

Polk County Public Schools

Ridgeview Global Studies Academy



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	23
Positive Culture & Environment	27
Budget to Support Goals	27

Ridgeview Global Studies Academy

1000 DUNSON RD, Davenport, FL 33896

<http://theridgeviewacademy.com>

Demographics

Principal: Sam Johnson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/16/2021

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	93%
2020-21 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%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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	23
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	27

Ridgeview Global Studies Academy

1000 DUNSON RD, Davenport, FL 33896

<http://theridgeviewacademy.com>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-12	Yes	88%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	58%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	A

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.

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Johnson, Sam	Principal	
Frier, Ralph	Other	
Thacker, Charles	Assistant Principal	
Kendrick, Jhonda	Assistant Principal	
Rice, Varian	Assistant Principal	
Trapnell, Dottie	Assistant Principal	
Carver, Cathy	Assistant Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/16/2021, Sam Johnson

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.*

17

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

92

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,516

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

15

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	142	141	140	139	133	133	129	130	106	82	0	0	1408
Attendance below 90 percent	23	25	22	21	12	21	6	7	10	5	14	0	0	166
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	0	1	11	3	3	3	1	0	0	24
Course failure in ELA	1	1	1	1	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	4	3	8	7	8	0	0	34
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	12	7	8	7	0	0	0	42
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	3	3	3	7	21	23	9	26	33	37	0	0	165

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

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	7	4	3	1	3	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 7/16/2021

2020-21 - 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	143	143	144	143	143	133	134	132	131	107	83	0	0	1436
Attendance below 90 percent	8	4	3	3	5	3	2	3	3	2	0	0	0	36
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	2	0	0	8	7	5	3	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA	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
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	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	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	1	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	1	0	0	0	8

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	6	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

2020-21 - 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	143	143	144	143	143	133	134	132	131	107	83	0	0	1436
Attendance below 90 percent	8	4	3	3	5	3	2	3	3	2	0	0	0	36
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	2	0	0	8	7	5	3	0	0	0	28
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	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	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	1	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	2	1	0	0	0	8

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	6	2	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
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 Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				75%	61%	61%	69%	54%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				70%	58%	59%	57%	52%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				57%	49%	54%	44%	46%	52%
Math Achievement				75%	61%	62%	69%	55%	61%
Math Learning Gains				69%	56%	59%	62%	54%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				57%	52%	52%	53%	51%	52%
Science Achievement				65%	52%	56%	60%	48%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				73%	79%	78%	99%	85%	77%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	71%	52%	19%	58%	13%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	79%	48%	31%	58%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
05	2021					
	2019	75%	47%	28%	56%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				
06	2021					
	2019	77%	48%	29%	54%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				
07	2021					
	2019	72%	42%	30%	52%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				
08	2021					
	2019	74%	48%	26%	56%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
09	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-74%				
10	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	74%	56%	18%	62%	12%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	78%	56%	22%	64%	14%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				
05	2021					
	2019	79%	51%	28%	60%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				
06	2021					
	2019	76%	47%	29%	55%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				
07	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	62%	39%	23%	54%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-76%				
08	2021					
	2019	51%	35%	16%	46%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	71%	45%	26%	53%	18%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	50%	41%	9%	48%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	100%	54%	46%	67%	33%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	73%	70%	3%	71%	2%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019					

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					
2019	98%	50%	48%	61%	37%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2021					

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	92%	53%	39%	57%	35%

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

i-Ready ELA & Math for grades 1-10 at the beginning, middle, and end of the year.

Grade 1					
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		141/98%	142/99%	138/98%
	Economically Disadvantaged		59/97%	59/60%	57/98%
	Students With Disabilities		12/86%	14/93%	11/85%
	English Language Learners		29/93%	26/96%	25/100%
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		133/93%	134/96%	135/98%
	Economically Disadvantaged		55/90%	55/93%	55/95%
	Students With Disabilities		10/71%	11/79%	12/92%
	English Language Learners		23/85%	24/92%	23/92%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	122/86%	135/95%	137/96%
	Economically Disadvantaged	65/79%	75/90%	79/96%
	Students With Disabilities	10/43%	13/72%	21/88%
	English Language Learners	18/72%	23/88%	24/92%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	116/82%	126/89%	134/95%
	Economically Disadvantaged	63/77%	69/83%	77/94%
	Students With Disabilities	17/74%	14/61%	20/83%
	English Language Learners	14/56%	20/80%	24/96%
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	124/89%	138/99%	149/96%
	Economically Disadvantaged	73/91%	77/95%	87/
	Students With Disabilities	6/46%	7/78%	11/
	English Language Learners	11/73%	12/80%	19/95%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	114/82%	128/90%	135/97%
	Economically Disadvantaged	74/91%	74/91%	77/97%
	Students With Disabilities	7/54%	10/77%	11/85%
	English Language Learners	8/53%	12/80%	15/100%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	129/91%	128/92%	132/94%
	Economically Disadvantaged	62/89%	63/88%	67/92%
	Students With Disabilities	8/47%	9/69%	16/84%
	English Language Learners	12/80%	14/93%	15/100%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	119/86%	130/92%	133/96%
	Economically Disadvantaged	52/75%	62/86%	67/96%
	Students With Disabilities	9/53%	12/71%	14/88%
	English Language Learners	9/60%	13/87%	14/93%
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	90/70%	102/79%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	41/58%	49/70%	
	Students With Disabilities	7/35%	5/50%	
	English Language Learners	4/33%	7/58%	10/83%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	90/68%	115/86%	123/95%
	Economically Disadvantaged	46/63%	12/55%	64/91%
	Students With Disabilities	5/23%	12/55%	17/81%
	English Language Learners	6/50%	12/100%	12/100%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	91/71%	103/80%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	48/69%	52/76%	
	Students With Disabilities	3/27%	3/33%	
	English Language Learners	1/10%	4/44%	3/43%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	98/77%	105/78%	108/84%
	Economically Disadvantaged	49/72%	55/75%	58/84%
	Students With Disabilities	3/21%	4/31%	6/50%
	English Language Learners	4/50%	5/50%	5/50%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 7				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	104/83%	117/94%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	52/79%	59/89%	
	Students With Disabilities	5/42%	5/50%	
	English Language Learners	3/43%	5/63%	5/71%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	106/82%	113/88%	115/93%
	Economically Disadvantaged	54/78%	58/84%	58/91%
	Students With Disabilities	5/42%	6/50%	8/73%
	English Language Learners	3/43%	4/57%	6/86%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Civics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	93/76%	100/81%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	41/71%	46/74%	
	Students With Disabilities	2/15%	2/22%	
	English Language Learners	2/25%	3/38%	3/36%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	80/63%	96/74%	94/80%
	Economically Disadvantaged	31/52%	44/70%	45/79%
	Students With Disabilities	4/31%	6/46%	6/46%
	English Language Learners	4/50%	5/63%	3/43%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 9				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	78/75%	79/77%	63/71%
	Economically Disadvantaged	38/73%	38/75%	26/62%
	Students With Disabilities	2/29%	2/40%	3/60%
	English Language Learners	2/22%	2/33%	3/60%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	68/64%	73/69%	73/69%
	Economically Disadvantaged	36/67%	35/66%	36/77%
	Students With Disabilities	2/29%	2/29%	3/50%
	English Language Learners	4/36%	3/27%	6/60%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 10				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	48/59%	44/57%	40/59%
	Economically Disadvantaged	28/61%	23/56%	21/60%
	Students With Disabilities	1/11%	0%	1/14%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	42/53%	40/51%	34/52%
	Economically Disadvantaged	23/50%	20/48%	19/54%
	Students With Disabilities	2/22%	1/11%	1/13%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	32	40	39	28	35	30	17	43			
ELL	62	65	51	52	46	30	47	69	43		
ASN	83	63		82	52		82				
BLK	58	56	45	40	35	26	36	61			
HSP	73	64	52	57	48	39	54	68	53		

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
MUL	70	63		65	44						
WHT	83	72	61	69	52	33	61	82	66		
FRL	70	62	52	55	43	36	48	69	53		
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						
WHT	76	58	55	78	66	60	75	97	86		
FRL	63	55	44	64	60	53	51	97	74		

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	59
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	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	593
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	53
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	72
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	45
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	57
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	61
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	64
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	55
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Absentees went up for each grade and student participation was down.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

According to progress monitoring data (iReady) from May 2021, eighty-four students scored three or more grade levels below in reading. Eighty-one students scored 2 grade levels below and 292 students scored one grade level below in reading. In mathematics, eighty-five students scored three or more grade levels below. Seventy-two students were 2 grade levels below and 347 students were one grade level below in mathematics.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

One contributing factor would be that students were absent more due to Covid. Additionally, instruction was interrupted due to students changing from traditional to distance learning. New actions would include students returning to campus and hiring of additional support staff with Title I funds.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

ELA Learning Gains and ELA Lowest 25%
Based on progress monitoring data, third, sixth and seventh grade reading showed highest growth.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

New progress monitoring tool and staff development helped to identify needs and provide appropriate intervention and support.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Additional support staff and extended learning opportunities provided through Title I funds.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

New B.E.S.T. standards workshops, iReady professional development, math manipulative professional development and technology workshops.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Additional support staff and extended learning opportunities provided through Title I funds.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Due to the number of students that are one or more grade level below in ELA, there is a need to give additional support to students and extended learning opportunities.
Measurable Outcome:	During the course of the year, increase Tier 1 by 5% while decreasing Tier 2 and Tier 3 students.
Monitoring:	Interventionist and Administration will monitor during three times of the year (beginning of year, mid-year and end of year progress).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Charles Thacker (charles.thacker@rgsa.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Support team (teacher, interventionist, and other staff as appropriate) will analyze data to provide intervention and personalized support to target Tier 2/3 students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Data from 2021 school year progress monitoring tool identifies the need. Research shows that the more personalized instruction students receive, the more likely they are to achieve.

Action Steps to Implement

Using Title I funds, personnel will be designated to perform strategies above.

Person Responsible Ralph Frier (ralph.frier@polk-fl.net)

Identify students who need additional support in ELA.

Person Responsible Charles Thacker (charles.thacker@rgsa.com)

Provide interventions, support and monitor students with need.

Person Responsible Charles Thacker (charles.thacker@rgsa.com)

Using Title I funds, provide extended learning opportunities for students in the area of ELA.

Person Responsible Charles Thacker (charles.thacker@rgsa.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Due to the number of students that are one or more grade level below in Math, there is a need to give additional support to students and extended learning opportunities.
Measurable Outcome:	During the course of the year, increase Tier 1 by 5% while decreasing Tier 2 and Tier 3 students.
Monitoring:	Support Staff and Administration will monitor during three times of the year (beginning of year, mid-year and end of year progress).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Dottie Trapnell (dottie.trapnell@rgsa.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Support team (teacher, interventionist, and other staff as appropriate) will analyze data to provide intervention and personalized support to target Tier 2/3 students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Data from 2021 school year progress monitoring tool identifies the need. Research shows that the more personalized instruction students receive, the more likely they are to achieve.

Action Steps to Implement

Using Title I funds, personnel will be designated to perform strategies above.	
Person Responsible	Ralph Frier (ralph.frier@polk-fl.net)
Identify students who need additional support in Math.	
Person Responsible	Dottie Trapnell (dottie.trapnell@rgsa.com)
Provide interventions, support and monitor students with need.	
Person Responsible	Dottie Trapnell (dottie.trapnell@rgsa.com)
Using Title I funds, provide extended learning opportunities for students in the area of Math.	
Person Responsible	Dottie Trapnell (dottie.trapnell@rgsa.com)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: As a high number of students transition back to face to face learning after 15 months of distance learning, having additional staff will help students impacted by the pandemic. These students may have experienced learning loss, lack of structure, financial hardship, family illness and death, sadness and/or depression.

Measurable Outcome: Increase in students utilizing school counseling services.

Monitoring: Monitor through school counselor logs and teacher referrals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Cathy Carver (cathy.carver@rgsa.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Use of school counselor to provide students support in SEL and College Career Readiness (CCR).

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students with strong social-emotional skills are better able to cope with everyday challenges and benefit academically and socially. Social and emotional competency lead to positive and long-term impact on student outcomes both in and out of school.

Action Steps to Implement

Using Title I funds, personnel will be designated to perform strategies above.

Person Responsible Ralph Frier (ralph.frier@polk-fl.net)

Identify students who need additional support in SEL and CCR.

Person Responsible Nicole Parsons (nicole.parsons@rgsa.com)

Provide interventions, support and monitor students with need.

Person Responsible Nicole Parsons (nicole.parsons@rgsa.com)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement / Testing

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	During the pandemic, parents were limited in campus access. Limited parent involvement for distance learners due to parent work schedule or extenuating circumstances.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase parent involvement to documented contact once a quarter.
Monitoring:	Logs and sign-in sheets
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amanda Bell (amanda.bell@rgsa.com)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Designate personnel to plan, coordinate and facilitate events/meetings that promote parent involvement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research shows that parental involvement increases student achievement and well-being.

Action Steps to Implement

Using Title I funds, personnel will be designated to perform strategies above.

Person Responsible Ralph Frier (ralph.frier@polk-fl.net)

Collaborate with teachers to identify students that need additional parental support.

Person Responsible Amanda Bell (amanda.bell@rgsa.com)

Engage with parents through various events and meetings.

Person Responsible Amanda Bell (amanda.bell@rgsa.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Ridgeview had 1.7 suspensions per 100 students as compared to 10.2 suspensions per 100 students for the State. Ridgeview's primary area of concern is minor disruptive behavior inside the classroom environment. Teachers and Administrators will continue to monitor student behavior and provide behavior interventions that align to the school's core values, overall vision and mission in an effort to prevent and reduce the problem behavior(s).

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.

A positive school culture and environment is built at RGSA by ensuring all stakeholders are involved by inviting parents, students and staff to meetings to seek input and plan for the needs of the school. An emphasis with all staff is placed on building positive, healthy relationships with students. This starts as early as the interview process and is an embedded expectation regardless of job role. RGSA embraces cultural diversity. We strive to develop a global mindset with our stakeholders.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Administrators, Guidance, Teachers, Parents, and Students each play a role in promoting a positive culture and environment at RGSA. Relationships with students are positive, respectful and caring. According to climate and culture survey with elementary and secondary students, teachers are described as honest, fun and caring. Similarly, teachers and staff describe their colleagues as honest, caring and respectful. Administrators empower teachers and staff to create and innovate. RGSA has a collegial environment and leaders, teachers and staff work together in a respectful, supportive and collaborative way.

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: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement / Testing	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00