

Polk County Public Schools

Ridgeview Global Studies Academy



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	16

Ridgeview Global Studies Academy

1000 DUNSON RD, Davenport, FL 33896

<http://theridgeviewacademy.com>

Demographics

Principal: Sam Johnson

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	93%
2018-19 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	2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (64%) 2015-16: B (58%) 2014-15: A (68%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	16

Ridgeview Global Studies Academy

1000 DUNSON RD, Davenport, FL 33896

<http://theridgeviewacademy.com>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 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	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	B

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	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Frier, Ralph	Other	
Ricks, Beth	Assistant Principal	
Thacker, Charles	Assistant Principal	
Rice, Varian	Dean	
Kendrick, Jhonda	Dean	
Johnson, Sam	Principal	
Trapnell, Dottie	Other	LEA

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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	145	145	146	148	137	143	132	136	134	90	0	0	0	1356
Attendance below 90 percent	10	6	5	3	8	2	3	2	5	0	0	0	0	44
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	0	0	10	12	10	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	0	0	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	10	16	10	12	12	10	0	0	0	0	70

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	1	2	0	1	2	0	0	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	2	8	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

74

Date this data was collected or last updated

Saturday 8/31/2019

Prior Year - 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	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 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	1	0	0	0	5	3	7	9	0	0	0	0	25

Prior Year - 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	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 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	1	0	0	0	5	3	7	9	0	0	0	0	25

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	75%	61%	61%	72%	56%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	70%	58%	59%	65%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	49%	54%	53%	44%	51%
Math Achievement	75%	61%	62%	68%	52%	58%
Math Learning Gains	69%	56%	59%	64%	50%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	52%	52%	46%	44%	50%
Science Achievement	65%	52%	56%	62%	49%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	73%	79%	78%	78%	68%	75%

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	
Number of students enrolled	145 (0)	145 (0)	146 (0)	148 (0)	137 (0)	143 (0)	132 (0)	136 (0)	134 (0)	90 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1356 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	10 (9)	6 (7)	5 (7)	3 (6)	8 (7)	2 (1)	3 (8)	2 (11)	5 (11)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	44 (67)
One or more suspensions	1 (0)	1 (1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (1)	0 (5)	10 (5)	12 (9)	10 (10)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	34 (31)
Course failure in ELA or Math	2 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	0 (0)	1 (2)	0 (0)	0 (3)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	6 (5)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	10 (18)	16 (18)	10 (29)	12 (24)	12 (22)	10 (22)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	70 (133)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	71%	52%	19%	58%	13%
	2018	72%	51%	21%	57%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	79%	48%	31%	58%	21%
	2018	70%	48%	22%	56%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	75%	47%	28%	56%	19%
	2018	63%	50%	13%	55%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
06	2019	77%	48%	29%	54%	23%
	2018	65%	41%	24%	52%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
07	2019	72%	42%	30%	52%	20%
	2018	67%	42%	25%	51%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
08	2019	74%	48%	26%	56%	18%
	2018	72%	49%	23%	58%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
09	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
10	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	74%	56%	18%	62%	12%
	2018	74%	56%	18%	62%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
04	2019	78%	56%	22%	64%	14%
	2018	78%	57%	21%	62%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	79%	51%	28%	60%	19%
	2018	60%	56%	4%	61%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		19%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
06	2019	76%	47%	29%	55%	21%
	2018	64%	40%	24%	52%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				
07	2019	62%	39%	23%	54%	8%
	2018	57%	40%	17%	54%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
08	2019	51%	35%	16%	46%	5%
	2018	38%	34%	4%	45%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	71%	45%	26%	53%	18%
	2018	61%	51%	10%	55%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	50%	41%	9%	48%	2%
	2018	47%	42%	5%	50%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	54%	46%	67%	33%
2018	100%	59%	41%	65%	35%
Compare		0%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	73%	70%	3%	71%	2%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	99%	84%	15%	71%	28%
Compare		-26%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	98%	50%	48%	61%	37%
2018	94%	60%	34%	62%	32%
Compare		4%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	92%	53%	39%	57%	35%
2018	100%	41%	59%	56%	44%
Compare		-8%			

Subgroup Data

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	34	47	40	42	47	43	17	9			
ELL	59	60	50	65	70	50	44				
ASN	92	85		83	90						
BLK	62	66	58	65	72	67	61				
HSP	72	68	56	73	70	56	60	69	84		
MUL	74	67		74	73						
WHT	80	71	53	78	66	53	70	80	72		
FRL	71	71	62	70	70	62	54	65	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
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		
MUL	75	57		75	67						

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
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			

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	686
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	58
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	88
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	61
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	68
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	72
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 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	69
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	66
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

ELA and Math Lowest 25th Percentiles showed the lowest performance.

Although ELA and Math Lowest 25th Percentiles were the lowest components last year as well, significant gains (ELA 13% and Math 4%) were made in this year's component.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Social Studies

More students were tested this year.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Social Studies

More students were tested this year and our SWD students did not make the gains needed.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

ELA Learning Gains and ELA Lowest 25%

Continued to identify these students and provided additional resources.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Attendance and reducing Level 1's.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Students with Disabilities
- 2.
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Students with Disabilities will be the primary area of focus since these students scored below the 41% bar in the Federal Index
Rationale	Although the Students with Disabilities made much progress from the 2017-2018 school year to the 2018-2019 school year, it still was not sufficient enough to make the 41% Federal Index requirement.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The Students with Disabilities will increase 5 percentage points overall to meet the 41% goal of the Federal Index.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Ralph Frier (ralph.frier@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy	An additional ESE Inclusion Teacher will be hired to help address the needs of the SWD students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Since the number of our SWD has increased, additional support staff is needed to help meet the needs of these students.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Hire an additional ESE Inclusion Teacher 2. 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Ralph Frier (ralph.frier@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Students with Disabilities will be the primary area of focus since these students scored below the 41% bar in the Federal Index	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00