

Clay County Schools

# Ridgeview High School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>21</b>

# Ridgeview High School

466 MADISON AVE, Orange Park, FL 32065

<http://rhs.oneclay.net>

## Demographics

**Principal: Becky Murphy**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School PK, 9-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	48%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: B (54%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>21</b>

# Ridgeview High School

466 MADISON AVE, Orange Park, FL 32065

<http://rhs.oneclay.net>

## School Demographics

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)
High School PK, 9-12	No	38%
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	<b>Charter School</b>	<b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	43%

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2019-20</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2016-17</b>
<b>Grade</b>	B	B	B	B

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Clay County School Board.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### **Provide the school's mission statement.**

The mission of Ridgeview High School is to develop lifelong learners who meet the global demands of 21st century skills through a challenging educational program which embraces diversity and unity, instills integrity and character, and promotes Respect, Honor and Scholarship.

#### **Provide the school's vision statement.**

Preparing ALL Students for Success in A Global Economy

### 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
Murphy, Becky	Principal	Principal Becky Murphy serves as the facilitator of the School Based MTSS Leadership Team and provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing MTSS, manages the school budget, manage school communications, conducts teacher evaluations and consistent classroom walkthroughs, leads planning for school-wide systems of intervention and professional development. Shared decision making is facilitated through the PLC process, teams of teachers work collaboratively in cycles of inquiry to ensure district learning. The principal ensures that all staff comply with the district-wide school site standards.
Creel, Lydia	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principals will assist the Principal with duties as needed which includes but is not limited to participating in data collection and analysis, delivering Tier 1 interventions, school-wide discipline plans, and helping to ensure adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation. Assistant Principals will also ensure that instruction is aligned with standards, is grade level appropriate and rigorous, through frequent classroom walkthroughs and providing timely feedback to teachers. RHS instructional leaders will also attend Professional Learning Communities working collaboratively with teachers and monitoring designated departmental data in order to increase student achievement.
Staefe, Kevin	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principals will assist the Principal with duties as needed which includes but is not limited to participating in data collection and analysis, delivering Tier 1 interventions, school-wide discipline plans, and helping to ensure adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation. Assistant Principals will also ensure that instruction is aligned with standards, is grade level appropriate and rigorous, through frequent classroom walkthroughs and providing timely feedback to teachers. RHS instructional leaders will also attend Professional Learning Communities working collaboratively with teachers and monitoring designated departmental data in order to increase student achievement.
Auguste, Tania	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principals will assist the Principal with duties as needed which includes but is not limited to participating in data collection and analysis, delivering Tier 1 interventions, school-wide discipline plans, and helping to ensure adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation. Assistant Principals will also ensure that instruction is aligned with standards, is grade level appropriate and rigorous, through frequent classroom walkthroughs and providing timely feedback to teachers. RHS instructional leaders will also attend Professional Learning Communities working collaboratively with teachers and monitoring designated departmental data in order to increase student achievement.

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Monday 7/1/2019, Becky Murphy



**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**

111

### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School PK, 9-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	48%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (60%) 2017-18: B (59%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: B (54%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A

<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

**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	0	440	481	392	391	1704
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	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	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	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	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59	49	52	42	202
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	7	60	19	88
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Wednesday 9/16/2020

**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	0	399	359	363	383	1504
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	61	70	99	278
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	17	13	19	68
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5	8	1	24
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	25	14	13	84

**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	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	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	399	359	363	383	1504
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	61	70	99	278
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	17	13	19	68
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	5	8	1	24
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32	25	14	13	84

**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	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	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	64%	60%	56%	57%	54%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	52%	51%	53%	50%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	39%	42%	36%	40%	41%
Math Achievement	55%	55%	51%	53%	60%	49%
Math Learning Gains	40%	46%	48%	44%	51%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	33%	38%	45%	26%	37%	39%
Science Achievement	77%	73%	68%	63%	63%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	80%	81%	73%	84%	78%	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	65%	61%	4%	55%	10%
	2018	57%	56%	1%	53%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	61%	57%	4%	53%	8%
	2018	63%	58%	5%	53%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

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	78%	72%	6%	67%	11%
2018	90%	90%	0%	65%	25%
Compare		-12%			

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	80%	80%	0%	70%	10%
2018	82%	78%	4%	68%	14%
Compare		-2%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	46%	65%	-19%	61%	-15%
2018	44%	66%	-22%	62%	-18%
Compare		2%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	57%	64%	-7%	57%	0%
2018	55%	61%	-6%	56%	-1%
Compare		2%			

### 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	40	44	33	48	42	27	53	67		94	33
ELL	33	53	36	45						90	
ASN	68	59		73	50		90	100		100	92
BLK	54	48	18	49	38	33	74	78		100	64

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
HSP	65	59	48	59	35	36	77	74		96	69
MUL	71	76		64	26		90	82		96	59
WHT	66	54	34	55	42	30	76	80		94	68
FRL	53	47	29	52	39	40	70	78		94	57
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	40	22	50	43	32	68	56		68	22
ELL	25	47	40	44	50						
ASN	81	84		76	29		100	100		100	78
BLK	49	47	29	37	41	37	75	67		85	41
HSP	57	48	24	51	36	29	92	72		90	54
MUL	67	57		45	29		92	100		92	18
WHT	62	57	41	55	40	28	88	86		90	64
FRL	52	49	35	47	41	34	80	74		83	42
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	28	36	23	21	24	18	36	41		49	27
ELL	20	40	20	25	29						
ASN	83	70		85	72		89	91		100	83
BLK	43	43	21	36	32	17	51	76		82	48
HSP	51	46	44	46	43	31	52	76		81	59
MUL	74	53		54	57	42	86	81		84	38
WHT	60	56	42	58	46	28	65	89		86	64
FRL	47	46	36	45	38	23	53	76		74	50

### 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	59
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	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	653
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99%

<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	48
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	51
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	79
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
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
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	62
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	71
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	60
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	55
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.

Overall the data component showing the lowest performance was our lower quartile students scoring proficient in math. Only 33% of our lower quartile students scored proficient in math compared to 38% in our district and 45% in the state. While we did increase two percentage from 31% to 33% scoring proficient, we do see a trend over the last two years in our data for our lower quartile students to be below the state average in scoring proficient.

There are several contributing factors to the proficiency math levels of our lower quartile students. The junior high schools in our district have increased math acceleration opportunities for students at the 7th and 8th grade level, and more students are taking both the Algebra and Geometry EOC in their 7th and 8th grade years. This results in a significant decrease of proficient students entering our high school Algebra classes. We also have had a high teacher turnover in our math department, and our newer teachers need more instructional support.

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

The number of students scoring proficient on the Biology EOC was the component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year, dropping from 88% proficient to 77%. The contributing factor to this was how our district scheduled students into our science progression. In 2017-2018, only students scoring highly proficient on the 8th grade FSA ELA took Biology and the Biology EOC. The remaining students took Environmental Science as 9th graders. In 2018-2019, these students took Biology and the resulting EOC. Our proficiency levels are a result of having all levels of FSA ELA students taking the Biology EOC.

#### 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.



The data component that had the greatest gap to the state average was our Lower Quartile students scoring proficient in math. Only 33% of our lower quartile students scored proficient in math compared to 45% in the state. While we did increase two percentage from 31% to 33% scoring proficient, we do see a trend over the last two years in our data for our lower quartile students to be below the state average in scoring proficient.

There are several contributing factors to the proficiency math levels of our lower quartile students. The junior high schools in our district have increased math acceleration opportunities for students at the 7th and 8th grade level, and more students are taking both the Algebra and Geometry EOC in their 7th and 8th grade years. This results in a significant decrease of proficient students entering our high school Algebra classes. We also have had a high teacher turnover in our math department, and our newer teachers need more instructional support.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement is our ELA Achievement.

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

Attendance

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

1. Engagement
2. Rigor
3. Grade Level Appropriate Curriculum
4. High Expectations for ALL stakeholders
- 5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** The performance level of our lowest 25 percentile was 35%. ELA PLC groups and Intensive Reading will be focusing on FSA scores and strands to identify comprehension trends so that we can have the most impact for the majority of the lower quartile students.

**Measurable Outcome:** Ridgeview High School will improve the percentage of students making learning gains in reading from 35% to 39%, as measured by Grade 9/10 ELA Florida Standards Assessments

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Becky Murphy (becky.murphy@myoneclay.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** ELA and Reading teachers will use Achieve 3000 to progress monitor throughout the year. Collaborate within PLC teams to create common formative assessments and analyze data in order to guide instruction. Provide students with writing practice aligned to the rigor of the assessment and develop ways to systemically intervene when formative assessment shows students are not mastering standards

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** These strategies will increase engagement, rigor, grade level appropriate instruction and academic ownership

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Reading and ELA teachers will receive Achieve 3000 training on close reading
2. Administration will meet with each PLC for data chats to review assessments and provide feedback
3. Using Achieve 3000 to increase student achievement in identifying key ideas, details and integration of knowledge and ideas.
4. Writing in every class, every day

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

1. Reading and ELA teachers will receive Achieve 3000 training on close reading
2. Administration will meet with each PLC for data chats to review assessments and provide feedback
3. Using Achieve 3000 to increase student achievement in identifying key ideas, details and integration of knowledge and ideas.
4. Writing in every class, every day

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]

1. Reading and ELA teachers will receive Achieve 3000 training on close reading
2. Administration will meet with each PLC for data chats to review assessments and provide feedback
3. Using Achieve 3000 to increase student achievement in identifying key ideas, details and integration of knowledge and ideas.
4. Writing in every class, every day

**Person Responsible** Becky Murphy (becky.murphy@myoneclay.net)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

**Area of Focus** The performance of our lowest 25 percentile was 33%. Math PLC groups will be focusing on FSA scores and strands to identify comprehension trends so that we can have the most impact for the majority of the lower quartile students.

**Measurable Outcome:** Ridgeview High School will improve the percentage of students making learning gains in math from 33% to 38%, as measured by Algebra EOC.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Becky Murphy (becky.murphy@myoneclay.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** We have placed level 1 and 2 students taking Algebra in blocked sections to give twice the time to learn the content. Math students who are level 2, but passed Algebra course are taking Liberal Arts Math to work on algebra deficiencies before retesting in December. Second semester will focus on Geometry skills to prepare

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** These strategies will increase engagement, rigor, grade level appropriate instruction and academic ownership.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Teachers meeting individually with students for data tracking on testing benchmarks
2. Incorporate small group rotation in all classes

**Person Responsible** Becky Murphy (becky.murphy@myoneclay.net)

**#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Improve student and faculty connectedness while specifically addressing and implementing character traits aligned with the 7 Mindsets curriculum to improve the climate of positivity and acceptance at RHS.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Improve faculty/staff and student connectedness; relationship building. Increase acceptance and empathy among students. Encourage students to self-reflect on their character strengths and focus on developing a growth mindset. Provide students opportunities to discuss and practice positive mindsets and traits to improve their overall success.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Becky Murphy (becky.murphy@myoneclay.net)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Incorporating the 7 Mindsets curriculum and the Positive Panther Council school-wide initiatives that promote Social and Emotional Learning and relationship building.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Initiating the mindsets training and the Positive Panther Project will help students social and emotional competencies which will in turn lead to lowered discipline issues, less suspensions and an increase in goal setting which should impact student performance as well.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Monthly school-wide activity that aligns with 7 Mindsets
2. Support of Administration to utilize 10-15/month during faculty meetings to conduct a lesson/activity
3. Support of Administration/teachers to embed lessons through 9th grade and 10th grade classrooms
4. Promoting Positivity throughout the school via the Positive Panther Project.

**Person Responsible**                      Becky Murphy (becky.murphy@myoneclay.net)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**The School Leadership Team will meet with teachers during their designated department meetings as well as individually to ensure the priorities identified in section 2E are met. The Leadership Team will share effective teaching strategies in order to improve academic achievement. In addition, the team will engage in ongoing two way communication with instructors at Ridgeview High, in order to maintain a strong culture of teaching and learning yielding academic gains.**

**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.

Four hundred and forty (440) freshmen are enrolled at RHS for the 2020-21 school year. Freshmen parental involvement will improve during the course of this year as measured by attendance at the freshmen orientation parent meeting and the parent/curriculum night sponsored by guidance

RHS provides student counseling through a variety of means. Our Guidance department meets with our students on a one on one basis, in group settings, and in small group settings at various times throughout the year. In addition, our guidance department has incorporated the Positive Panther Project, which is a school-wide initiative meeting on the first Wednesday of every month. This project incorporates the 7 Mindsets lessons with an overall goal of creating a sense of connectedness and enhancing Social and Emotional Learning skills for all learners. What is more, each counselor has an open door policy for their students to visit if needed. RHS provides students access to a behavioral counselor through the local mental health agency with parent consent needed after first visit. RHS provides students of military members another resource to connect with other students who understand the trials of being a military dependent through another licensed counselor. Along with all faculty members, mentoring is provided by National Honor Society and Beta Club members. Mentoring is also provided by Take Stock in Children for students identified in 8th grade as at risk for graduation/college attendance. Faculty are trained every year on Suicide Prevention and Indicators. RHS has various clubs, organizations, and events that students are encouraged to participate in to connect with peers. RHS has a zero tolerance policy on any type of bullying and advertises this policy to all stakeholders. Teachers, counselors, and administrators have an open door policy and are available to all students when needed.

**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: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>