River Ridge High School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

River Ridge High School

11646 TOWN CENTER RD, New Port Richey, FL 34654

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

Demographics

Principal: Toni Zetzsche

Start Date for this Principal: 9/21/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	41%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (56%) 2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

River Ridge High School

11646 TOWN CENTER RD, New Port Richey, FL 34654

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	41%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	26%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		B	B

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Zetzsche, Toni	Principal	
Zammetti, Danielle	Assistant Principal	
Bruno, Ronald	Assistant Principal	
Donlon, Ann	Assistant Principal	
Meek , Jessica	Assistant Principal	
Greco-Ball, Jennifer	Other	
Brusoe, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	
Busch, Jacqueline	Teacher, K-12	
Carlson, Mike	Teacher, Career/Technical	
Clouse, Katia	Teacher, K-12	
Dill, Susan	Teacher, K-12	
Fleming, Roland	Teacher, K-12	
Glover, Marie	Teacher, K-12	
Glover, Wilfred	Teacher, K-12	
Hess, Beth	Teacher, Career/Technical	
Howery, Douglas	Teacher, K-12	
Laroue, Taylor	Teacher, K-12	
Newman, Tim	Teacher, K-12	
Peterson, Laurie	School Counselor	
Rossman, Nicole	Teacher, K-12	
Sadler, Kerry	Teacher, K-12	
Smith, Shannon	Graduation Coach	
Wilson, Kristina	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

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

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
2

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
86

Total number of students enrolled at the school
1,854

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
8

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
7

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	432	441	425	390	1688
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46	54	61	0	161
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33	22	11	0	66
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course Failures ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48	105	92	0	245
Level 1 on 2022 statewide ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	63	80	91	0	234

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	39	66	63	0	168

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/27/2022

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

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

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

Indicator	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	91	96	85	61	333

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	

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

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

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

Indicator	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	91	96	85	61	333

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	46%	51%	51%				57%	57%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	45%						51%	53%	51%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	36%						42%	41%	42%
Math Achievement	55%	35%	38%				59%	56%	51%
Math Learning Gains	57%						51%	49%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%						50%	42%	45%
Science Achievement	63%	50%	40%				74%	70%	68%
Social Studies Achievement	66%	49%	48%				76%	73%	73%

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

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	73%	68%	5%	67%	6%
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	75%	69%	6%	70%	5%
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	39%	60%	-21%	61%	-22%
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	72%	62%	10%	57%	15%

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	17	37	37	28	40	42	26	42		82	16
ELL	17	41		36	36		45				
ASN	54	52		54	58		69			100	64
BLK	36	59		36	62						
HSP	42	35	20	53	53	29	63	68		98	39
MUL	47	46		42	43		63	45		100	55
WHT	47	46	37	57	58	52	63	66		91	50
FRL	35	40	34	47	53	51	54	56		86	40

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	12	27	29	24	27	17	20	43		70	26
ELL	25	43		44	36		20				
ASN	56	39		80	57		69			100	60
BLK	30			25	25						
HSP	48	47	45	51	35	15	63	68		91	47
MUL	44	27		53	31		60	90		94	47
WHT	55	50	34	50	31	29	64	68		92	49
FRL	39	41	36	41	30	27	54	58		87	39

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	20	33	27	14	28	29	29	43		70	13
ELL											
ASN	60	61		67	53		76	90			
BLK	55	55		50							
HSP	55	55	42	40	45	31	67	62		90	42
MUL	48	52		52	52		79	93		94	31
WHT	58	50	42	62	52	50	74	77		84	46
FRL	47	50	45	48	50	44	65	70		83	39

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	56
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	556
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	35
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	64
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	48
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	50
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	55
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	57
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	50
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

2022 School grade components decreased in almost every category. FSA ELA Achievement decrease from 57% to 47%. Math achievement decrease from 59% to 55%. The learning gains from our lowest 25% decreased in both ELA (42% to 36%) and Math (50% to 47%). Behaviorally, 1,065 referrals were written (9th grade = 378, 10th grade = 330, 11th grade = 256 and 12th grade=101). The discipline codes of 2R (defiance and disrespect) and 2C (skippng and leaving class without permission) were the highest across all four grade levels. Our course failure rates continue to decrease each year, with targeted focus and is down to an average of 8.05% between first and second semester.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Our greatest areas of need for improvement: overall ELA achievement scores, overall Math achievement scores - particularly in Algebra proficiency, learning gains for our lowest 25% in both reading and math, number of disciplinary referrals in categories 2C and 2R and overall by grade level, and course failure rates.

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

In order to meet these needs for improve, the staff at RRHS will engage in:
*PD for standards based grading practices
*an increase in training and awareness of Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS)
*PLC work to identify required learning and essential standards
*SLT will engage in PD and lead PLC work in a shift to standards-based grading schoolwide
*Addition of staff: four additional discipline IAs and new intensive reading class/teacher

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Math learning gains saw an increase of 6% from previous year. Acceleration Success saw an increase of 4% from previous year. Graduation rate increased by 7%. Schoolwide there was a decrease in the amount of course failures from 12% - 8%.

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

Our 2021 SIP included goals in the area of math gains and course failures. Contributing factors for these areas were the focus on these goals throughout the year and in PLC meetings. As an administrative team, we monitored the course failure rate weekly and met with teachers and PLCs to address areas of concerns and offer staff support. The schoolwide acceleration success rate increased with the addition of AICE General Paper as an 11th grade English course for all students. Since graduation data is lag data (one year behind), one factor was the waiver of state assessments for graduation.

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

SLT and PLC teams will participate in professional development around standards-based grading practices and align gradebooks according to new expectations. PLCs will work vertically to analyze data and identify relevant strategies to deliver cross curricular content and identify gaps in learning from prior years. The ELA department at grades 9 and 10 will administer the new FAST test during the 2022-2023 school year as baseline data, and analyze the growth of student learning and progress between administrations. Students in need of additional intensive reading supports will be identified and placed in an intensive reading elective in addition to their ELA class period.

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.

School leadership team will engage in PD around standards based grading practices and will train their PLC teams. Our intervention and/or behavior specialist will develop PD around classroom mangagement and behavior intervention strategies. A teacher leader will increase the awareness of PBIS initiatives schoolwide and create additional student celebrations around success and achievement.

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

Throughout the year, systems and structures will be documented so that new staff and changing staff can maintain moving forward. The administrative team will use the Admin SharePoint site to share vital schoolwide documents. Teams (SLT, PLC, and admin) will use progress monitoring strategies at least quarterly to make adjustments to areas of improvement.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	9th grade SWD achievement scores show that only 19% are proficient in ELA compared to their cohort at 49%. 10th grade SWD achievement scores show that only 12.3% are proficient in ELA compared to their cohort at 42.5%.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Learning gains on FSA ELA will increase by at least 10%.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	ELA students in grades 9 and 10 will take NWEA assessments at the end of each quarter to show progress towards proficiency. PLC groups, with the inclusion of ESE support staff, will monitor progress and develop action steps to make adjustments throughout the year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Danielle Zammetti (dzammett@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Our PLC work will align with district vision and works with core standards, assessment, progress monitoring to include strategies for consistency across the curriculum and provide high impact instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	By guiding our PLC work, there will be a focus on identifying essential standards/required learning, analyzing data, and identifying multiple ways for students to show mastery of standards.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	School grade data indicated that achievement levels in math dropped from 59% to 55%. Learning gains for our lowest 25% dropped from 50% to 47%.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Algebra 1 and Geometry proficiency will each increase by 5%. Algebra proficiency will increase from 42.6% to 48%. Geometry proficiency will increase from 69.8% to 75%.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Data from common formative assessments and NWEA progress monitoring (Algebra only) will be analyzed each quarter in PLC groups.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ann Donlon (adonlon@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	PLC groups will work collaboratively to identify essential standards and create common formative assessments to ensure standards based grading is implemented with fidelity.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Focus on alignment of district initiative for secondary grading practices and a shift toward gradebook alignment in PLC's.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	School grade data indicated that ELA achievement levels dropped from 57% to 46%. Learning gains dropped from 51% to 45% and learning for our lowest 25% dropped from 42% to 36%.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	With the new state FAST test, this year will be baseline data. PLC groups will analyze the NWEA and FAST quarterly assessments to determine percentage of students reaching ELA proficiency from quarter 1 to quarter 4.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Data from common formative assessments, NWEA progress monitoring, and the new baseline FAST assessment will be analyzed quarterly in PLC groups.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ronald Bruno (rbruno@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	PLC groups will work collaboratively to identify essential standards and create common formative assessments to ensure standards based grading is implemented with fidelity.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Focus on alignment of district initiative for secondary grading practices and a shift toward gradebook alignment in PLC's.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	Based on data from previous year, we were successful in decreasing course failure rate from 12.1% (2021) to 8.6% (2022).
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	The number of course failures will drop to at or below 5% by the end of each semester.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Progress report and report card data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Danielle Zammetti (dzammett@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	PLC groups will work collaboratively to identify required learning and essential standards and identify grading period benchmarks. School leadership team will engage in PD and lead PLC work in a shift to standards-based grading schoolwide.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Focus on alignment of district initiative for secondary grading practices and a shift toward gradebook alignment in PLC's.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#5. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	After reviewing Pasco MyAnalytics, schoolwide referrals were 1065 for the school year. Top two areas of concern were 2R (224) and 2C (155) behavior codes. 9th grade - 378 referrals - 2R (98), 2C (48) 10th grade - 330 referrals - 2R (82), 2C (39) 11th grade - 256 referrals - 2R (30), 2C (44) 12th grade - 101 referrals - 2R (14), 2C (22)
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	During the 2022-2023 school year the school will increase its use of Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports (PBIS) to see a 5% decrease in the number of disciplinary referrals schoolwide.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	Our Intervention Specialist will run school-wide behavior data, analyze trends, and create action plans for students and teachers to target overall referrals and specifically behavior codes 2R and 2C.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Greco-Ball (jegrecob@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	Utilization of PBIS strategies schoolwide.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	District wide PBIS initiative.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Through a varied group of stakeholders that will include but is not limited to administration, instructional personnel, non-instructional personnel, parents, students, community and business leaders, RRHS will build a positive culture and environment that will meet the needs of all learners. Positive Behavior Interventions (PBIS) will be presented to SAC via our new Intervention Specialist who will be monitoring student referral reports weekly in order to design interventions that will positively impact student behaviors and ultimately engage students in learning and increase mastery of skills in coursework. PBIS will also include schoolwide positive interventions including but not limited to: Postcards home, StarryKnights, Find a Freshy, and Athlete of the Week. School Intervention Specialist will introduce PD and tips of the week for attending to the social emotional needs of both students and staff. Our 2022-2023 school year theme is UKnighted. The school is UKnighted is ensuring that all students are college, career, and life ready.

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

Instructional Staff: Engage in the Academic and Behavioral Network to build compassionate classrooms and help foster a positive schoolwide culture.

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

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

Administrators: Each administrator oversees a grade-level and Academy; common focus on using social media to promote public awareness of school, student, and staff accomplishments.