# Ridgeview Elementary School



# 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# 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**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>PK-6 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2020-21 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 98% |
| **2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>English Language Learners<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: A (65%)<br><br>2017-18: A (68%)<br><br>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.](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

# 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 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 20 | 49 | 68 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 20 | 49 | 68 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 19 | 30 | 40 |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 7 | 49 | 61 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 7 | 49 | 61 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 19 | 30 | 40 |
| | English Language Learners | | | |

| Grade 2 | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 20 | 44 | 70 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 20 | 44 | 70 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 27 | 30 | 32 |
| | English Language Learners | | | |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | 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 Description and Rationale:** | 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. |
| | 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:** | 1. SAVVAS curriculum grades K-6: provide students with rigorous instruction in reading comprehension<br>2. K-3 From Phonics To Reading - Provide students opportunity to work with a supplement to the core curriculum.<br>3. Heggerty- To improve phonics and phonemic awareness.<br>4. Lexia Core 5- To provide additional support to K-6 core curriculum.<br>5. DIBELS- To monitor progress across grades K-6.<br>7. Title I assistants - provide small group instruction in reading skills and comprehension<br>8. SAVVAS Leveled Readers and Decodable Readers - Provide students with rich and engaging grade-level text to increase comprehension skills and strategies across genres.<br>9. Chromebooks will be used to complete Lexia Core 5 and Achieve3000.<br>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 | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Strengthen Tier One instruction to increase student learning gains and proficiency on grade-level math standards including students in the lowest quartile.<br><br>Based on data regarding learning gains, math learning gains were at 57% during the 2021 school year.<br><br>Based on iReady Diagnostic baseline assessment data for fall 2021, 20% of students demonstrate proficiency on grade level standards in the area of math. |
| **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:** | 1. Curriculum Associates Math Practice and Problem Solving - provide students with supplemental activities and additional practice and problem solving opportunities.<br>2. Reflex Math - provide students with online platform to increase fact fluency leading to increased ability to perform grade-level calculations.<br>3. Mimio Interactive WhiteBoard - increase student engagement in math lessons with interactive instruction<br>4. Chromebooks - students will utilize Chromebooks to work on digital platforms such as Reflex and iReady<br>5. Title I assistants will provide small group instruction in the area of math.<br>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 Description and Rationale:** | 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. |

| | |
|---|---|
| **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, 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 |