

Clay County Schools

Ridgeview Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Ridgeview Elementary School

421 JEFFERSON AVE, Orange Park, FL 32065

<http://rve.oneclay.net>

Demographics

Principal: Courtney Schumacher

Start Date for this Principal: 9/2/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	98%
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: A (65%) 2017-18: A (68%) 2016-17: A (77%) 2015-16: B (58%)
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	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Ridgeview Elementary School

421 JEFFERSON AVE, Orange Park, FL 32065

<http://rve.oneclay.net>

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)
Elementary School PK-6	Yes	78%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	40%

School Grades History

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

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.

** (The Title I Schoolwide Plan/SIP/PFEP can be made available in most languages)***

Our mission is to work collaboratively with all stakeholders to provide a public education experience that is motivating, challenging, and rewarding for all children. We will increase student achievement by providing students with learning opportunities that are rigorous, relevant and transcend beyond the boundaries of the school walls. We will ensure a working and learning environment built upon honesty, integrity, and respect. Through these values, we will maximize student potential and promote individual responsibility.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Ridgeview Elementary School exists to prepare life-long learners for success in a global and competitive workplace and in acquiring applicable life skills.

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
Roche, Heather	Principal	Monitor and support the progress of school improvement plan
McHugh-Clark, Judi	Assistant Principal	Monitor and support the progress of school improvement plan
Lyons, Linda	Teacher, K-12	Team Lead - Implement research based strategies and support team in making progress towards goals
Walker, Erin	Teacher, K-12	Team Lead - Implement research based strategies and support team in making progress towards goals
Bodie, Miriam	Teacher, K-12	Team Lead - Implement research based strategies and support team in making progress towards goals
Morrison, Kim	Teacher, ESE	Intervention Team Facilitator - Monitor the progress of students on MTSS and provide intervention supports
Bazemore, Tiffany	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach - Provide support to teachers, assist in monitoring progress of the school improvement plan by compiling and analyzing data to drive intentional instruction.
Lockman, Tracy	Teacher, K-12	Team Lead - Implement research based strategies and support team in making progress towards goals
Worsdell, Lacey	Teacher, K-12	Team Lead - Implement research based strategies and support team in making progress towards goals
Macdonald, Gina	Teacher, K-12	Team Lead - Implement research based strategies and support team in making progress towards goals
Gonzalez, Jenna	Teacher, K-12	Team Lead - Implement research based strategies and support team in making progress towards goals
Simmons, Christy	Teacher, K-12	Team Lead - Implement research based strategies and support team in making progress towards goals
Tullous, Sue	Teacher, K-12	Team Lead - Implement research based strategies and support team in making progress towards goals

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 9/2/2020, Courtney Schumacher

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.*

3

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

50

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	98%
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: A (65%) 2017-18: A (68%) 2016-17: A (77%) 2015-16: B (58%)
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 .	

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	66	69	93	84	78	76	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	549
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	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	4	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	1	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/2/2020

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	58	81	78	74	66	69	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	491
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	9	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	3	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	3	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	58	81	78	74	66	69	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	491
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	9	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	3	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	3	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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%	72%	62%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	64%	62%	58%	79%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	54%	53%	83%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	74%	70%	63%	78%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	66%	66%	62%	78%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	56%	51%	76%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	60%	65%	53%	74%	55%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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
03	2019	71%	68%	3%	58%	13%
	2018	70%	68%	2%	57%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	83%	64%	19%	58%	25%
	2018	77%	62%	15%	56%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				
05	2019	70%	62%	8%	56%	14%
	2018	71%	59%	12%	55%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
06	2019	62%	64%	-2%	54%	8%
	2018	68%	63%	5%	52%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	76%	71%	5%	62%	14%
	2018	76%	70%	6%	62%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	92%	69%	23%	64%	28%
	2018	83%	66%	17%	62%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				
05	2019	67%	64%	3%	60%	7%
	2018	66%	65%	1%	61%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-16%				
06	2019	72%	70%	2%	55%	17%
	2018	86%	68%	18%	52%	34%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	64%	63%	1%	53%	11%
	2018	73%	64%	9%	55%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
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	51	47	52	53	54	61	25				
BLK	52	55	45	55	68	73	50				
HSP	83	60		83	70						
MUL	77	56		86	67						
WHT	71	67	53	76	66	59	56				
FRL	68	60	53	68	64	67	61				
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	53	49	44	51	51	50	55				
BLK	55	56		63	50	27	40				
HSP	69	61		86	81		60				
MUL	62	71		67	71						

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
WHT	75	62	54	77	71	69	83				
FRL	68	63	60	71	67	53	69				
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	55	80	80	66	75	69	65				
BLK	64	83		62	79						
HSP	71	80		84	72		100				
MUL	78	69		83	92						
WHT	73	80	83	79	78	73	67				
FRL	65	79	85	73	81	80	73				

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	65
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	455
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	49
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	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	57
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	74
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	72
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	64
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	63
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.

ELA Lowest 25th percentile showed the lowest performance overall. Lack of use of adopted instructional materials with fidelity. Percent of new teachers, new to RVE and/or teaching.

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

Fifth grade Science showed the greatest decline from the previous year. A change in instructional personnel from previous years. Lack of rigorous use of adopted curriculum.

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.

Math lowest 25th percentile shows the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Implementation of MAFS and iReady small group targeted instruction.

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

Math lowest quartile showed the most improvement. The use of approved supplemental materials (MAFS and iReady) led to this improvement, along with using Eureka math with fidelity as core curriculum.

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

Based on the EWS data, the greatest area of concern is attendance issues as they relate to overall low achievement.

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

1. Increase Reading Proficiency of all students including the bottom quartile for on grade-level standards
2. Increase Math Proficiency of all students including the bottom quartile for on grade-level standards
3. Increase Science Proficiency on grade level standards
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

	Increase student learning gains and proficiency on grade-level standards in the area of ELA including students in the lowest quartile.
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>Based on data regarding learning gains, ELA learning gains were at 64% during the 2019 school year.</p> <p>Based on iReady Diagnostic baseline assessment data for fall 2020, 31% of students demonstrate proficiency on grade level standards in the area of reading.</p>
Measurable Outcome:	If we have high expectations and provide grade-level appropriate assignments delivered through strong instruction and deep engagement, then we will see an increase of 2-3% in learning gains and proficiency on grade-level standards will increase.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Heather Roche (heather.roche@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Use grade-level appropriate curriculum with rigor and fidelity
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. LAFS curriculum grades K-6: provide students with rigorous instruction in reading comprehension 2. Curriculum Associates Reading Assessment Books - Provide students opportunity to work with similar testing format as FSA to better prepare them for standardized testing 3. RAZ-Plus: Provide students with differentiated reading instruction based on individual reading levels. 4. StoryWorks - Provide students with rich and engaging grade-level text to increase comprehension skills and strategies across genres. 5. Sipps - Provide students with phonics based instruction to increase reading ability 6. NewsELA - Provide students with access to engaging fiction and nonfiction texts that are grade-appropriate and high-interest to increase reading comprehension 7. Title I assistants - provide small group instruction in reading skills and comprehension 8. Scholastic News - Provide students with rich and engaging grade-level text to increase comprehension skills and strategies across genres 9. Chromebooks will be used to complete iReady and Achieve3000 10. Instructional Coaches - support teachers with the implementation of curriculum, research based strategies, and instructional framework

Action Steps to Implement

Monitor progress through regular data analysis

Person Responsible Heather Roche (heather.roche@myoneclay.net)

Provide support to teachers with the implementation of curriculum and research based strategies through coaching cycles

Person Responsible Tiffany Bazemore (tiffany.bazemore@myoneclay.net)

Provide professional development opportunities to increase teacher capacity

Person Responsible Heather Roche (heather.roche@myoneclay.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

	Increase student learning gains and proficiency on grade-level math standards including students in the lowest quartile.
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>Based on data regarding learning gains, math learning gains were at 66% during the 2019 school year.</p> <p>Based on iReady Diagnostic baseline assessment data for fall 2020, 20% of students demonstrate proficiency on grade level standards in the area of math.</p>
Measurable Outcome:	If we have high expectations and provide grade-level appropriate assignments delivered through strong instruction and deep engagement, then we will see an increase of 2-3% in learning gains and proficiency on grade-level math standards will increase.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Heather Roche (heather.roche@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Use grade-level appropriate curriculum (Eureka and MAFS) with rigor and fidelity
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Curriculum Associates Math Practice and Problem Solving - provide students with supplemental activities and additional practice and problem solving opportunities. 2. Reflex Math - provide students with online platform to increase fact fluency leading to increased ability to perform grade-level calculations. 3. Mimio Interactive WhiteBoard - increase student engagement in math lessons with interactive instruction 4. Chromebooks - students will utilize Chromebooks to work on digital platforms such as Reflex and iReady 5. Title I assistants will provide small group instruction in the area of math. 6. Instructional Coaches - support teachers with the implementation of curriculum, research based strategies, and instructional framework

Action Steps to Implement

Monitor progress through regular data analysis

Person Responsible Heather Roche (heather.roche@myoneclay.net)

Provide support to teachers with the implementation of curriculum and research based strategies through coaching cycles

Person Responsible Tiffany Bazemore (tiffany.bazemore@myoneclay.net)

Provide professional development opportunities to increase teacher capacity

Person Responsible Heather Roche (heather.roche@myoneclay.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Increase student proficiency in grade-level science standards.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on 2019 data, students were at 60% proficient on grade-level standards in 5th grade. Based on Performance Matters baseline assessment data for fall 2020 in grades 4-6, 7% of students demonstrate proficiency on grade level standards in the area of science.
Measurable Outcome:	If we have high expectations and provide grade-level appropriate assignments delivered through strong instruction and deep engagement, then we will see an increase of 2-3% in learning gains and proficiency in grade-level science standards will increase.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Heather Roche (heather.roche@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Use grade-level appropriate curriculum (HMH) with rigor and fidelity
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Science Speed Bags - Provide students with opportunity to increase science knowledge through applied reading comprehension and science content. 2. Science Speed Bag Assessments - Provide students with the opportunity to work with similar testing format as FSA to better prepare them for standardized testing. 3. Science Speed Bags Spiral Reviews - Provide students with regular spiral review of science content 4. ChromeBooks - students will use Chromebooks to work on HMH digital platform.

Action Steps to Implement

Monitor progress through regular data analysis

Person Responsible Heather Roche (heather.roche@myoneclay.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Walk-throughs to ensure grade level standards to a rigorous degree are being taught.

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.

Ridgeview builds a positive school culture and environment that ensures all stakeholders are involved by using regular communication with families through multiple outlets. RVE provides stakeholders with opportunities to be involved in student learning through Parent and Family engagement events and conferences.

Our SAC committee meets 3 times per year and encourages all stakeholders to attend. Stakeholders provide input into the development of the Parent Family Engagement Plan and policies. During the SAC committee, members discuss barriers faced by our student's families including work schedules, language barriers, lack of transportation, Covid-19, and childcare for younger siblings. The SAC committee helps to develop solutions to these barriers. Stakeholders also provide input into the development of the School Improvement Plan. SAC committee regularly discusses Title I budget and the utilization of funding. SAC allows parents to provide feedback from engagement events and make suggestions for future engagement needs.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00