
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	18

Ridge Community High School

500 ORCHID DR, Davenport, FL 33837

<http://www.ridgecommunityhigh.com/>

Demographics

Principal: Angela Clark

Start Date for this Principal: 8/13/2017

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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: C (45%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (46%)
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

This plan is pending approval by the Polk 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Ridge Community High School

500 ORCHID DR, Davenport, FL 33837

<http://www.ridgecommunityhigh.com/>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>High School 9-12</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>75%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>82%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Polk 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.

The mission of Ridge Community High School is to empower students, parents, teachers, and staff and to create an environment that accommodates a diversity of backgrounds, interests, and abilities.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We are committed to transforming the lives of our students by providing a rigorous curriculum that equips students with knowledge and skill that contribute to high levels of achievement. Our goal is to expand our students' horizons through a variety of social, cultural, and educational activities.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hackett, Joshua	Assistant Principal	
Lewis, Gregory	Assistant Principal	
Bairley, Nicholas	Teacher, K-12	
Johnson, Karen	Assistant Principal	
Ely, Stephen	Principal	
Arnold, Casey	Teacher, ESE	
Loomans, Pamela	Instructional Coach	
Robinson, Amanda	Assistant Principal	
Clark, Angela	Assistant Principal	
Holliday, Felicia		

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 8/13/2017, Angela Clark

Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

153

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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: C (45%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (46%)
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 .	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	769	758	798	736	3061
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	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	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 5/21/2020

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		
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	758	805	736	645	2944
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31	44	28	43	146
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	404	314	238	128	1084
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	209	193	168	88	658

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	40%	47%	56%	40%	44%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	38%	46%	51%	37%	41%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	28%	37%	42%	34%	33%	41%
Math Achievement	34%	43%	51%	29%	37%	49%
Math Learning Gains	41%	45%	48%	30%	33%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	44%	45%	29%	32%	39%
Science Achievement	57%	58%	68%	56%	56%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	53%	61%	73%	56%	60%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

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
09	2019	38%	45%	-7%	55%	-17%
	2018	40%	43%	-3%	53%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	35%	42%	-7%	53%	-18%
	2018	35%	42%	-7%	53%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

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
2019	53%	54%	-1%	67%	-14%
2018	46%	59%	-13%	65%	-19%
Compare		7%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	49%	57%	-8%	70%	-21%
2018	54%	57%	-3%	68%	-14%
Compare		-5%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	23%	50%	-27%	61%	-38%
2018	38%	60%	-22%	62%	-24%
Compare		-15%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	40%	53%	-13%	57%	-17%
2018	28%	41%	-13%	56%	-28%
Compare		12%			

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	21	36	30	25	35	33	34	18		79	11
ELL	9	26	27	20	33	50	32	21		73	34
AMI	47	55		27							
ASN	79	50						91			
BLK	35	36	24	19	25	16	50	39		90	34
HSP	36	37	27	35	43	35	54	50		81	41
MUL	47	32		43			58	50		69	36
WHT	48	40	39	44	44	46	71	69		83	49
FRL	31	34	29	29	40	36	49	43		81	38

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	22	34	28	28	39	50	32	45		62	14
ELL	14	34	34	21	40	47	32	18		70	34
AMI	53	50		55			70				
ASN	79	53		64	55		92				
BLK	32	34	24	26	37	36	42	58		89	46
HSP	38	42	37	34	41	41	47	52		81	44
MUL	31	38		15	37		53	67		80	58
WHT	51	46	31	43	41	41	63	74		89	51
FRL	36	41	36	31	38	38	46	52		82	44

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	5	39	38	7	18	21	17	31		66	14
ELL	6	19	24	11	26	31	30	31		70	36
AMI	36	36									
ASN	58	50		47	31						
BLK	31	35	38	16	26	34	43	47		84	40
HSP	34	35	32	27	30	27	49	53		81	47
MUL	39	36		41	27		64	73		89	44
WHT	56	42	34	39	32	35	73	67		80	52
FRL	31	36	34	24	29	30	52	49		81	45

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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	45
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	496
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
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	34
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	43
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Native American Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	73
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	37
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	44
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	48
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	53
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	41
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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.

The SWD student performance in ELA was the lowest component. There has been in low overall performance in ELA over the past 3 years.

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

The greatest decline from the previous year was in ELA specifically the lowest 25th percentile. Factors that contributed to this decline were teacher retention, lack of ongoing progress monitoring, and lack of common planning and assessments.

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.

The component that had the largest gap compared to the state average was social studies.

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

Achievement in science, particularly biology showed the most improvement. Teachers focused on frontloading the curriculum and used testing days to review curriculum.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Two areas of concern are the SWD and ELL students. There needs to be a schoolwide push to have these students make gains in ELA.

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

1. Structured PLC's
2. Teacher focus on student data
3. Target/Task alignment
4. Authentic student engagement
5. Push learning gains in ELA and Algebra

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Instructional best practices the are consistent and data driven will create authentic student engagement. Teachers need to focus on student data as well as target/ task alignment.
Measurable Outcome:	One hundred percent authentic student engagement in all classes to increase student achievement.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Angela Clark (angela.clark01@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Progress monitoring for teacher effectiveness.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The administration needs to be accountable to teachers and students providing instructional assistance with fidelity.

Action Steps to Implement

Target/Task alignment
 Structured professional development
 Data chats during PLC's with departments
Person Responsible Stephen Ely (stephen.ely@polk-fl.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase the achievement levels in all areas of ELA specifically focusing on learning gains for SWD and ELL students. The achievement levels in these subgroups has decrease and is becoming a trend within ELA.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase in ELA achievement in SWD and ELL students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amanda Robinson (amanda.robinson@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Common assessments, quarterly writing prompts, and STAR testing.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These strategies create ongoing progress monitoring for teachers and administration to track student achievement and focus on subgroups.

Action Steps to Implement

Support facilitation in ELA classes for SWD students.
 Added facilitation in ESOL department
 Administration expectations in ESOL and ESE departments.
Person Responsible Stephen Ely (stephen.ely@polk-fl.net)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase overall achievement in math specifically the African American subgroup. The overall achievement and the lowest 25 percent decreased dramatically.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the overall math achievement and the lowest 25% within the African American subgroup by 3 percent.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stephen Ely (stephen.ely@polk-fl.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Common assessments and quarterly assessments
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	To have ongoing student data that math teachers can use to drive instruction and for feedback in PLC's and lesson planning.

Action Steps to Implement

- Progress monitoring
 - Structured PLC's
 - Data chats
 - Target/task alignment
 - Tutoring
 - Support facilitation
- Person Responsible** Stephen Ely (stephen.ely@polk-fl.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

The leadership team will set clear, nonnegotiable schoolwide expectations. The leadership team will provide constant professional learning for all staff members as well as visit classrooms with fidelity while providing feedback. The leadership continue to push best practices for all teachers thus increasing student achievement.

Part IV: 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 to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. 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.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Creating a positive culture within the school is key to a school's success. At Ridge Community our staff has implemented PBIS which rewards students for doing the right thing. Students can earn tickets that can be used for multiple events throughout the school year. Mentoring our at risk students has also help sustain a community type environment. The leadership team also takes the time to reward staff members thus keeping them focused on student success. Members of the leadership team meets weekly with the local Chamber of Commerce to further our partnerships that enable our students to get jobs as well as sponsoring many events for our students and staff.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$230,124.85
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0937 - Ridge Community High School	Title, I Part A		\$66,957.74
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0937 - Ridge Community High School	Title, I Part A		\$66,326.60
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0937 - Ridge Community High School	Title, I Part A		\$27,140.60
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0937 - Ridge Community High School	Title, I Part A		\$69,699.91
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$136,752.04
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0937 - Ridge Community High School	Title, I Part A		\$67,052.43
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0937 - Ridge Community High School	Title, I Part A		\$69,699.61
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American				\$69,699.61

Polk - 0937 - Ridge Community High School - 2020-21 SIP

	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0937 - Ridge Community High School	Title, I Part A		\$69,699.61
					Total:	\$436,576.50