

Clay County Schools

Ridgeview 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	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	22

Ridgeview Elementary School

421 JEFFERSON AVE, Orange Park, FL 32065

<http://rve.oneclay.net>

Demographics

Principal: Courtney Schumacher

Start Date for this Principal: 1/9/2019

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	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	98%
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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: A (68%) 2016-17: A (77%)
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	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Ridgeview Elementary School

421 JEFFERSON AVE, Orange Park, FL 32065

<http://rve.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	Yes	87%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	45%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Roche, Heather	Principal	Monitor and support the progress of school improvement plan
McHugh-Clark, Judi	Assistant Principal	
Morrison, Kim	Teacher, ESE	
Bazemore, Tiffany	Instructional Coach	
Simmons, Christy	Teacher, K-12	
Fitzsimons, Kristina	Teacher, K-12	
Makar, Kristin	Teacher, K-12	
Gonzalez, Jenna	Teacher, K-12	
Lockman, Tracy	Teacher, K-12	
Bodie, Miriam	Teacher, K-12	
Lyons, Linda	Teacher, ESE	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 1/9/2019, Courtney Schumacher

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

3

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

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

50

Total number of students enrolled at the school

570

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.

5

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	67	74	100	83	94	76	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	570
Attendance below 90 percent	3	1	1	2	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	4	4	6	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	16	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	17	13	10	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	4	4	6	8	16	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

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	4	4	6	5	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	4	4	7	3	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
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

Monday 8/23/2021

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	66	69	93	84	78	76	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	549
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	66	69	93	84	78	76	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	549
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	4	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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%	70%	63%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				64%	62%	58%	62%	59%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56%	54%	53%	61%	50%	48%
Math Achievement				74%	70%	63%	75%	69%	62%
Math Learning Gains				66%	66%	62%	70%	68%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				65%	56%	51%	61%	56%	47%
Science Achievement				60%	65%	53%	75%	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	83%	64%	19%	58%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
05	2021					
	2019	70%	62%	8%	56%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				
06	2021					
	2019	62%	64%	-2%	54%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	76%	71%	5%	62%	14%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	92%	69%	23%	64%	28%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
05	2021					
	2019	67%	64%	3%	60%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-92%				
06	2021					
	2019	72%	70%	2%	55%	17%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	64%	63%	1%	53%	11%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

We utilized iReady ELA and Math for all K-6 students, as well as Achieve data for 4-6. For Science, students were tested using Performance Matters.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	20	49	68
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	49	68
	Students With Disabilities	19	30	40
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	7	49	61
	Economically Disadvantaged	7	49	61
	Students With Disabilities	19	30	40
	English Language Learners			
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	20	44	70
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	44	70
	Students With Disabilities	27	30	32
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	14	33	58
	Economically Disadvantaged	14	33	58
	Students With Disabilities	27	30	34
	English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	41	55	65
	Economically Disadvantaged	41	55	65
	Students With Disabilities	43	48	50
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	10	26	50
	Economically Disadvantaged	10	26	50
	Students With Disabilities	45	54	59
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	24	45	52
	Economically Disadvantaged	24	45	52
	Students With Disabilities	33	40	42
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	24	30	53
	Economically Disadvantaged	24	30	53
	Students With Disabilities	33	40	42
	English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	32	47	70
	Economically Disadvantaged	32	47	70
	Students With Disabilities	43	51	60
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	25	41	58
	Economically Disadvantaged	25	41	58
	Students With Disabilities	20	31	39
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	16	85	92
	Economically Disadvantaged	16	85	92
	Students With Disabilities	50	65	71
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	37	53	72
	Economically Disadvantaged	37	53	72
	Students With Disabilities	25	50	70
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	35	58	85
	Economically Disadvantaged	35	58	85
	Students With Disabilities	30	50	72
	English Language Learners			

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	47	56	50	39	46	50	70				
BLK	51	64	60	49	74		58				
HSP	71	72		59	61		80				
MUL	67			60							
WHT	68	68	53	66	52	40	83				
FRL	64	68	56	57	59	60	77				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	51	47	52	53	54	61	25				
BLK	52	55	45	55	68	73	50				
HSP	83	60		83	70						
MUL	77	56		86	67						
WHT	71	67	53	76	66	59	56				
FRL	68	60	53	68	64	67	61				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	53	49	44	51	51	50	55				
BLK	55	56		63	50	27	40				
HSP	69	61		86	81		60				
MUL	62	71		67	71						
WHT	75	62	54	77	71	69	83				
FRL	68	63	60	71	67	53	69				

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	64
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	449
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	51
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	59
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	69
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	64
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	61
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?

ELA Learning Gains showed the lowest performance overall. Lack of use of adopted instructional materials with fidelity. Percent of new teachers, new to RVE and/or teaching. Math and Science have experienced incremental growth with all groups in all grade levels except third grade.

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

Third and Fourth grade Math showed the greatest decline from the previous year. The greatest need in ELA is to strengthen the Tier 1 instruction. Overall Math proficiency went from 74% to 61%

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

Implementation of MAFS and iReady small group targeted instruction. PLCs to strengthen Tier 1 curriculum. Professional Development for new ELA standards and curriculum. For Science, inter-school PLC groups. For Math, consistent walk-throughs to ensure fidelity to the adopted curriculum.

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

5th grade Science improved from 60% to 79% proficiency. The use of approved supplemental materials, as well as teacher with a high-level content knowledge, led to this improvement, along with using HMH with fidelity.

6th Math also showed the most improvement from 60% to 81% proficiency for the same reasons noted above.

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

Contributing factors that led to this improvement were teachers with a high-level of content knowledge, the use of adopted curriculum with fidelity.

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

1. PLCs on newly adopted curriculum and standards in ELA.
2. Administrative walk-throughs to ensure fidelity to the adopted curriculum in all areas.
3. Professional development to help strengthen Tier 1 instruction.

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.

1. Whole group PLCs
2. Grade level PLCs
3. Subject level PLCs
4. District-provided PLCs.

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

Monitoring by school administration, school-based instructional coaches, and district-based instructional personnel. PLC process to ensure fidelity of resources. Provide targeted tutoring.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards

Area of Focus	Using the SAVVAS curriculum and the standards, we will strengthen Tier One instruction in order to increase student learning gains and proficiency on grade-level standards in the area of ELA, including students in the lowest quartile.
Description and Rationale:	Based on data regarding learning gains, ELA learning gains were at 68% during the 2021 school year. Based on iReady Diagnostic baseline assessment data for fall 2021, 31% of students demonstrate proficiency on grade level standards in the area of reading.
Measurable Outcome:	If we have high expectations and provide grade-level appropriate assignments delivered from the SAVVAS curriculum through strong instruction and deep engagement, then we will see an increase of 5% in learning gains and proficiency on grade-level standards will increase.
Monitoring:	This area will be monitored through administrative walk-throughs, PLC agendas, and review of lesson plans and quarterly data meetings.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Heather Roche (heather.roche@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Use grade-level appropriate curriculum with rigor and fidelity
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. SAVVAS curriculum grades K-6: provide students with rigorous instruction in reading comprehension 2. K-3 From Phonics To Reading - Provide students opportunity to work with a supplement to the core curriculum. 3. Heggerty- To improve phonics and phonemic awareness. 4. Lexia Core 5- To provide additional support to K-6 core curriculum. 5. DIBELS- To monitor progress across grades K-6. 7. Title I assistants - provide small group instruction in reading skills and comprehension 8. SAVVAS Leveled Readers and Decodable Readers - Provide students with rich and engaging grade-level text to increase comprehension skills and strategies across genres. 9. Chromebooks will be used to complete Lexia Core 5 and Achieve3000. 10. Instructional Coaches - support teachers with the implementation of curriculum, research based strategies, and instructional framework.

Action Steps to Implement

Through PLCs, professional development and administrative walk-throughs, we will utilize the above listed materials to strengthen Tier 1 instructions.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

	Strengthen Tier One instruction to increase student learning gains and proficiency on grade-level math standards including students in the lowest quartile.
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	<p>Based on data regarding learning gains, math learning gains were at 57% during the 2021 school year.</p> <p>Based on iReady Diagnostic baseline assessment data for fall 2021, 20% of students demonstrate proficiency on grade level standards in the area of math.</p>
Measurable Outcome:	If we have high expectations and provide grade-level appropriate assignments delivered through strong instruction and deep engagement, then we will see an increase of 10% in learning gains and proficiency on grade-level math standards will increase.
Monitoring:	This area will be monitored through administrative walk-throughs, PLC agendas, and review of lesson plans and quarterly data meetings.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Heather Roche (heather.roche@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Use grade-level appropriate curriculum (Eureka, MAFS and iReady) with rigor and fidelity
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Curriculum Associates Math Practice and Problem Solving - provide students with supplemental activities and additional practice and problem solving opportunities. 2. Reflex Math - provide students with online platform to increase fact fluency leading to increased ability to perform grade-level calculations. 3. Mimio Interactive WhiteBoard - increase student engagement in math lessons with interactive instruction 4. Chromebooks - students will utilize Chromebooks to work on digital platforms such as Reflex and iReady 5. Title I assistants will provide small group instruction in the area of math. 6. Instructional Coaches - support teachers with the implementation of curriculum, research based strategies, and instructional framework

Action Steps to Implement

Through PLCs, professional development, and administrative walk-throughs, we will strengthen Tier 1 instruction for all students.

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

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

Area of Focus	Based on last year's referral and suspension data, along with the results of the student Insight Surveys, we identified the need to implement positive behavioral supports. The Insight survey results showed a need to implement SEL education.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	Last year it was calculated that 45,680 minutes of instructional time were lost due to suspensions and office time outs. We hope to decrease this lost instructional time by a minimum of 80%.
Monitoring:	It will monitored through the monthly meeting of the PBIS team to review data ensure implementation.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Heather Roche (heather.roche@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will utilize the strategies taught through 7 Mindsets portal during our weekly PRIDE Academy. We will utilize a school-wide system of positive rewards through the implementation of PRIDE tickets, awarded to students weekly for exhibiting the qualities of perseverance, respect, integrity, dependability, and excellence. The skills will be implicitly taught during our weekly PRIDE academy.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The Insight survey results showed a need to implement SEL education.

Action Steps to Implement

We will utilize the strategies taught through 7 Mindsets portal during our weekly PRIDE Academy. We will utilize a school-wide system of positive rewards through the implementation of PRIDE tickets, awarded to students weekly for exhibiting the qualities of perseverance, respect, integrity, dependability, and excellence. The skills will be implicitly taught during our weekly PRIDE academy.

Person Responsible Heather Roche (heather.roche@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.

Based on comparisons with other elementary schools in the district and state, Ridgeview ELementary is ranked near the top. However, based on the results of our Insight survey, and the accounting of lost instructional time, we determined a need to focus on positive behavior supports and SEL education.

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.

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

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

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

Parents/Guardians- Participate in conferences and parent engagement events.

Students- Demonstrate PRIDE and engage in learning and curriculum.

School Faculty and Staff- Implement curriculum and ensure safety and well-being of all students.

Community Partners- Support school needs and endeavors.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: B.E.S.T. Standards	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00