

Clay County Schools

Rideout 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 | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 19 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 20 |

Rideout Elementary School

3065 APALACHICOLA BLVD, Middleburg, FL 32068

<http://roe.oneclay.net>

Demographics

Principal: Trisha Stewart

Start Date for this Principal: 6/12/2017

| | |
|--|--|
| 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 | No |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 52% |
| 2019-20 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%) |
| 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 | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 16 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 20 |

Rideout Elementary School

3065 APALACHICOLA BLVD, Middleburg, FL 32068

<http://roe.oneclay.net>

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-6</p> | <p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>No</p> | <p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>41%</p> |
| <p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p> | <p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p> | <p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>32%</p> |

School Grades History

| Year | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | A | A | 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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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. |
| 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. |
| Charbonneau, Carla | Teacher, K-12 | The school leadership team will analyze data to identify barriers and implement improvement steps that will increase student achievement. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/12/2017, Trisha Stewart

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.*

4

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

39

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 | No |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 52% |
| 2019-20 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%) |
| 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 | 61 | 50 | 52 | 60 | 64 | 71 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 409 |
| 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 | 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 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 4 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |

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 | |

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

Tuesday 9/8/2020

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 | 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 | 0 |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 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 | 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 | 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 | 0 |
|---------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

| School Grade Component | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 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% |

| School Grade Component | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| 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 | |
| | (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 | 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% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 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% | 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 | 56 |
| 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 | 77 |
| 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 | 80 |
| 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 | 65 |
| 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 | 60 |
| 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.

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 data 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?

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 quartile proficiency in Reading
2. Increase lowest quartile 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. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and 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.

Measurable Outcome: 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 Steps to Implement

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. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and 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.

Measurable Outcome: 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. We want to see our scores on the FSA increase from 59% to 60%.

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 Steps to Implement

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. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and 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.

Measurable Outcome: 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 Steps to Implement

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

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

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

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.

RideOut has included proximal and broad stakeholders to support a positive school culture and environment. We have several positive reinforcements in place to encourage success in our students academics. Our students have the opportunity to be a member of our Roedy 100 club for displaying positive character traits. We showcase our students for being Ready On Time and Engaged which promotes good attendance. We create fun competitions for the school to encourage completing i-Ready/Achieve lessons with success.

We like to celebrate our teachers by preparing fun themed days for them which promotes a sense of family and community.

Our business partners have contributed to our school success by being part of our SAC committee and contributing items to ensure the success of our students.

In addition, we are always open to having our local high school or college students involved with our school. Last year we had a group of high school students hold a contest for the class with the best attendance. They came in and rewarded the class and did fun activities with our students.

We will be a part of the 7 Mindsets this year which will enhance our positive culture even more. We are excited about this opportunity.

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: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |