

St. Johns County School District

# Valley Ridge Academy



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>17</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>21</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>22</b> |

# Valley Ridge Academy

105 GREENLEAF DR, Ponte Vedra, FL 32081

<http://www-vra.stjohns.k12.fl.us/>

## Demographics

**Principal: Angela Fuller**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Combination School<br>KG-8   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | No   |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 16%  |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>English Language Learners<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: A (79%)<br>2017-18: A (75%)<br>2016-17: A (78%)<br>2015-16: A (74%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Northeast  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | N/A  |

\* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 2/16/2021.

## 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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>17</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>22</b> |

# Valley Ridge Academy

105 GREENLEAF DR, Ponte Vedra, FL 32081

<http://www-vra.stjohns.k12.fl.us/>

## School Demographics

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| <p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br/>(per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School<br/>KG-8</p> | <p><b>2019-20 Title I School</b></p> <p>No</p> | <p><b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br/>(as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>8%</p> |
| <p><b>Primary Service Type</b><br/>(per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>               | <p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>         | <p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b><br/>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>27%</p>              |

## School Grades History

|              |                |                |                |                |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| <b>Year</b>  | <b>2019-20</b> | <b>2018-19</b> | <b>2017-18</b> | <b>2016-17</b> |
| <b>Grade</b> | A              | A              | A              | A              |

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Johns County School Board on 2/16/2021.

## 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 community of Valley Ridge Academy is dedicated to creating a safe and nurturing environment that inspires and challenges students while developing lifelong learners through collaboration, citizenship, creativity and reflection.

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

Our vision for VRA is one where children are educated through a collaborative effort among parents, faculty, staff, students, and the community. Our school environment encourages children to take risks and become creative producers without fear of failure.

### 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 |
|------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| McMandon, Sandra | Principal           |                                 |
| Hudson, Julie    | Assistant Principal |                                 |
| Lee, James       | Assistant Principal |                                 |
| Allred, Debra    | Assistant Principal |                                 |
| Dail, Ellen      | School Counselor    |                                 |
| MacNaught, Erica | School Counselor    |                                 |
| Nover, Holly     | SAC Member          |                                 |
| Narin, Matthew   | Dean                |                                 |
| Reynolds, Brooke | Instructional Coach |                                 |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2016, Angela Fuller

**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.*

11

**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.*

17

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

31

**Demographic Data**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2020-21 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Combination School<br>KG-8   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2019-20 Title I School</b>  | No   |
| <b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 16%  |
| <b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities<br>English Language Learners<br>Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: A (79%)<br>2017-18: A (75%)<br>2016-17: A (78%)<br>2015-16: A (74%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Northeast  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Cassandra Brusca</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | N/A  |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |  |

**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               | 133         | 149 | 125 | 151 | 152 | 148 | 167 | 138 | 195 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1358  |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 1           | 3   | 0   | 1   | 3   | 4   | 4   | 3   | 6   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 25    |
| One or more suspensions                   | 1           | 0   | 2   | 0   | 1   | 1   | 5   | 5   | 9   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 24    |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 0   | 0   | 2   | 0   | 0   | 1   | 0   | 1   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4     |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 0   | 0   | 1   | 0   | 0   | 2   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0   | 0   | 1   | 4   | 7   | 7   | 1   | 11  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 31    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 3   | 2   | 6   | 2   | 5   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 18    |

**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 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 2 | 8 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 20    |

**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 | 8 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 17    |
| Students retained two or more times |             | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Friday 6/19/2020

**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     | 155         | 134 | 148 | 156 | 143 | 155 | 148 | 171 | 182 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1392  |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 3           | 4   | 2   | 1   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 9   | 11  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 42    |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 1   | 2   | 4   | 3   | 4   | 3   | 8   | 18  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 43    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0   | 0   | 3   | 2   | 0   | 0   | 5   | 1   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 11    |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0   | 0   | 1   | 4   | 8   | 8   | 12  | 15  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 48    |

**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 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 16    |

**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     | 3           | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 10    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4     |

**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     | 155         | 134 | 148 | 156 | 143 | 155 | 148 | 171 | 182 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1392  |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 3           | 4   | 2   | 1   | 3   | 4   | 5   | 9   | 11  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 42    |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 1   | 2   | 4   | 3   | 4   | 3   | 8   | 18  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 43    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0   | 0   | 3   | 2   | 0   | 0   | 5   | 1   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 11    |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0   | 0   | 1   | 4   | 8   | 8   | 12  | 15  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 48    |

**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 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 16    |

**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     | 3           | 1 | 4 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 10    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4     |

**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             | 84%    | 84%      | 61%   | 81%    | 84%      | 57%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 71%    | 67%      | 59%   | 68%    | 68%      | 57%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 65%    | 61%      | 54%   | 67%    | 70%      | 51%   |
| Math Achievement            | 91%    | 88%      | 62%   | 88%    | 88%      | 58%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 81%    | 71%      | 59%   | 84%    | 73%      | 56%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 79%    | 66%      | 52%   | 76%    | 70%      | 50%   |
| Science Achievement         | 78%    | 77%      | 56%   | 75%    | 79%      | 53%   |

| School Grade Component     | 2019   |          |       | 2018   |          |       |
|----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                            | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Social Studies Achievement | 94%    | 95%      | 78%   | 98%    | 95%      | 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   |       |
|   | (0)                               | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (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 |
| 03                    | 2019 | 91%    | 78%      | 13%                        | 58%   | 33%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 82%    | 78%      | 4%                         | 57%   | 25%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 9%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 85%    | 77%      | 8%                         | 58%   | 27%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 80%    | 74%      | 6%                         | 56%   | 24%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 5%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 3%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 84%    | 76%      | 8%                         | 56%   | 28%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 81%    | 73%      | 8%                         | 55%   | 26%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 3%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 4%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 06                    | 2019 | 84%    | 74%      | 10%                        | 54%   | 30%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 78%    | 71%      | 7%                         | 52%   | 26%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 6%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 3%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 07                    | 2019 | 78%    | 72%      | 6%                         | 52%   | 26%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 74%    | 70%      | 4%                         | 51%   | 23%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 4%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 08                    | 2019 | 81%    | 71%      | 10%                        | 56%   | 25%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 81%    | 76%      | 5%                         | 58%   | 23%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 7%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03    | 2019 | 90%    | 82%      | 8%                         | 62%   | 28%                     |

| <b>MATH</b>           |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Grade</b>          | <b>Year</b> | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School-District Comparison</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School-State Comparison</b> |
|                       | 2018        | 88%           | 80%             | 8%                                | 62%          | 26%                            |
| Same Grade Comparison |             | 2%            |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison     |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 04                    | 2019        | 96%           | 82%             | 14%                               | 64%          | 32%                            |
|                       | 2018        | 91%           | 83%             | 8%                                | 62%          | 29%                            |
| Same Grade Comparison |             | 5%            |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison     |             | 8%            |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 05                    | 2019        | 90%           | 80%             | 10%                               | 60%          | 30%                            |
|                       | 2018        | 88%           | 79%             | 9%                                | 61%          | 27%                            |
| Same Grade Comparison |             | 2%            |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison     |             | -1%           |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 06                    | 2019        | 83%           | 74%             | 9%                                | 55%          | 28%                            |
|                       | 2018        | 79%           | 73%             | 6%                                | 52%          | 27%                            |
| Same Grade Comparison |             | 4%            |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison     |             | -5%           |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 07                    | 2019        | 88%           | 80%             | 8%                                | 54%          | 34%                            |
|                       | 2018        | 90%           | 80%             | 10%                               | 54%          | 36%                            |
| Same Grade Comparison |             | -2%           |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison     |             | 9%            |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 08                    | 2019        | 87%           | 78%             | 9%                                | 46%          | 41%                            |
|                       | 2018        | 72%           | 73%             | -1%                               | 45%          | 27%                            |
| Same Grade Comparison |             | 15%           |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison     |             | -3%           |                 |                                   |              |                                |

| <b>SCIENCE</b>        |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Grade</b>          | <b>Year</b> | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School-District Comparison</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School-State Comparison</b> |
| 05                    | 2019        | 81%           | 73%             | 8%                                | 53%          | 28%                            |
|                       | 2018        | 82%           | 73%             | 9%                                | 55%          | 27%                            |
| Same Grade Comparison |             | -1%           |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison     |             |               |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| 08                    | 2019        | 75%           | 72%             | 3%                                | 48%          | 27%                            |
|                       | 2018        | 76%           | 75%             | 1%                                | 50%          | 26%                            |
| Same Grade Comparison |             | -1%           |                 |                                   |              |                                |
| Cohort Comparison     |             | -7%           |                 |                                   |              |                                |

| <b>BIOLOGY EOC</b> |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
|--------------------|---------------|-----------------|------------------------------|--------------|---------------------------|
| <b>Year</b>        | <b>School</b> | <b>District</b> | <b>School Minus District</b> | <b>State</b> | <b>School Minus State</b> |
| 2019               |               |                 |                              |              |                           |
| 2018               |               |                 |                              |              |                           |

| CIVICS EOC   |        |          |                       |       |                    |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019         | 93%    | 90%      | 3%                    | 71%   | 22%                |
| 2018         | 93%    | 89%      | 4%                    | 71%   | 22%                |
| Compare      |        | 0%       |                       |       |                    |
| 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         | 100%   | 79%      | 21%                   | 61%   | 39%                |
| 2018         | 99%    | 79%      | 20%                   | 62%   | 37%                |
| Compare      |        | 1%       |                       |       |                    |
| GEOMETRY EOC |        |          |                       |       |                    |
| Year         | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2019         | 100%   | 81%      | 19%                   | 57%   | 43%                |
| 2018         | 100%   | 77%      | 23%                   | 56%   | 44%                |
| Compare      |        | 0%       |                       |       |                    |

**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                                       | 47       | 60     | 53          | 69        | 78      | 71           | 40       | 64      | 18        |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 94       | 82     |             | 96        | 88      |              | 93       | 100     | 97        |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 60       | 56     | 50          | 77        | 72      | 78           | 31       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 80       | 71     | 67          | 82        | 79      | 71           | 85       | 92      | 53        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 84       | 60     |             | 92        | 84      |              |          | 91      |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 84       | 70     | 64          | 92        | 81      | 79           | 78       | 95      | 68        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 70       | 67     | 61          | 73        | 75      | 74           | 54       | 81      | 36        |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 51       | 48     | 46          | 60        | 62      | 52           | 43       | 78      |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 54       |        |             | 69        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 91       | 77     | 77          | 96        | 86      |              | 94       | 95      | 88        |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 47       | 58     | 42          | 61        | 76      | 68           | 50       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 79       | 71     | 67          | 83        | 67      | 43           | 62       | 94      | 75        |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 80       | 55     |             | 84        | 85      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |

| 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                                       | 80       | 65     | 52          | 89        | 79      | 73           | 82       | 94      | 67        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 63       | 61     | 48          | 73        | 70      | 66           | 55       | 93      | 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                                       | 48       | 58     | 60          | 60        | 66      | 56           | 50       | 89      |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 40       |        |             | 70        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ASN                                       | 89       | 72     |             | 96        | 88      |              | 100      | 100     | 92        |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 46       | 60     | 64          | 54        | 63      | 62           |          | 90      |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 80       | 72     | 81          | 83        | 89      | 82           | 64       | 93      |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 80       | 75     |             | 88        | 85      |              | 75       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 83       | 68     | 66          | 89        | 84      | 77           | 77       | 99      | 67        |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 61       | 61     | 60          | 67        | 76      | 70           | 48       | 97      |           |                   |                     |

**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)  | N/A  |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 79   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 0    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency |      |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 714  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 9    |
| Percent Tested  | 100% |

**Subgroup Data**

**Students With Disabilities**

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                | 56 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0  |

**English Language Learners**

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                |     |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |

| 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%            | 0   |
| Asian Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Asian Students   | 93  |
| 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                                    | 61  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?            | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%     | 0   |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 76  |
| 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   | 82  |
| 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   | 79  |
| 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                                | 66  |
| 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.**

Learning gains made in the lowest quartile for ELA was the lowest data component for 2019. 65% of students in the lowest 25th percentile in ELA made learning gains compared to 53% in 2018- an increase of 12%. The increase from 2018 to 2019 can be contributed to the PLC process being implemented with fidelity, collaborative teams evaluating student mastery and flexible grouping based upon data, and targeted professional learning to increase Tier I best practices. A certified tutor was also utilized for explicit ELA instruction for our elementary students in the lowest quartile. Though effective measures have been successfully implemented, continued instructional focus for students in the lowest quartile remains a priority for 2020. ELA same-grade comparison data and cohort data showed growth or maintenance in every measured level in grades three through eight. Subgroup data shows a growth area need for students with disabilities in ELA scoring a level three or above; yielding a 5.4% decrease from 2018 (51.2%) to 2019 (45.8%).

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from 2018 to 2019 was Science Achievement- displaying a one percent decline from 79% to 78%. Further, the economically disadvantaged students in fifth grade scoring a level three or above dropped from 63.2% to 45.5. This 17.7 percentage point drop, along with the decline in overall achievement, likely results from transitional elements experienced in 2019 including a new curriculum and two new science teachers on the middle school team.

#### **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.**

All of the data components were above the state average for 2019. The element that was closest to the state average was ELA learning gains in the lowest 25th percentile. In 2018, the ELA learning gains in the lowest 25th percentile were only one percentage point above the state average. With the state average increasing in 2019 to 54% of students making learning gains within the lowest quartile for ELA, the gap widened beyond one percent in 2018, to 11% higher than the state average, for a total of 65% of students in the lowest quartile making learning gains in ELA.

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

The data components that showed the most growth from 2018 to 2019 are learning gains in the lowest quartile for ELA and Math. Both components measured higher in 2019- 11% in math (from 68% in 2018 to 79% in 2019) and 12% in ELA (from 53% in 2018 to 65% in 2019). Collaborative teams were successful in the PLC process and identified students needing remediation on essential standards. Several deliberate practice plans for instructional staff focused on best practices for closing the achievement gap and deliberate planning for students in the lowest quartile. Targeted professional learning based on observation cycles, walk-throughs, Tier 1 trends, and faculty needs allowed for teachers to utilize metacognitive and multi-sensory strategies for more effective instruction. Data chats were conducted to monitor all growth in each class and PLC mentors assisted collaborative teams in reviewing grade-level needs. Intervention resources were utilized for students



identified most at risk and school certified tutors worked directly with the lowest quartile on learning targets within the standards. Middle school students also were identified for acceleration or advanced courses where appropriate.

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

An area of potential concern reflected in the EWS data is the amount of Level 1 scores gradually becoming larger from third to eighth grade. Each grade level, the number of students scoring a level 1 increases (with the exception of fifth grade to sixth grade going from nine students to eight students).

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

1. Student learning gains in the lowest quartile for ELA and Math: at least 2% in each area.
2. Increase in subgroup data: Economically disadvantaged for fifth grade science (levels 3 or above); increased proficiency for eighth grade science for students with disabilities; ELA proficiency for students with disabilities.
3. Continue to maintain and increase supports for 2020 instructional systems and application plan: PLC, professional development, data chats, instructional feedback, school tutors, and intervention resources.
4. School-wide PBIS and character development.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** ELA lowest 25%  
Deliberately target the lowest quartile of students with specific interventions as described within the action steps below to specifically target Learning Gain achievement by this population. This area of focus will lead to an increase in learning gains and overall proficiency.

**Measurable Outcome:** Through targeted interventions designed to close gaps in learning that have been identified through data review, students within the specific population will demonstrate a 2 point increase in learning gains on state assessments.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Sandra McMandon (sandra.mcmandon@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** VRA will offer professional development in targeted areas of deficiency for grade level needs based upon data from sources such as i-Ready, FSA, common formative and summative assessments, and student overall grades.  
This data will be reviewed on a regular basis within grade level and subject specific Professional Learning

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Communities (PLC's) and used to further plan instruction and targeted identified gaps. Adjustments will be made to the described Action Steps, targeted instruction, students seeing the instructional tutor, TIDE groupings and interventions, and PLC focus will be made as needed based on data review.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. VRA will offer professional development in targeted areas of deficiency for grade level needs based upon data from sources such as i-Ready, FSA, common formative and summative assessments, and student overall grades.

**Person Responsible** Sandra McMandon (sandra.mcmandon@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

2. A tutor for the lowest quartile will be provided for the elementary grades and the reteach/retest process for standards mastery will be implemented across the school. Thirty minutes of TIDE time (Targeted Interventions, Differentiation and Enrichment) will also be applied throughout all elementary grades.

**Person Responsible** Sandra McMandon (sandra.mcmandon@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

2. A tutor for the lowest quartile will be provided for the elementary grades and the reteach/retest process for standards mastery will be implemented across the school. Thirty minutes of TIDE time (Targeted Interventions, Differentiation and Enrichment) will also be applied throughout all elementary grades.

**Person Responsible** Sandra McMandon (sandra.mcmandon@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

## #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | Mathematics Lowest 25%<br>Deliberately target the lowest quartile of students with specific interventions as described within the action steps below to specifically target Learning Gain achievement by this population. This area of focus will lead to an increase in learning gains and overall proficiency.                            |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | Through targeted interventions designed to close gaps in learning that have been identified through data review, students within the specific population will demonstrate a 2 point increase in learning gains on state assessments.  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Sandra McMandon (sandra.mcmandon@stjohns.k12.fl.us)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | VRA will offer professional development in targeted areas of deficiency for grade level needs based upon data from sources such as i-Ready, FSA, common formative and summative assessments, and student overall grades.<br><br>This data will be reviewed on a regular basis within grade level and subject specific Professional Learning |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | Communities (PLC's) and used to further plan instruction and targeted identified gaps. Adjustments will be made to the described Action Steps, targeted instruction, students seeing the instructional tutor, TIDE groupings and interventions, and PLC focus will be made as needed based on data review.                                  |

### Action Steps to Implement

1. VRA will offer professional development in targeted areas of deficiency for grade level needs based upon data from sources such as i-Ready, FSA, common formative and summative assessments, and student overall grades.

**Person Responsible** Sandra McMandon (sandra.mcmandon@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

2. A tutor for the lowest quartile will be provided for the upper elementary grades and middle grades and the reteach/retest process for standards mastery will be implemented across the school. Thirty minutes of TIDE time (Targeted Interventions, Differentiation and Enrichment) will also be applied throughout all elementary grades.

**Person Responsible** Sandra McMandon (sandra.mcmandon@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

3. The PLC process will be fully implemented, allowing grade levels to plan common assessments and compare data for specific needs. Common planning time has been designated for data review and the PLC process. This will allow teams to flexible group based on student needs.

**Person Responsible** Sandra McMandon (sandra.mcmandon@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

**#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Character Counts!/PBIS  
 A strong focus on the importance of character development is central to all aspects of student success. A review of data on student behavior referrals and reports of bullying indicated gains could be made in this area through a concerted school-wide effort.

**Measurable Outcome:** VRA will reduce behavior referrals and bullying reports by 10% through the use of a school-wide PBIS program supported by Character Counts! lessons. These lessons are implemented by our guidance department as well as PTO parent volunteers. Additionally, VRA will make use of the VRA360 program to increase student self-reflection with the goal of reducing the recidivism rate for students being sent to the Dean's Office for behavior.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Matthew Narin (matthew.narin@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Character Counts lessons that teach caring, responsibility, respect, trustworthiness, citizenship, and fairness will be fulfilled by teachers, guidance counselors, and parent volunteers. Our school behavior system encourages positive performance through rewarding good behavior (PBIS).

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Success will be evidenced through an ongoing review of data on student behavior and reports of bullying. Examining the % of student rewards redeemed and comparing it against student behavior data will provide a good indication of the plans overall effectiveness.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Character Counts lessons that teach caring, responsibility, respect, trustworthiness, citizenship, and fairness will be fulfilled by teachers, guidance counselors, and parent volunteers. Our school behavior system encourages positive performance through rewarding good behavior (PBIS).

**Person Responsible** Matthew Narin (matthew.narin@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**In addition to our specified areas of focus, school leadership will provide support and professional development to our staff in order to meet the needs of students who are distance learners, as well as students who are attending class in the building. This will be done through the identification of specific online platforms, best practices for virtual instruction, and mirrored expectations for both sets of learners.**

## 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.

A positive culture and environment begin with inclusivity and communication. Ensuring that the school organization is responsive to the needs of the community is only possible by maintaining an open dialogue that incorporates the voices of all stakeholders. Valley Ridge Academy utilized multiple methods to achieve these goals such as annual Needs Assessment surveys, monthly SAC meetings and ongoing school communications in the form of regular email blasts, and bi-monthly calendar updates and monthly newsletters. When a community is informed, they feel involved and valued which leads to a culture of transparency, trust and collaboration.

It was through this ongoing dialogue with the community that led Valley Ridge Academy to implement a Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (PBIS) program in 2016-2017 school year. Since that time, the faculty, staff, students and parents have worked diligently to create a culture and environment in which positive choices and displays of good character are recognized, rewarded and set as an example for others to follow. During the 2019-2020 school year, Valley Ridge Academy was one of only 4 SJCS D schools to be recognized as a Bronze Level Model PBIS School by the Florida Positive Behavioral Interventions & Support Project. This recognition not only validates the hard work of the Valley Ridge Academy community but also inspires us to stay the course knowing that we are doing what is right for our students.

Finally, a school environment can only be considered truly inclusive and accepting if everyone is made to feel connected. There are pockets of every school's population that struggle to see the educational environment as welcoming and rewarding. To meet the needs of these families, Valley Ridge Academy created and continues to host the Soaring High Camp throughout the year and over the summer. Soaring High, provides mentors, educational support, material support and most importantly a fun and energetic experience for some of our communities most needy families to build solid, lasting relationships between home and school. Students who participate are made to feel that school is a positive environment in which they are safe, welcomed and loved. As the program has grown, so has the recognition as Valley Ridge Academy was recognized by the Florida Department of Education as the 2019-2020 State of Florida Region Four Community Outreach Award recipient. While the recognition is wonderful and validating,

knowing that we are making the school more inclusive, more welcoming and more accessible to all our community, is truly rewarding.

**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: ELA  | \$0.00        |
| 2             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math                                       | \$0.00        |
| 3             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports | \$0.00        |
| <b>Total:</b> |        |  | <b>\$0.00</b> |