

Polk County Public Schools

Ridgeview Global Studies Academy



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 3 |
| School Information | 4 |
| Needs Assessment | 6 |
| Planning for Improvement | 10 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 10 |

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 |
|--------|-------------|