Ridgeview Global Studies Academy

2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Ridgeview Global Studies Academy

1000 DUNSON RD, Davenport, FL 33896

http://theridgeviewacademy.com

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2017-18 Title I School**	**2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-12	No	66%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	57%

School Grades History

Year	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16	2014-15
Grade	A	A	B	A*

School Board Approval

N/A

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.

Ridgeview Global Studies Academy's mission states: In our ever-changing, multicultural world, we will spark the desire in our school family to become responsible and caring decision-makers. United, we will provide challenges and skills in a loving environment, empowering everyone to reach his fullest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

According to Florida's state statute governing charter schools, the vision for charter schools is to provide more school choice and innovation which will ultimately lead to higher student achievement. Ridgeview Global Studies Academy will be a school that embraces and celebrates the diversity of languages and cultures in our suburban environment while retaining the cohesive feel of a neighborhood school.

The global studies strand will be threaded throughout the academic, exploratory and enrichment curriculum. Integrated thematic units will supplement this additional academic program and include cultures, environments, and economics. An emphasis on the appreciation of the cultural diversity represented in these studies will provide a core focus. Various nationalities represented by students attending Ridgeview Global Studies Academy will serve as local contacts for direct information regarding those countries. Students will have the opportunity to serve as Student Ambassadors to welcome and inform guests about Ridgeview Global Studies Academy.

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title
Frier, Ralph	Other
Ricks, Beth	Assistant Principal
Thacker, Charles	Assistant Principal
Rice, Varian	Dean
Kendrick, Jhonda	Dean
Johnson, Sam	Principal

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

Ridgeview Global Studies Academy's School Leadership Team serves as the school's climate committee, ensuring that a positive learning environment fosters learning gains and student achievement in a diverse setting. The team serves as a liaison to gather input from other staff members. The Leadership Team participates in writing, monitoring, and evaluating the School Improvement Plan. This includes assisting with goals, objectives, strategies, and evaluation for all curriculum areas. It also analyses data, conducts needs assessments, and provides input for areas of need for staff development.

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	9	7	7	6	7	1	8	11	11	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	5	5	9	10	0	0	0	0	31
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	18	18	29	24	22	22	0	0	0	0	133

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	1	0	0	0	5	3	7	9	0	0	0	0	25

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	2	0	8	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	2	1	6	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

Date this data was collected
Thursday 7/19/2018

Year 2016-17 - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	10	6	8	4	8	4	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	0	0	0	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	1	1	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	22	36	27	34	36	0	0	0	0	0	155

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	2	3	9	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	38

Year 2016-17 - 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	
Attendance below 90 percent	10	6	8	4	8	4	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	0	0	3	0	0	0	6	6	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	1	1	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	22	36	27	34	36	0	0	0	0	0	155

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students exhibiting two or more indicators	0	0	0	2	3	9	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	38

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis
Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

ELA lowest 25th percentile. No, it is not a trend.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

ELA lowest 25th percentile.

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

Social Studies Achievement

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

Social Studies Achievement. No

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

Not all students took Civics in 7th grade

School Data
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	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	69%	54%	60%	70%	56%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	52%	57%	64%	57%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	46%	52%	45%	50%	49%
Math Achievement	69%	55%	61%	66%	54%	56%

School Grade Component	2018			2017		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Learning Gains	62%	54%	58%	59%	52%	54%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	51%	52%	38%	48%	48%
Science Achievement	60%	48%	57%	62%	52%	52%
Social Studies Achievement	99%	85%	77%	0%	72%	72%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	9 (10)	7 (6)	7 (8)	6 (4)	7 (8)	1 (4)	8 (4)	11 (5)	11 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	67 (49)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (3)	0 (0)	1 (0)	5 (0)	5 (6)	9 (6)	10 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	31 (15)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (1)	0 (6)	2 (4)	0 (0)	3 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (12)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	18 (22)	18 (36)	29 (27)	24 (34)	22 (36)	22 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	133 (155)

Grade Level Data
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	2018	72%	51%	21%	57%	15%	
	2017	77%	53%	24%	58%	19%	
Same Grade Comparison		-5%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2018	70%	48%	22%	56%	14%	
	2017	74%	51%	23%	56%	18%	
Same Grade Comparison		-4%					
Cohort Comparison		-7%					
05	2018	63%	50%	13%	55%	8%	
	2017	64%	44%	20%	53%	11%	
Same Grade Comparison		-1%					
Cohort Comparison		-11%					
06	2018	65%	41%	24%	52%	13%	
	2017	70%	45%	25%	52%	18%	
Same Grade Comparison		-5%					
Cohort Comparison		1%					
07	2018	67%	42%	25%	51%	16%	
	2017	71%	45%	26%	52%	19%	
Same Grade Comparison		-4%					
Cohort Comparison		-3%					

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
08	2018	72%	49%	23%	58%	14%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		1%				
09	2018					
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2018					
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2018	74%	56%	18%	62%	12%
	2017	71%	58%	13%	62%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	78%	57%	21%	62%	16%
	2017	68%	60%	8%	64%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2018	60%	56%	4%	61%	-1%
	2017	70%	47%	23%	57%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
06	2018	64%	40%	24%	52%	12%
	2017	65%	39%	26%	51%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
07	2018	57%	40%	17%	54%	3%
	2017	57%	40%	17%	53%	4%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
08	2018	38%	34%	4%	45%	-7%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison		-19%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2018	61%	51%	10%	55%	6%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2018	47%	42%	5%	50%	-3%
	2017					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		47%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	100%	59%	41%	65%	35%
2017					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	99%	84%	15%	71%	28%
2017	77%	62%	15%	69%	8%
Compare		22%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018					
2017					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	94%	60%	34%	62%	32%
2017	100%	43%	57%	60%	40%
Compare		-6%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	100%	41%	59%	56%	44%
2017					

Subgroup Data

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	18	35	31	29	39	36	8				
ELL	44	51	47	48	51	42	15				
ASN	77	50		77	64		80				
BLK	57	47	23	62	64	50	37				
HSP	63	60	45	59	56	51	47	100	68		

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
MUL	75	57		75	67						
WHT	76	58	55	78	66	60	75	97	86		
FRL	63	55	44	64	60	53	51	97	74		

2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	28	50	49	27	47	38	18	38			
ELL	50	56	55	48	51	48	30	40			
ASN	90	71		70	76						
BLK	59	64	58	52	52	38	56				
HSP	67	60	50	60	62	53	58	72			
MUL	77			69							
WHT	79	71	63	78	66	35	67	82			
FRL	68	64	53	61	58	43	53	73			

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

Activity #1

Title	Alignment of math curriculum between grades
Rationale	Need for vertical alignment of math standards and assistance for teachers in implementing differentiated math strategies.
Intended Outcome	Math Curriculum Specialist will lead teachers in vertical alignment of math standards and assist them in implementing differentiated math strategies.
Point Person	Dottie Trapnell (dottie.trapnell@rgsa.com)

Action Step

Description	Math Curriculum Specialist will meet with teachers and facilitate the vertical alignment of math standards.
Person Responsible	Dottie Trapnell (dottie.trapnell@rgsa.com)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

Description	Lesson plans will indicate alignment of standards
Person Responsible	Beth Ricks (beth.ricks@rgsa.com)

Part V: Budget

Total:	$70,000.00