River Ridge High School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

River Ridge High School

11646 TOWN CENTER RD, New Port Richey, FL 34654

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

Demographics

Principal: Toni Zetzsche

Start Date for this Principal: 9/21/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	41%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org.](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

River Ridge High School

11646 TOWN CENTER RD, New Port Richey, FL 34654

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	40%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	25%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		B	B	B

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission is to provide the highest degree of instructional excellence while recognizing the unique needs and developing the abilities of every student. Through the cooperative efforts of family, school, and community, students will prepare to be responsible, productive citizens and life-long learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

All our students will achieve success in college, career, and life.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Zetzsche, Toni	Principal	
Bruno, Ronald	Assistant Principal	
Meek , Jessica	Assistant Principal	
Sullivan, Janene	Assistant Principal	
Zammetti, Danielle	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 9/21/2015, Toni Zetzsche

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
0

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.*
4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
89

Total number of students enrolled at the school
1,655

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
15

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
7

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	419	440	391	369	1619
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	74	93	83	138	388
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30	20	22	15	87
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100	128	129	36	393
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86	35	21	6	148
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	115	78	50	310
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	85	97	53	275
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course Failure ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	186	163	150	42	541

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

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	91	96	85	61	333

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated
Wednesday 7/21/2021

2020-21 - 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	442	429	401	363	1635
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	46	63	73	239
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	28	20	71	167
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	95	78	50	290
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	115	97	53	305
Course Failures ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	85	74	44	247

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	61	42	172

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

2020-21 - 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	442	429	401	363	1635
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57	46	63	73	239
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	28	20	71	167
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67	95	78	50	290
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40	115	97	53	305
Course Failures ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44	85	74	44	247

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	69	61	42	172

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				57%	57%	56%	56%	58%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				51%	53%	51%	52%	54%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	41%	42%	45%	43%	44%
Math Achievement				59%	56%	51%	57%	57%	51%
Math Learning Gains				51%	49%	48%	51%	52%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50%	42%	45%	35%	41%	45%
Science Achievement				74%	70%	68%	65%	68%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				76%	73%	73%	78%	71%	71%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	61%	57%	4%	55%	6%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	53%	53%	0%	53%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				

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
2021					
2019	73%	68%	5%	67%	6%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	75%	69%	6%	70%	5%

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	39%	60%	-21%	61%	-22%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	72%	62%	10%	57%	15%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	12	27	29	24	27	17	20	43		70	26
ELL	25	43		44	36		20				
ASN	56	39		80	57		69			100	60
BLK	30			25	25						
HSP	48	47	45	51	35	15	63	68		91	47
MUL	44	27		53	31		60	90		94	47
WHT	55	50	34	50	31	29	64	68		92	49
FRL	39	41	36	41	30	27	54	58		87	39

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	20	33	27	14	28	29	29	43		70	13
ELL											

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
ASN	60	61		67	53		76	90			
BLK	55	55		50							
HSP	55	55	42	40	45	31	67	62		90	42
MUL	48	52		52	52		79	93		94	31
WHT	58	50	42	62	52	50	74	77		84	46
FRL	47	50	45	48	50	44	65	70		83	39
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	27	39	37	23	32	32	28	57		59	13
ASN	63	71		68	31					90	
BLK	18	27		30							
HSP	51	48	56	49	51	20	68	66		80	45
MUL	76	69		71	67		50	85		100	50
WHT	56	51	44	58	52	35	65	80		89	46
FRL	44	47	43	50	45	30	56	72		77	36

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	90
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	607
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	88%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	43

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	66
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	27
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	51
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	56
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	52
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	45
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

There are fewer students attending RRHS this past year overall. The unsatisfactory attendance and course failures rose by: 10%-15% across all grade levels. Our students with disabilities subgroup showed little achievement gains in ELA. The lowest quartile students in 10th grade ELA showed little gains as well. It is our belief that new intervention procedures/plans along with new staff, created instability in scheduled and utilized interventions.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Subgroup data showed that SWD scores went down 7% for ELA Achievement (from 27% to 20%) Algebra 1 scores decreased by 14% (from 53% to 39%)

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

It is our belief that new staff and lack of student motivation were contributing factors. Action steps would include: additional staff training, focus on SEL strategies for teachers and students, and additional time built into bell schedule for interventions.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The 9th grade ELA scores were reported at 4% above the district average and 6% above the state average. The 9th grade PLC was led by veteran teachers with a strong focus on core actions 1 and 2 and intensive PD focused around delivery of standards with efficacy. Bio, Geo, and SS assessments data shows RRHS scored higher than both the district and the state.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Mandatory interventions were put into place that addressed learning gaps. That paired with some new hires that have made connections with students are attributed to the improvement.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

PLCs will need to analyze data, differentiate instruction, and promote intervention time.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Training will target students who struggle academically and efforts will be focused on changing their mindset to one of growth in order to meet standards. Training teachers and students to persevere when barriers are present. 2021-2022 theme is focused on GRIT: Hutle and Heart with school-wide PD on GRIT, Growth Mindset and the Power of Yet. Monthly early-release day trainings to focus on standards-based instruction across all curricular areas.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

We will utilize eHallpass paired with mandatory "Quest" Intervention time to make improvements with regard to student learning gains and the meeting of standards across all grade levels and subgroups. School-wide Intervention Specialist will work with all teachers, PLC groups, and struggling students. Learning Design Coach will complete weekly walk-throughs and attend PLC meetings to assist teachers in preparation of lessons and student engagement strategies.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	SWD achievement scores showed a decrease in ELA Achievement of -7% with only 20% of our SWD being proficient on ELA assessments.
Measurable Outcome:	Learning gain on FSA ELA will increase by at least 10% (to overcome the 7% drop and an increase of 3%).
Monitoring:	ELA students in Grades 9 and 10 will take the NWEA Assessment at the end of each quarter to show progress towards proficiency. PLC groups will monitor progress and work together to make curriculum adjustments throughout the year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ronald Bruno (rbruno@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Early-Release days will focus on standards based grading and curriculum.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By providing professional development to all teachers, there will be a focus on grading practices and data analysis to ensure students are being held to appropriate standards.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Overall school Algebra scores showed a decrease from 53% proficient to 39% (decrease of 14%).
Measurable Outcome:	Algebra 1 proficiency will increase from 39% to 55% for an overall increase of 16%.
Monitoring:	Data from Common Formative assessments within PLC will be analyzed as well as the newly implemented NWEA assessment for Algebra given each quarter.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Janene Sullivan (jsulliva@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Creation and analysis of common formative assessments and quarterly standardized testing will ensure standards-based grading practices are being implemented along with appropriate pacing of curriculum.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Reviewing common formative assessment data as well as quarterly NWEA assessment data will ensure our students are receiving proper core instruction and interventions can be implemented for struggling students.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on data from the 2020-2021 school year, a critical need area is course failure rates. We saw a drastic increase from the previous year in the number of courses students were failing. School year 1920 Semester 1 course failure rate = 4.2% School year 2021 Semester 1 course failure rate = 12.6% School year 1920 Semester 2 course failure rate = 7.2% School year 2021 Semester 2 course failure rate = 12.1%
Measurable Outcome:	The number of course failures will drop at least 5% to a course average failure rate under 7% by the end of first semester.
Monitoring:	Progress report and report data data
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Danielle Zammetti (dzammett@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Student intervention time (QUEST) Standards Based instruction PD
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	BY providing stuents with standards-based grading practices, coupled with immediate (and daily) intervention time in the schedule, students will show mastery of standards and our failure rate will decrease.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on data from the last two school years, our average daily attendance rate dropped from 94% in 19-20 school year to 91% in the 20-21 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	In the 2021-2022 school year, our average daily attendance rate will increase from 91-94%
Monitoring:	Our attendance committee will review attendance and take steps to improve individual student attendance rates.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Janene Sullivan (jsulliva@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to SafeSchoolsforAlex and EWS data, our school-wide behavior incidents are decreasing, and the decrease needs to continue. We saw a drop from 8.8 incidents per 100 students to 5.0 incidents per 100 students in the last two school years.
Measurable Outcome:	In the 2021-2022 school year we will see an additional decrease from 5.0 incidents to 3.5 incidents per 100 students.
Monitoring:	Our Intervention Specialist will run school-wide behavior data, analyze trends and create action plans for students and teachers to target highly impacted areas of discipline (referral code 2R: defiance and disrespect is one known target area).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Toni Zetzsche (tzetzsch@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilization of PBIS strategies school-wide.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

In the 2018-2019 school year, our school average was 8.8 incidents per 100 students. During the 2019-2020 school year, we saw a decrease in overall incidents from 8.8 to 5.0 per 100 students. In addition, our OSS data decreased from 227 suspensions to 131. The biggest area of concern is within the area of threatening/intimidation based on data from the 2019-2020 school year. Last year we added the position of school-wide intervention specialist to run behavior data trends, report back to the leadership team and increase the use of PBIS across campus.

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.

Through a varied group of stakeholders that will include but is not limited to administration, instructional personnel, non-instructional personnel, parents, students, community and business leaders, RRHS will build a positive culture and environment that will meet the needs of all learners. Academies will structure a growth model for their programs designed to improve opportunities for all students to be successful in the classes that are encompassed by each academy. Each teacher in prospective academies will collaborate to design/update academy expectations for performance. Academy plans will be presented to SAC. Positive Behavior Interventions will also be presented to SAC via our new Intervention Specialist who will be monitoring student referral reports weekly in order to design interventions that will positively impact student behaviors and ultimately engage students in learning therefore improving mastery of skills in coursework. PBIS will also include schoolwide positive interventions including but not limited to: Postcards home, StarryKnights, Find a Freshy, TikTok Dance "Social DisDance", and Athlete of the Week. Intervention Speicialist will also introduce PD and tips of the week for attending to the social emotional needs of both students and staff. In the 2021-2022 school year, our focus is on the theme "GRIT: Hustle and Heart". This is based on the work and book by Angela Duckworth. Each staff member is receiving a copy of the book and work will begin at our staff retreat introducing GRIT, along with a refresher on the work we've done on the Growth Mindset and the Power of Yet. With the addition of a staff member to oversee SEL, we have created a staff SEL room and the addition of Wellness Wednesdays for each teacher to take 5-minutes from their class periods to conduct a small wellness activity with students.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Instructional Staff: implementation of Wellness Wednesday in classrooms; professional development around GRIT and work by Angela Duckworth

Community/Business Partners: partnering with school to provide wellness activities, assist in hosting awards events, and assist with monthly events to enhance positive culture

SAC: SAC members will be presented with discipline and PBIS data monthly; they will determine best use of SAC budget allocations to support and assist with building a postive culture and environment

Administrators: Each administrator oversees a grade-level and Academy; focused on using social media to provide public awareness of accomplishments