

Clay County Schools

Rideout Elementary School



2021-22 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	19
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	23

Rideout Elementary School

3065 APALACHICOLA BLVD, Middleburg, FL 32068

<http://roe.oneclay.net>

Demographics

Principal: Trisha Stewart

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	52%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 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	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Rideout Elementary School

3065 APALACHICOLA BLVD, Middleburg, FL 32068

<http://roe.oneclay.net>

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)
Elementary School PK-6	No	38%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	34%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Stewart, Trisha	Principal	The principal will be responsible for providing leadership in the development, 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.
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.
Shepherd, Kathryn	Teacher, ESE	The school leadership team will analyze data to identify barriers and implement improvement steps that will increase student achievement.
Repper, Nicholas	Behavior Specialist	The school leadership team will analyze data to identify barriers and implement improvement steps that will increase student achievement.
Barnett, Tara	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

Thursday 7/1/2021, 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

Total number of students enrolled at the school

489

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

4

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

6

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems****2021-22****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	68	69	45	62	49	66	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	435
Attendance below 90 percent	19	12	11	16	10	15	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	3	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	5	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	

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	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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 8/25/2021

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	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	

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	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	

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				70%	65%	57%	60%	63%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				71%	62%	58%	56%	59%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56%	54%	53%	47%	50%	48%
Math Achievement				70%	70%	63%	61%	69%	62%
Math Learning Gains				68%	66%	62%	65%	68%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59%	56%	51%	50%	56%	47%
Science Achievement				67%	65%	53%	64%	66%	55%

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
03	2021					
	2019	71%	68%	3%	58%	13%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	85%	64%	21%	58%	27%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
05	2021					
	2019	57%	62%	-5%	56%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				
06	2021					
	2019	67%	64%	3%	54%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	75%	71%	4%	62%	13%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	74%	69%	5%	64%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				
05	2021					
	2019	50%	64%	-14%	60%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				
06	2021					
	2019	81%	70%	11%	55%	26%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	63%	63%	0%	53%	10%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

The progress monitoring tool that will be used for each grade level is i-Ready. We will also use a baseline assessment, mid-year assessment and the state assessment for science.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	5/11%	15/33%	30/63%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	15/7%	14/14%	15/40%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	3/6%	10/22%	30/61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	15/7%	14/14%	15/33%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	16/28%	36/62%	45/76%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	17	17	17/71%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	2/4%	14/24%	32/54%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	17/0%	17/18%	17/41%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	9/18%	21/44%	24/47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	14/14%	10/30%	13/31%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	0/8%	13/27%	33/65%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	14/0%	11/18%	13/38%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	10/14%	18/24%	37/49%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	19/11%	20/10%	20/35%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	6/9%	17/23%	39/51%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	19/0%	20/5%	20/30%
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	12/18%	14/19%	23/32%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	21/5%	21/10%	21/10%
	English Language Learners	3/0%	3/0%	3/33%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	3/4%	18/25%	39/53%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	21/0%	21/10%	21/33%
	English Language Learners	3/0%	3/0%	3/33%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	13%	68%	71%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	21	21	21
	English Language Learners	3	3	3
Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15/32%	21/44%	29/58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	8/0%	8/0%	9/33%
	English Language Learners	1/0%	1/0%	1/0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6/13%	24/50%	35/69%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	8/0%	8/13%	9/33%
	English Language Learners	1/0%	1/0%	1/100%

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	38	35		42	52	46	45				
BLK	44			50							
HSP	61	47		79	73		64				
MUL	63			76							
WHT	69	59	57	76	74	65	72				
FRL	56	58		64	73		65				
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				

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	69
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	480
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	47
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	65
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	70
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	
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	67
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	63
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?

Overall, we saw an increase in proficiency in both ELA and math. As we looked closer at the grade level data and the subgroups, there was a decrease from 18-19 to 20-21. Third graders in 18-19 showed 71% proficiency in ELA while these same students showed 61% proficiency as 5th graders. Fourth graders in 18-19 showed 85% proficiency in ELA while these same students showed 73% proficiency as 6th graders. There were no significant differences in the proficiency in the math subject area across grade levels.

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

The greatest need for improvement at ROE is in the ELA subject area. More specifically, our lowest 25th percentile of students across grade levels.

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

The contributing factors were new teachers to grade levels and the balance of teachers handling online learning and brick and mortar learning. We have developed a schedule where we have time with each grade level for data chats to discuss how we are moving our students. We are improving our PLCs so the work is continuing and teachers can collaborate with other schools to increase the success of our students. We are working with coaches from the district to assist with targeting the power standards and also the crosswalk between the new B.E.S.T standards and LAFS standards.

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

The data shows that we improved the most in math. Overall we increased our proficiency from 70% to 75% from 2019 to 2021. Our learning gains increased from 68% to 77% and our LG lowest 25% increased from 59% to 68%.

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

We had laser focused teachers who had coaches involved with their classrooms, small group instruction was evident with a plethora of strategies being used and our ESE teachers working with our students that have IEPs are factors in our improvement.

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

Continuing our purposeful small group instruction, planning intentional PLCs, professional development that focuses on the power standards and placing teachers based on their content area strength.

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.

We will be working with our district coaches in all subject areas to assist with small groups, new curriculum and resources that are being implemented this year and attending trainings on i-Ready, Achieve and Lexia. Our teachers will also be attending professional development that our district offers to improve their craft.

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

We will be meeting with every grade level for our data chats to ensure everyone has a pulse on areas of need and enrichment opportunities. We will continue our vertical planning amongst the grade levels to ensure that prerequisites are being taught for the next grade level.

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 RideOut's reading needs throughout the school. We know that reading effects all subject areas and we need to continuously monitor our student's progress. Overall our lowest 25th percentile of students averaged learning gains of 65% in ELA. We will continue to close these gaps and improve teacher capacity to increase these student's achievement levels.
Measurable Outcome:	From Spring 2021 to Spring 2022, our lowest 25th percentile of students will improve their ELA learning gains from 65% to 66% on the Florida Standards Assessment.
Monitoring:	Teachers will be creating intentional small groups in their classrooms and differentiating instruction to ensure every student is being met where they are. Teachers will use Achieve 3000, i-Ready, Lexia, and Heggarty to monitor student's progress throughout the school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Trisha Stewart (trisha.stewart@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The Savvas curriculum is being used with fidelity as well as intentional small groups where new resources are being implemented. Such as, Lexia, Heggarty, and Savvas small group intervention materials. Achieve 3000 and i-Ready are being used in specific grade levels to increase student's achievement levels.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Achieve 3000, i-Ready, Savvas, Lexia, Heggarty and Phonics for Reading are all evidence based resources that identifies student's areas of need and then follows up with remediation materials to close the gaps. Guiding students to take ownership of their own academics provides an intrinsic motivation to do their very best.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implementing intentional, differentiated small group instruction
2. Providing professional development on all new resources
3. Professional development on the district's initiatives as well as SEL implementation in all classrooms
4. Providing continual feedback to teachers

Person Responsible Trisha Stewart (trisha.stewart@myoneclay.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus
Focus Description and Rationale: RideOut's math learning gains for our lowest 25th percentile increased from 59% in 2019 to 68% in 2021. Although we saw growth in math overall, we can still increase achievement in this area.

Measurable Outcome: We will analyze and monitor our i-Ready data and use the small groups that are suggested from the i-Ready program to implement different interventions and resources to close the gaps. From Spring 2021 to Spring 2022, we want to see our math learning gains for our lowest 25th percentile increase from 68% to 69%.

Monitoring: Students will be monitored by analyzing i-Ready data closely, evidence based assessments/assignments and teacher observations in the classrooms. As well as, admin walk-throughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Trisha Stewart (trisha.stewart@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Planning intentional small groups using the i-Ready data and teacher input allows for interventions that meet student's areas of need. We will also provide teachers with professional development that increases their capacity and in turn increases student achievement and ownership.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research shows that implementing small group instruction in the classroom increases student achievement. Identifying areas of need and creating small groups to address those needs can benefit all students. Teaching students to develop academic ownership will assist with our student's overall success because they will acquire the intrinsic motivation to want to do their best and track their progress.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implementing intentional, differentiated small groups
2. Professional Development on analyzing i-Ready data
3. Professional Development on i-Ready tool box
4. Professional Development on high expectations, strong instruction, deep engagement, grade appropriate assignments and working on every students SEL
5. Providing continual feedback to reinforce small-group instruction

Person Responsible Trisha Stewart (trisha.stewart@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 at school, the more they are exposed to the academics they need to be successful. We will continue to strive for better attendance rates to increase student achievement and to develop the whole child both socially and emotionally.

Measurable Outcome: Attendance will be at or above 90% at the end of the 2021-2022 school year.

Monitoring: Attendance reports will be pulled from Synergy 8 times during the school year on interim days and report card days to monitor student's attendance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Trisha Stewart (trisha.stewart@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 is absent more than 2 days from school. We are scheduling SST meetings to provide support to families who are having difficulties getting their child (ren) to school.

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 SST meetings enable us to look deeper into why students are habitually absent from school.

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 Trisha Stewart (trisha.stewart@myoneclay.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

RideOut Elementary has a lower rate of discipline incidents compared to the state. We have a strong PBIS in place that we have combined with our school character traits. We have our EBD units here at RideOut but we have trained and experienced teachers/assistants that have done a phenomenal job with limiting our behavior incidences.

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.

Our PBIS team has worked hard to implement positive reinforcements for attendance, good behavior, and exemplar character traits with the goal being to develop the whole child. We are creating a parent volunteer group that enables parents to get involved with our school. In addition, we are utilizing social media platforms and blackboard to communicate with all stakeholders so information and highlights of our school are shared.

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

Our district has added an additional category on our walkthrough tool that allows administrators to acknowledge when teachers are providing positive feedback to our students in the classrooms. This is a great way to increase positivity throughout our school. Administrators identify ROEDY heroes on a weekly basis for going up and above their role at ROE and make phone calls to the parents of students that have completed their ROEDY character trait sheets. We have also acquired a boulder that parents/teachers can rent to recognize their child for birthdays or special accomplishments. Our goal is to get parents back in the building to assist our teachers and be a part of our environment again.

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