

Polk County Public Schools

# Hartridge Academy



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>10</b>

# Hartridge Academy

1400 US HIGHWAY 92 W, Winter Haven, FL 33881

<https://www.hartridgeacademy.com>

## School Demographics

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	<b>2017-18 Title I School</b>	<b>2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	No	54%
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	<b>Charter School</b>	<b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	38%

## School Grades History

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

The Mission of Hartridge Academy is to provide a high quality education for all students.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

The Vision of Hartridge Academy is to provide a high quality education for all students.

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**

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

Name	Title
RICHARDS, DEBRA	Principal

**Duties**

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

The principal is responsible for the daily operations of the school in regards to students, staff, community, facility, and other stakeholders. The principal also prepares short and long-term external reports (federal, state, district, government agencies). Hartridge has a governing board of members for oversight, problem resolutions, policy making/amending, budget approval, audit committee, long-term strategic planning, etc. Teachers, parents of students, and community members participate in decision making through the School Advisory Committee, Volunteering, Project Committees, and Recruiting (students and staff) and making recommendations/suggestions.

### 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	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	2	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

**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	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

**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	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Retained Students: Previous Year(s)	0	0	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

**Date this data was collected**

Monday 7/23/2018

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

**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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

**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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

## 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?**

Math gains in the 25th percentile. Last year 76% of our students scored 3 or above. Our lowest quartile were not level 1 scores. We cannot expect high gains when there is little room for growth.

**Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?**

Our greatest decline was in Math achievement

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

Math gains in lowest quartile.

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

Reading learning gains. No trend. Our reading achievements were consistently high thus little room for gains.

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

We received Title 1 funds which we used for daily afterschool tutoring.

### 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	68%	50%	56%	77%	48%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	51%	55%	27%	49%	52%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	45%	48%	31%	42%	46%
Math Achievement	54%	58%	62%	86%	54%	58%
Math Learning Gains	36%	56%	59%	65%	52%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	23%	44%	47%	58%	41%	46%
Science Achievement	59%	53%	55%	80%	46%	51%

**EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey**

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	2 (0)	3 (0)	3 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	9 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (1)	6 (0)	4 (0)	16 (1)

**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	81%	51%	30%	57%	24%
	2017	85%	53%	32%	58%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	55%	48%	7%	56%	-1%
	2017	73%	51%	22%	56%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-18%				
Cohort Comparison		-30%				
05	2018	63%	50%	13%	55%	8%
	2017	64%	44%	20%	53%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2018	59%	56%	3%	62%	-3%
	2017	76%	58%	18%	62%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2018	52%	57%	-5%	62%	-10%
	2017	78%	60%	18%	64%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-26%				
Cohort Comparison		-24%				
05	2018	48%	56%	-8%	61%	-13%
	2017	77%	47%	30%	57%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-29%				
Cohort Comparison		-30%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2018	59%	51%	8%	55%	4%
	2017					
Cohort Comparison						

### 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
ELL	67			50							
HSP	70	67		55	33						
WHT	66	50		62	41		64				
FRL	67	50		47	38		55				

  

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
HSP	74			74							
WHT	77	41	40	80	55		57				
FRL	62	25		71	50						

### 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	
<b>Title</b>	Math achievement
<b>Rationale</b>	Math scores were lower than what class work, internal assessments, authentic assessments, and practice tests predicted. The majority (54%) of our students scored 3 or higher, however, the previous year was 76%. This is a significant decrease.
<b>Intended Outcome</b>	Overall achievement in Math will increase at least 2%
<b>Point Person</b>	DEBRA RICHARDS (debra.richards@polk-fl.net)

Action Step	
<b>Description</b>	Math teachers and principal will analyze the outcomes of each math area on FSA 2018. A new mapping will devote more instructional time in these areas and less on the areas with most success rather than equal time per chapter, topic, etc.
<b>Person Responsible</b>	DEBRA RICHARDS (debra.richards@polk-fl.net)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
<b>Description</b>	Principal and math teachers will meet upon completion of instruction of each standard (or related group of standards) to analyze the evidence of understanding before teacher moves onto another standard(s). Lesson plans will be revised accordingly.
<b>Person Responsible</b>	DEBRA RICHARDS (debra.richards@polk-fl.net)

Activity #2	
<b>Title</b>	Math gains
<b>Rationale</b>	The 23% of students in lowest quartile in math made gains which was a decrease from 43% from 2017.
<b>Intended Outcome</b>	Math gains in the lowest quartile will increase at least 2%
<b>Point Person</b>	DEBRA RICHARDS (debra.richards@polk-fl.net)

Action Step	
<b>Description</b>	In addition to the steps taken for overall math achievement, the Level 1 students will receive afterschool tutoring in math.
<b>Person Responsible</b>	DEBRA RICHARDS (debra.richards@polk-fl.net)

Plan to Monitor Effectiveness	
<b>Description</b>	Teachers will meet with the principal weekly to analyze the progress of each Level 1 student.
<b>Person Responsible</b>	DEBRA RICHARDS (debra.richards@polk-fl.net)

**Part IV: Title I Requirements**

### Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

**Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.**

n/a

#### PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

**Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.**

n/a

**Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.**

n/a

**Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.**

n/a

**Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.**

N/A

## Part V: Budget

<b>Total:</b>	<b>\$5,400.00</b>
---------------	-------------------