

St. Johns County School District

# Valley Ridge Academy



2021-22 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>21</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>27</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</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: 5/1/2021

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	16%
<b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (79%) 2017-18: A (75%) 2016-17: A (78%)
<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>	

\* 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 St. Johns 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](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>21</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</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> (per MSID File)</p> <p>Combination School KG-8</p>	<p><b>2020-21 Title I School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>13%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (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> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>27%</p>

## 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 St. Johns County School Board.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE’s school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the “Date Modified” listed in the footer.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

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

The 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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Allred, Debra	Assistant Principal	
Fuller, Angela	Principal	
Hudson, Julie	Assistant Principal	
Schulz, Jessica	Assistant Principal	
Reynolds, Brooke	Instructional Coach	
Narin, Matthew	Dean	
MacNaught, Erica	School Counselor	

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Saturday 5/1/2021, 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**

87

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

1,267

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

12

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

16

**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	136	128	145	122	146	151	139	146	143	0	0	0	0	1256
Attendance below 90 percent	8	6	3	6	2	2	4	12	8	0	0	0	0	51
One or more suspensions	1	1	2	0	2	1	5	13	16	0	0	0	0	41
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	1	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	6	7	2	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	3	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	2	0	0	1	1	8	5	0	0	0	17

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year			2	8	6	7	7	7	7	5	8	0	0	0	57
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

Wednesday 9/1/2021

**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	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	

**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	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	0	17
Students retained two or more times	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				84%	84%	61%	80%	72%	60%
ELA Learning Gains				71%	67%	59%	66%	62%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				65%	61%	54%	53%	62%	52%
Math Achievement				91%	88%	62%	88%	76%	61%
Math Learning Gains				81%	71%	59%	79%	65%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				79%	66%	52%	68%	68%	52%
Science Achievement				78%	77%	56%	79%	73%	57%
Social Studies Achievement				94%	95%	78%	93%	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	91%	78%	13%	58%	33%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	85%	77%	8%	58%	27%
Cohort Comparison						
05	2021					
	2019	84%	76%	8%	56%	28%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2021					
	2019	84%	74%	10%	54%	30%
Cohort Comparison						
07	2021					
	2019	78%	72%	6%	52%	26%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	81%	71%	10%	56%	25%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	90%	82%	8%	62%	28%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	96%	82%	14%	64%	32%
Cohort Comparison		-90%				
05	2021					
	2019	90%	80%	10%	60%	30%
Cohort Comparison		-96%				
06	2021					
	2019	83%	74%	9%	55%	28%
Cohort Comparison		-90%				
07	2021					
	2019	88%	80%	8%	54%	34%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				
08	2021					
	2019	87%	78%	9%	46%	41%
Cohort Comparison		-88%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	81%	73%	8%	53%	28%
Cohort Comparison						
08	2021					
	2019	75%	72%	3%	48%	27%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				

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

<b>CIVICS EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2021					
2019	93%	90%	3%	71%	22%
<b>HISTORY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2021					
2019					
<b>ALGEBRA EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2021					
2019	100%	79%	21%	61%	39%
<b>GEOMETRY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2021					
2019	100%	81%	19%	57%	43%

**Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments**

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

i-Ready data.

Fall = percent of students Early on Grade Level or above.

Winter = percent of students Mid On Grade Level or above.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	55	63	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	23	14	
Mathematics	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	40	50	
Mathematics	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	15	7	
	English Language Learners			

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	64	65	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	43	53	
Mathematics	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	48	40	
Mathematics	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	21	33	
	English Language Learners			

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	82	63	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	50	25	
Mathematics	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	44	43	
Mathematics	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	8	8	
	English Language Learners			

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	67	55	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	24	32	
Mathematics	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	55	45	
Mathematics	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	14	15	
	English Language Learners			

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	63	47	
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	18	18	
Mathematics	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	61	46	
Science	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	24	18	
	English Language Learners			

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
Mathematics	English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
Mathematics	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 7				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
Civics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			



Grade 8				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners			

**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	43	46	37	54	40	43	35	62			
ELL	75	100		86	73						
ASN	91	78		96	72		89		86		
BLK	68	53	45	70	37	18	58				
HSP	76	67	61	80	62	68	75	95	71		
MUL	67			77							
WHT	82	63	52	88	66	63	80	93	81		
FRL	64	72	62	79	72	73	57				
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		

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
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						
WHT	80	65	52	89	79	73	82	94	67		
FRL	63	61	48	73	70	66	55	93	44		

**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	73
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	661
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	84

English Language Learners	
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	85
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	50
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	73
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	72
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	74
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	68
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?

Prior to the 19-20 school year VRA experienced an upward trend in most areas of achievement and gains. However, due to the loss of instruction during the International pandemic, scores declined in almost all areas, with the exception of acceleration, which increased by nine percent. VRA sub group data indicates an achievement deficit for SWD and Black students. Those two groups dropped their overall "grades" from a B in 2018-19 to a C in 2020-2021.

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

Based on the 2019 data the greatest area of need are in our two sub groups of SWD and Black students. These students are currently enrolled as 6th and 7th graders at VRA for the 2021-22 school year.

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

We believe the biggest contributing factor for these students' low performance is due to decreased support outside of the school building, especially during online (at home) learning. Many of their basic needs were not being fully met and therefor education fell secondary to these primary needs. Examples we experienced at VRA:  
limited or no technology at home, limited parental academic support and supervision, etc. VRA is committed to the PLC process and collaborating with all stakeholders to meet the needs of each student, and share resources and ideas to improve student performance.

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

VRA's largest increase was in the area of acceleration, from 71% to 80%.

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

VRA disaggregated data to identify students who were close to proficiency that could be accelerated to an advanced course. There was a school initiative to enroll all middle school students into a technology course, for the opportunity to earn digital tools certification.

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

VRA will continue to identify students who could benefit from advanced courses.

**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.**

Weekly PLC meetings with all grade levels include data chats and action steps for student achievement and differentiation.

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

VRA will monitor and promote the PLC process and how it relates to success of each student and teacher.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** This goal was identified as a critical need based on our previous ELA Lowest 25% Learning Gains of 65% in 2018-2019, compared to 53% in 2020-2021. This shows a 12% decrease.

**Measurable Outcome:** The school will increase the ELA Lowest 25% Learning Gains to 60% proficiency, with a 7% increase in proficiency for the 2021-2022 school year.

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

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Angela Fuller (angela.fuller@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** During professional development and PLCs, teachers will identify essential standards, create common formative assessments, and share and analyze the data from sources such as i-Ready, FSA, common formative and summative assessments, and student overall grades in order to create groups for remediation and enrichment. Students in the bottom quartile will be "flagged" for extra monitoring and extra interventions will be put in place for students not showing growth after the second iReady diagnostic. Additionally, teachers will focus their instruction on curriculum from Savvas and Foundations to support the needs of their students.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** With a change in curriculum and updates to the curriculum maps, the teachers are able to more effectively align their work to the needs of the students with an emphasis on student growth at all levels. The data gathered will be reviewed on a regular basis within grade level and subject specific Professional Learning Communities (PLC's) and used to further plan instruction and targeted identified gaps. It is thought that the loss of instructional time due to COVID was the cause of the drastic decline in the Lowest 25% showing Learning Gains in ELA. With students being in front of a teacher each day it is our desire to see an increase in this area.

**Action Steps to Implement**

VRA will conduct PLCs 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:** Brooke Reynolds (brooke.reynolds@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will receive training and ongoing support with the new ELA Savvas Curriculum and Foundations program.

**Person Responsible:** Brooke Reynolds (brooke.reynolds@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will be given the opportunity to participate in a book study around the principles of reading.

**Person Responsible** Angela Fuller (angela.fuller@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will share best practices for student learning related to ELA.

**Person Responsible** Brooke Reynolds (brooke.reynolds@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will create groups based on the data for both re-teaching and enrichment.

**Person Responsible** Brooke Reynolds (brooke.reynolds@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will receive training and ongoing support with the new ELA Savvas Curriculum and Foundations program.

Identify and teach essential standards in ELA.

Teachers will attend weekly PLC meetings to create common assessments and analyze student data.

Remediation and enrichment subgroups will be created based on the data.

Students not making progress will be brought to the MTSS team for review and support.

Teachers will be given the opportunity to participate in a book study around the principles of reading.

Teachers will share best practices for student learning related to ELA.

**Person Responsible** Angela Fuller (angela.fuller@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	This goal was identified as a critical need based on our previous Math Lowest 25% Learning Gains of 79% in 2018-2019, compared to 62% in 2020-2021. This shows a 17% decrease.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	The school will increase the Math Lowest 25% Learning Gains to 70% proficiency, with a 8% increase in proficiency for the 2021-2022 school year.
<b>Monitoring:</b>	Through targeted interventions designed to close gaps in learning that have been identified through data review, students within the specific population will demonstrate an eight point increase in learning gains on state assessments.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Angela Fuller (angela.fuller@stjohns.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	During professional development and PLCs, teachers will identify essential standards, create common formative assessments, and share and analyze the data from sources such as i-Ready, FSA, common formative and summative assessments, and student overall grades in order to create groups for remediation and enrichment. Students in the bottom quartile will be "flagged" for extra monitoring and extra interventions will be put in place for students not showing growth after the second iReady diagnostic. Additionally, teachers will focus their instruction on curriculum from Savvas.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	With updates to the curriculum maps, the teachers are able to more effectively align their work to the needs of the students with an emphasis on student growth at all levels. The data gathered will be reviewed on a regular basis within grade level and subject specific Professional Learning Communities (PLC's) and used to further plan instruction and targeted identified gaps. It is thought that the loss of instructional time due to COVID was the cause of the drastic decline in the Lowest 25% showing Learning Gains in Math. With students being in front of a teacher each day it is our desire to see an increase in this area.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Identify and teach essential standards in Math.  
 Teachers will attend weekly PLC meetings to create common assessments and analyze student data.  
 Remediation and enrichment subgroups will be created based on the data.  
 Students not making progress will be brought to the MTSS team for review and support.  
 Teachers will share best practices for student learning related to Math.

**Person Responsible** [no one identified]



**#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

**Measurable Outcome:**

**Monitoring:**

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** [no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Action Steps to Implement**

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)

**#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Data shows VRA's students with disabilities sub group dropped in overall achievement proficiency in both ELA and Math from the 2018-19 school year to the 2020-21 school year. Although the drop in math was from 69% to 53% the drop in ELA was from 47% to 44%. Since ELA proficiency is less than 50% of students in this sub group proficient we will focus on ELA proficiency for the 2021-22 school year.

**Measurable Outcome:** Based on data, a minimum of 50% students with disabilities will show proficiency in ELA based on FSA and iReady data by the end of the school year.

**Monitoring:** The MTSS core team will meet weekly to review data and discuss students not making adequate progress. Administrators and the Instructional coach will attend weekly grade level PLC meetings to ensure teams stay true to the PLC process and are working collaboratively to identify and teach essential standards using best practices and District purchased curriculum. ESE teachers will attend monthly meetings for collaboration.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** [no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Using the PLC process general education teachers will collaborate with special education teachers to identify individual educational goals, essential standards, instructional strategies, create common formative assessments, and share and analyze data in order to create groups for remediation and enrichment. Students in the bottom quartile will be "flagged" for extra monitoring and extra interventions will be put in place for students not showing growth after the 2nd iReady diagnostic. IEP goals will be amended and Individual Continuity Plans will be created as needed.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** When student intervention groupings for both math and ELA have been performed with fidelity through Professional Learning Communities, student achievement has been successful.

**Action Steps to Implement**

Identify and teach essential standards in ELA.  
 Teachers will attend weekly PLC meetings to create common assessments and analyze student data.  
 Remediation and enrichment subgroups will be created based on the data.  
 Students not making progress will be brought to the MTSS team for review and support.  
 Teachers will collaborate with ESE teachers/service providers to ensure IEP goals and supports are closing the achievement gap.  
 ESE students not making adequate progress will have an IEP meeting to review services and increase support or amend goals.

**Person Responsible:** Angela Fuller (angela.fuller@stjohns.k12.fl.us)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safe-schools-for-alex.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.

## 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.

Valley Ridge Academy will create a positive school culture with respect and dignity for all. The climate and culture of our school is the foundation that makes learning possible. Simply put, we will have shared norms, beliefs, values, goals and results in agreed upon processes and procedures that produce consistency in administrators, teachers, and student practices, working together for the good of all.

Though we live in an affluent area, our Free/Reduced Lunch percentage has increased from 10.2% in 2019-2020 to 13% in 2020-2021. Minority enrollment is approximately 26.2% of the schools enrollment. 13.5% of our students are identified with an IEP. Due to spring 2020 statewide COVID-19 school shutdown students have missed five months of learning and social emotional learning and have been in a full year of a hybrid model with mask mandates, it is critical to rebuild the academic foundation of our learners and reestablish relationships with students and families. Getting to know students can go a long way in finding ways to motivate students and help them understand the lifelong importance of the knowledge and skills they are learning at school.

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

Our school theme for this year is "Building a Stronger and Brighter Future Together." Each staff member identified the lowest 25% with a Lego, putting a name to a face. We are working together to remove students from the Lego tower to celebrate student success. This is a year of rebuilding with leadership change, new curriculums, an influx of enrollment, an increase in Free/Reduced Lunch, higher mental health needs, and even more educational needs.

Communication is key to school culture and we will continue to keep parents informed with school procedures and changes. We are excited to be able to continue our partnership with parents, PTO, SAC, faith-based partners, and school clubs who all have a positive impact on our students.