Pine Ridge High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Pine Ridge High School

926 HOWLAND BLVD, Deltona, FL 32738

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/pineridge/pages/default.aspx

Demographics

Principal: William Ryser, Jr.

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (47%)
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	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 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

Pine Ridge High School

926 HOWLAND BLVD, Deltona, FL 32738

http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/pineridge/pages/default.aspx

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	73%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	55%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	C

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.

Panthers will graduate high school in 4 years or less with a diploma in one hand and a plan for a successful personal future in the other.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Through creative approaches we commit ourselves to nurture mutual respect, personal responsibility and individual growth, thereby fostering lifelong success for our students.

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
Hackey, Christina	Instructional Media	Support teachers with resources and instructional technology.
Boyles, Lynn	Instructional Technology	Support teachers in application and implementation of tech applications.
Filipek, Laura	Teacher, K-12	Monitor lowest quartile students and facilitate before and after school tutoring for selected LQ students.
Gilbert, Jessica	School Counselor	Lead counseling team to monitor student progression and placement
Gowen, Linda	Teacher, K-12	Lead science instructors in professional learning and data discussion.
Hampshire, Jennifer	Teacher, ESE	Support ESE teachers to provide proper interventions and accommodations for ESE students.
Schicker, Kyle	Assistant Principal	Engage teachers with applicable, best practice, and research based professional learning.
Selesky, Cheryl	Assistant Principal	Support ESE teachers to provide proper interventions and accommodations for ESE students.
Nehrig, Paul	Principal	Facilitate mission and vision of the school.
Williamson, Judy	Teacher, K-12	Lead social studies instructors in professional learning and data discussion.
Banks, Vicki	Assistant Principal	Lead graduation assurance team, ensure master schedule is accommodating and appropriate for student population.
Cange, Madsen	Assistant Principal	Provide a safe and secure facility for students and faculty. By way of implementing behavior programs and security audits.
Targowski, Andrew	Dean	Enforce behavior programs and implement Social Emotional Learning strategies program
Spallone, Marlo	Teacher, K-12	Support AICE teachers, students, and guardians in professional learning, scheduling/coordinating testing and test study sessions for AP and AICE
Timpson, Edwena	Instructional Coach	Support Reading and ELA instruction with classroom observations, completing coaching cyles, and data tracking.
Diamond, Elizabeth	Teacher, Career/ Technical	Supports career and technical education teachers as the department head.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/1/2019, William Ryser, Jr.

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
95

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (47%)
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	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	380	365	326	275	1346
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	45	30	15	113
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27	93	54	36	210
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112	98	89	62	361
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111	92	49	38	290

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	87	103	56	37	283

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	35	44	29	5	113
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25	25	25	10	85

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/13/2020

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	493	465	404	382	1744
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56	50	39	12	157
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54	68	46	21	189
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137	127	121	72	457
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	202	162	139	91	594

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	57	54	45	11	167

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	64	52	43	15	174
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	40	46	28	133

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	458	456	366	408	1688
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64	86	64	130	344
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	39	16	19	129
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121	90	68	54	333
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	144	134	101	95	474

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	171	131	96	101	499

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	33	47	28	42	150
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	27	19	41	104

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	44%	52%	56%	45%	49%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	45%	49%	51%	50%	48%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	30%	37%	42%	42%	37%	41%
Math Achievement	39%	48%	51%	47%	50%	49%
Math Learning Gains	45%	49%	48%	32%	42%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	25%	38%	45%	30%	34%	39%
Science Achievement	73%	76%	68%	75%	72%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	66%	69%	73%	57%	68%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**				**Total**
	9	**10**	**11**	**12**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (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.

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
09	2019	44%	51%	-7%	55%	-11%
	2018	39%	50%	-11%	53%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	42%	50%	-8%	53%	-11%
	2018	40%	49%	-9%	53%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

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	72%	72%	0%	67%	5%
2018	61%	65%	-4%	65%	-4%
Compare		11%			

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	63%	63%	0%	70%	-7%
2018	57%	63%	-6%	68%	-11%
Compare		6%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	31%	54%	-23%	61%	-30%
2018	23%	57%	-34%	62%	-39%
Compare		8%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	43%	55%	-12%	57%	-14%
2018	46%	55%	-9%	56%	-10%
Compare		-3%			

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	18	33	22	28	56	33	54	33		71	13
ELL	21	36	37	23	32	6	62	41		65	18
BLK	42	42	28	34	50	31	74	69		77	33
HSP	40	44	32	35	44	19	74	61		80	28

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
MUL	46	42		33						71	42
WHT	50	46	28	45	43	32	72	70		79	36
FRL	40	42	28	37	45	17	70	61		75	25

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	16	31	26	30	48	42	49	40		63	21
ELL	12	25	22	24	42		35	37		65	15
BLK	36	42	35	27	37	19	49	44		63	30
HSP	38	38	30	36	45	41	62	53		80	44
MUL	33	30		73	67		54	58		100	43
WHT	47	40	24	53	53	49	70	72		78	43
FRL	36	37	26	41	47	36	61	54		73	34

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	15	37	35	28	47	40	46	27		70	14
ELL	15	42	40	42	29		50	32		66	29
BLK	29	41	33	36	31	33	78	59		78	33
HSP	45	52	42	45	31	22	71	51		77	43
MUL	45	28		40				62		69	36
WHT	50	53	46	51	32	34	80	60		78	45
FRL	39	48	43	45	31	31	74	50		70	35

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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	539
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	36
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	48
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	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	47
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	50
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

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.

Last year's lowest performance reporting category was our lowest quartile for math learning gains. The factors that led to this performance were teacher turnover mid year, and training new teachers in their content area and pedagogy. Focus was given to algebra 1b students in the understanding that this would boost this reporting category. After discussion this year, our school has learned that algebra 1b students would not fall in this category nor would they be considered a typical learning gain. This is due to the fact that there is a gap year in testing and are not able to be considered for learning gains or lowest quartile learning gains. Correctly identifying students to implement intervention strategies has been adjusted for this new learning.

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

Last year's greatest decline in reporting categories from the prior year was again our lowest quartile for math learning gains. The factors that led to this performance were teacher turnover mid year, and training new teachers in their content area and pedagogy. Focus was given to algebra 1b students in the understanding that this would boost this reporting category. After discussion this year, our school has learned that algebra 1b students would not fall in this category nor would they be considered a typical learning gain. This is due to the fact that there is a gap year in testing and are not able to be considered for learning gains or lowest quartile learning gains. Correctly identifying students to implement intervention strategies has been adjusted for this new learning.

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.

College and Career Acceleration was 28 points below the state average for the graduating class of 2018. Teacher certification and course offerings led to this gap. Two teachers did not hold the certification for which their course aligned and the industry certification courses were not permitted to be reported. Dual enrollment course enrollments saw a decrease due to on campus availability caused by teacher retention. Course offerings were not consistent with middle school trends and previous offerings to which we could not report on. School policy on testing all students sitting in

industry certification leading courses was not put into effect for prior year, but will be an expectation this school year.

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

Science achievement showed the most improvement. Science achievement saw a significant increase due to focus in PLCs on intervention strategies. The increase can also be attributed to differentiation strategies provided digitally by district personnel.

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

Course failure rates for freshmen and sophomores are extremely high, especially if compared to senior class.

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

1. Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains
2. Math Achievement
3. ELA Lowest Quartile Learning Gains
4. Career and College Readiness
5. Course failures for underclassmen

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	2018-2019 Mathematics LQ Learning Gains was our lowest performing category and compared to year prior declined by 15 points. Progress monitoring data from the 2019-2020 school year was under district averages and declined by 12 points compared to 2019 SY. Mathematics has cross curricular connections in science.
Measurable Outcome:	Mathematics lowest quartile learning gains will increase from 25 percent to 40 percent.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kyle Schicker (kbschick@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards aligned instruction with a focus on teacher clarity in Algebra and Geometry courses. Standards aligned instruction is outlined with curriculum, content, coherence, and rigor. Teacher clarity includes but goes beyond the notion of being clear about what you want your students to know and be able to do. Teacher clarity involves using the above clarity to focus subsequent teaching and assessment. These activities include initial explanations and demonstrations. They also include practice and review sessions. But teacher clarity does not rule out other types of activities provided they help to achieve the intended learning. When your students have not understood what you have taught them, teacher clarity also involves explaining things a different way, giving students constructive feedback or taking other actions to help them master it.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In Hattie's 2009 book, Visible Learning, he reports that teacher clarity has an effect size of d = 0.75. This claim was based on a meta-analysis by Frank Fendick.

Action Steps to Implement

Continue application of common classroom board to include learning targets, standard, success criteria, and key vocabulary monitoring will be done with walk through data.

Person Responsible	Paul Nehrig (pmnehrig@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Professional learning facilitated on new curriculum adjustments to accommodate for loss of learning due to COVID school cancellation in algebra 1, algebra 1b, and geometry course curriculum maps.

Person Responsible	Kyle Schicker (kbschick@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Academic coaching cycles to support new algebra and geometry teachers.

Person Responsible	Edwena Timpson (ehtimpso@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Weekly PLC team meetings with focus agendas on learning targets and outlining specific action steps on how to remediate for students who do not achieve mastery on a common assessment. (Lowest Quartile specific).

Person Responsible	Kyle Schicker (kbschick@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Develop and administer standards-aligned common assessments in algebra 1 and geometry classes.

Person Responsible Kyle Schicker (kbschick@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Facilitate professional learning and Implement AVID strategies of the month to include WICOR, monitoring by sign in sheets and classroom walk through data.

Person Responsible Laura Filipek (lbfilipe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Facilitate professional learning on Universal Design for Learning to accommodate learning for students of varying needs in lowest quartile of mathematics.

Person Responsible Cheryl Selesky (caselesk@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Facilitate professional learning on utilizing school city as an assessment and data analysis program to focus on students with high needs of support. (Lowest Quartile).

Person Responsible Kyle Schicker (kbschick@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Over a three year period, ELA lowest quartile learning gains declined by 12 points. For our sophomore students, this test is a graduation requirement. ELA Lowest quartile learning gains is 10 points below district and 14 points below state average. Increasing student literacy has cross curricular achievement/growth implications in all subjects.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA lowest quartile learning gains will increase from 30 points to 45 points.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kyle Schicker (kbschick@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards aligned instruction with a focus on teacher clarity in ninth and tenth grade english courses. Standards aligned instruction is outlined with curriculum, content, coherence, and rigor. Teacher clarity includes but goes beyond the notion of being clear about what you want your students to know and be able to do. Teacher clarity involves using the above clarity to focus subsequent teaching and assessment. These activities include initial explanations and demonstrations. They also include practice and review sessions. But teacher clarity does not rule out other types of activities provided they help to achieve the intended learning. When your students have not understood what you have taught them, teacher clarity also involves explaining things a different way, giving students constructive feedback or taking other actions to help them master it.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In Hattie's 2009 book, Visible Learning, he reports that teacher clarity has an effect size of d = 0.75. This claim was based on a meta-analysis by Frank Fendick.

Action Steps to Implement

Continue application of common classroom board to include learning targets, standard, success criteria, and key vocabulary monitoring will be done with walk through data.

Person Responsible	Paul Nehrig (pmnehrig@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Professional learning facilitated on new curriculum pacing in ELA ninth grade and tenth grade course curriculum maps.

Person Responsible	Kyle Schicker (kbschick@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Academic coaching cycles to support new ninth and tenth grade ELA teachers.

Person Responsible	Edwena Timpson (ehtimpso@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Weekly PLC team meetings with focus agendas on learning targets and outlining specific action steps on how to remediate for students who do not achieve mastery on a common assessment. (Lowest Quartile specific).

Person Responsible	Kyle Schicker (kbschick@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Develop and administer standards-aligned common assessments in ninth and tenth grade ELA classes.

Person Responsible	Kyle Schicker (kbschick@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Facilitate professional learning and Implement AVID strategies of the month to include WICOR, monitoring by sign in sheets and classroom walk through data.

Person Responsible	Laura Filipek (lbfilipe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Facilitate professional learning on Universal Design for Learning to accommodate learning for students of varying needs in lowest quartile of english language arts.

Person Responsible	Cheryl Selesky (caselesk@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Facilitate professional learning on utilizing school city as an assessment and data analysis program to focus on students with high needs of support. (Lowest Quartile).

Person Responsible	Kyle Schicker (kbschick@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Career & Technical Education	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	College and career readiness (acceleration) has declined by nine points. College and career readiness is 11 points below district and 25 points below state average. College and career readiness is predicted to decrease again for the 2021 report card by 5 points.
Measurable Outcome:	College and career readiness will increase from 34 points to 60 points.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kyle Schicker (kbschick@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards aligned instruction with a focus on teacher clarity as it pertains to industry certification tests that are aligned to career and technical education courses. Standards aligned instruction is outlined with curriculum, content, coherence, and rigor. Teacher clarity includes but goes beyond the notion of being clear about what you want your students to know and be able to do. Teacher clarity involves using the above clarity to focus subsequent teaching and assessment. These activities include initial explanations and demonstrations. They also include practice and review sessions. But teacher clarity does not rule out other types of activities provided they help to achieve the intended learning. When your students have not understood what you have taught them, teacher clarity also involves explaining things a different way, giving students constructive feedback or taking other actions to help them master it.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In Hattie's 2009 book, Visible Learning, he reports that teacher clarity has an effect size of d = 0.75. This claim was based on a meta-analysis by Frank Fendick.

Action Steps to Implement

Continue application of common classroom board to include learning targets, standard, success criteria, and key vocabulary monitoring will be done with walk through data.

Person Responsible	Paul Nehrig (pmnehrig@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Professional learning facilitated for teachers new to industry certification testing in their programs.

Person Responsible	Kyle Schicker (kbschick@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Facilitate teacher professional learning on industry certification adjustments and standards.

Person Responsible	Elizabeth Diamond (eadiamon@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Align industry certifications to course curriculum and test all students enrolled in identified courses.

Person Responsible	Elizabeth Diamond (eadiamon@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Facilitate professional learning and Implement AVID strategies of the month to include WICOR, monitoring by sign in sheets and classroom walk through data.

Person Responsible	Laura Filipek (lbfilipe@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Facilitate professional learning on Universal Design for Learning to accommodate learning for students of varying needs and interests for careers.

Person Responsible	Cheryl Selesky (caselesk@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The ESSA subgroups, SWD and ELL, will be under continuous progress monitoring for all tested subjects and will be a mandatory PLC agenda item for data analysis and action planning for these groups.

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.

Pine Ridge High School employs several initiatives to promote a positive culture and environment, from school-wide programs to one-on-one relationship building. We are proud to have introduced Social-Emotional (SEL) and Restorative Practices to our faculty and staff, and the work of our SEL Leadership Team in providing professional learning and support, in partnership with our district specialist Nick Prince. This team will continue its work in facilitating teacher learning in how to implement social emotional learning and restorative practices in their classrooms and on our school campus. In spite of shifting to an online format during the spring of last school year, we had begun some new traditions such as a whole-school pep rally in the stands of our home stadium, as well as the continuation of old traditions such as a weekly & monthly recognition program. We have a committed school advisory council that helps us creatively design programs that promote parental involvement. The school advisory council monthly meetings always have an opportunity for stakeholders to offer input and suggest revisions to school planning, from the school improvement plan to the allocation of school improvement funds. Our school counseling department regularly meets with parents to educate them on programs and resources available to our students and families including college and careers. Each academy has their own parent boards that involves local business to help students transition into the workplace and provides our students with experiences and internships as well as offer input and suggestions to steer academy goals.. We promote events that include our feeder elementary and middle school students and faculty.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

<div style="background-color:#1F2A66; color:white; text-align:center;">

Part V: Budget

</div>

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Career & Technical Education	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**