2. Recognize students and classes that have fantastic attendance rates 3. Display attendance data in the hallway on our Attendance Bulletin Board 4. Develop positive relationships with parents and students 5. Continue to contact parents if students miss more than 2 days
Person Responsible	Kim Marks (kimberly.marks@myoneclay.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

We have developed a SEL and PBIS team to implement positive reinforcements for attendance, character traits and exemplar behavior with the goal being developing the whole student. In addition, we want to increase purposeful talk, intentional reflections and academic ownership as priorities for all students.