River Ridge High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

River Ridge High School

11646 TOWN CENTER RD, New Port Richey, FL 34654

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

Demographics

Principal: Toni Zetzsche

Start Date for this Principal: 7/27/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	41%
2019-20 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%)
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

River Ridge High School

11646 TOWN CENTER RD, New Port Richey, FL 34654

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	36%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	22%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
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 will achieve success in college, career, and life.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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	Assistant Principal
Lawrence, Danielle	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/27/2020, Toni Zetzsche

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
85

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	41%
2019-20 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%)
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.	

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	442	429	401	363	1635
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	46	63	73	239
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	28	20	71	167
Course failure in ELA	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	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	95	78	50	290
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	115	97	53	305
Course Failures ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	85	74	44	247

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	69	61	42	172

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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/27/2020

Prior Year - 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	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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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	

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
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	

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%

	Grade Level (prior year reported)				
Indicator	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	**Total**
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Grade Level Data
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
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			
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

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

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

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%	1
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%	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	68
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	53
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0

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%	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	60
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	54
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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.

Our students with disabilities subgroup showed little achievement gains in ELA. The lowest quartile students in 10th grade ELA showed little gains as well. It is our belief that new intervention procedures/plans along with new staff, created instability in scheduled and utilized interventions.

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

Our Algebra 1 scores decreased by 14% from 53% to 39%. It is our belief that new staff and lack of student motivation were contributing factors.

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?

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

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Our 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. Learning gains on FSA/ELA will increase by 5% with an emphasis on the lowest quartile as there was a 3% decrease in performance.
2. Students taking Advanced Placement coursework will increase by 20% through targeted conversations and EOS support.
3. Geometry state assessments will increase for the 2020-2021 school year by 6% raising the overall achievement level to 80% proficiency. Previous reported scores were at 72%.
4. Algebra 1 proficiency scores dropped 14% previously, therefore our Algebra scores will increase from 39% to 55% an overall increase of 16%.
5. We will increase staff engagement and collaboration through PLC work that focuses on data analysis and differentiation and focused tiered interventions.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No description entered

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

The SLT will ensure collaboration occurs with PLCs with each department that address skill mastery and will work with the LDC who will provide coaching in a "Model Classroom". Staff will implement Tiered interventions based on data presented from common assessments that address identified deficiencies. LDC will monitor student engagement in classes and will provide coaching for staff to improve delivery of lessons that meet the rigor of the standards. LDC will collaborate with PLCs to identify areas of need based on quarterly checks and will identify Tier 2 and 3 interventions to improve standards identified as needing improvement by the collective PLC.

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 ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Through a varied group of stakeholders that will include but is not limited to administration, instructional personnel, non instructional personnel, parents, students, community and business leaders, RRHS will build a positive culture and environment that will meet the needs of all learners. Academies will structure a growth model for their programs designed to improve opportunities for all students to be successful in the classes that are encompassed by each academy. Each teacher in prospective academies will collaborate to design/update academy expectations for performance. Academy plans will be presented to SAC. Positive Behavior Interventions will also be presented to SAC via our new Intervention Specialist who will be

monitoring student referral reports weekly in order to design interventions that will positively impact student behaviors and ultimately engage students in learning therefore improving mastery of skills in coursework. PBIS will also include schoolwide positive interventions including but not limited to: Postcards home, StarryKnights, Find a Freshy, TikTok Dance "Social DisDance", and Athlete of the Week. Intervention Speicialist will also introduce PD and tips of the week for attending to the social emotional needs of both students and staff.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.