

Polk County Public Schools

Ridgeview Global Studies Academy School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	22
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	23

Ridgeview Global Studies Academy

1000 DUNSON RD, Davenport, FL 33896

<http://theridgeviewacademy.com>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

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, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation 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	
Carver, Cathy	Assistant Principal	
Trapnell, Dottie	Assistant Principal	

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The school leadership team analyzed student performance data to identify areas for school improvement. The SLT also used input from Cognia and various stakeholder surveys (staff, students,

and parents) to develop school improvement needs, goals, and action plans. The goals and corresponding plan was shared with parents who had an opportunity to provide the SLT with feedback by way of survey.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Progress monitoring will occur at least three times per year: at the beginning of the year, in the middle of the year, and at the end of the year. Progress will be measured by student outcomes on the i-Ready Reading and Math diagnostic assessments as well as on the FAST ELA and Mathematics Progress Monitoring 1-3 assessments.

Demographic Data

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	56%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	93%
Charter School	Yes
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	28	25	19	18	15	14	0	0	0	119
One or more suspensions	0	4	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	9
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	4	4	2	0	1	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	1	3	4	4	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	16	15	18	15	17	12	93
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	13	14	11	6	13	12	69
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	2	7	2	2	6	0	0	0	19

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	3	6	7	0	1	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	24	17	17	14	10	10	13	18	16	168	
One or more suspensions	2	1	1	1	0	1	7	15	14	72	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	10	8	12	13	13	78	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	13	17	20	19	10	88	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	2	2	1	11	12	15	22	127	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	1	1	5	1	0	0	1	1	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	24	17	17	14	10	10	13	18	16	139
One or more suspensions	2	1	1	1	0	1	7	15	14	42
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	10	8	12	13	13	66
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	13	17	20	19	10	88
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	2	2	1	11	12	15	22	65

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	1	1	5	1	0	0	1	1	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	67	48	53	75	51	55	76		
ELA Learning Gains				61			66		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				49			54		
Math Achievement*	70	49	55	68	37	42	62		
Math Learning Gains				62			48		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				51			35		
Science Achievement*	65	47	52	64	48	54	56		
Social Studies Achievement*	80	68	68	87	53	59	73		
Middle School Acceleration	54	61	70	57	43	51	61		
Graduation Rate		54	74		46	50			
College and Career Acceleration		39	53		71	70			
ELP Progress	68	50	55	70	55	70	62		

** In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	474
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	644
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	37	Yes	1	
ELL	53			
AMI				
ASN	82			
BLK	55			
HSP	62			
MUL	74			
PAC				
WHT	74			
FRL	61			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	44			
ELL	58			
AMI				
ASN	85			
BLK	64			
HSP	63			
MUL	79			
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	64			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	67			70			65	80	54			68
SWD	26			38			21	56			6	56
ELL	46			57			40	59			6	68
AMI												
ASN	78			85							2	
BLK	56			60			41	63			5	
HSP	62			63			65	74	45		7	68
MUL	85			63							2	
PAC												
WHT	73			79			71	88	64		7	60
FRL	61			64			61	76	43		7	64

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	75	61	49	68	62	51	64	87	57			70
SWD	34	38	37	29	42	41	23	76				73
ELL	63	56	49	55	60	50	46	76				70
AMI												
ASN	91	81		81	82		92					
BLK	73	67	66	59	57	65	54	86				46
HSP	70	60	49	63	60	48	54	85	61			76
MUL	80	67		88	80							
PAC												
WHT	79	60	42	73	63	47	73	86	63			57
FRL	72	59	51	65	64	52	59	88	55			77

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	76	66	54	62	48	35	56	73	61			62
SWD	32	40	39	28	35	30	17	43				53
ELL	62	65	51	52	46	30	47	69	43			62
AMI												
ASN	83	63		82	52		82					
BLK	58	56	45	40	35	26	36	61				44
HSP	73	64	52	57	48	39	54	68	53			65
MUL	70	63		65	44							
PAC												
WHT	83	72	61	69	52	33	61	82	66			64
FRL	70	62	52	55	43	36	48	69	53			64

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
10	2023 - Spring	63%	40%	23%	50%	13%
05	2023 - Spring	73%	43%	30%	54%	19%
07	2023 - Spring	60%	36%	24%	47%	13%
08	2023 - Spring	69%	39%	30%	47%	22%
09	2023 - Spring	69%	39%	30%	48%	21%
04	2023 - Spring	68%	53%	15%	58%	10%
06	2023 - Spring	69%	35%	34%	47%	22%
03	2023 - Spring	69%	42%	27%	50%	19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	67%	38%	29%	54%	13%
07	2023 - Spring	74%	35%	39%	48%	26%
03	2023 - Spring	80%	51%	29%	59%	21%
04	2023 - Spring	80%	56%	24%	61%	19%
08	2023 - Spring	74%	42%	32%	55%	19%
05	2023 - Spring	80%	44%	36%	55%	25%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	43%	33%	10%	44%	-1%
05	2023 - Spring	64%	39%	25%	51%	13%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	62%	37%	25%	50%	12%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	60%	37%	23%	48%	12%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	80%	50%	30%	63%	17%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	83%	65%	18%	66%	17%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	76%	49%	27%	63%	13%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

ELA proficiency at 68% overall - there were several staffing changes made in the secondary ELA department for various reasons. There was also a transition to new State ELA standards, a new State ELA assessment, and new ELA curriculum across all grade levels.

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

ELA proficiency at 68% overall - there were several staffing changes made in the secondary ELA department for various reasons. There was also a transition to new State ELA standards, a new State ELA assessment, and new ELA curriculum across all grade levels.

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 RGSA data components exceeded the State and District averages in all subject areas.

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

Math proficiency showed the greatest improvement. This is most likely due to the training and support provided by the school-based Math Coach and the collaborative efforts of our math teachers.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Student attendance continues to be an area of concern.

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

1. ELA achievement
2. Mathematics achievement
3. Family engagement

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Parent and family engagement declined during the 2020-2021 and 2021-2022 school years because of the pandemic restrictions. Research shows that parental and family involvement correlates to student achievement and overall well-being. During the 2022-23 school year, parent and family engagement has improved gradually; however, there is a continued need to increase family engagement.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Increase parent engagement to documented contact once per quarter.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Logs and sign-in sheets.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amanda Bell (amanda.bell@rgsa.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Designate personnel to plan, coordinate, and facilitate events/meetings that promote parent involvement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research shows that parental involvement increased student achievement and overall well-being.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Using Title 1 funds, personnel will be designated to implement the interventions/strategies listed above.

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

By When: July 2023

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

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

By When: Ongoing

Provide staff with training on the importance of family engagement and best practices.

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

By When: Fall 2023

Engage with parents through various events and meetings.

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

By When: Ongoing

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Due to the number of students that are one or more grade levels below in ELA, there is a need to provide additional support and extend learning opportunities in this area.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

The school improvement goal for this initiative is to increase the number of Tier 1 students to 72% while decreasing the number of students needing Tier 2 and Tier 3 support.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

School leadership, instructional staff, and interventionists will monitor progress three times per year through i-Ready Reading diagnostic assessments and FAST ELA PM scores.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Charles Thacker (charles.thacker@rgsa.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

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 Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Data from the 2022-2023 school year progress monitoring tool identifies the need. Research shows that the more personalized instruction students receive, the more likely they are to achieve.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Use Title 1 funds for additional staff (Reading interventionists, ESE teachers, paraprofessionals) to support identified students.

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

By When: August 2023

Identify students who need additional support in English Language Arts through progress monitoring tools, state assessments, and course grades.

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

By When: August 2023 (and ongoing)

Interventionists and support staff provide personalized instruction and interventions, support, and monitor the progress of identified students.

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

By When: Ongoing

Provide tutoring as an extended learning opportunity for students below grade level in ELA.

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

By When: Fall and Spring after school; Summer during regular school hours.

Purchase supplemental curriculum that helps identify gaps in student learning with recommended lessons for accelerating learning forward (i-Ready and iLit).

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

By When: August 2023

Provide instructional staff with training related to the new ELA benchmarks and newly purchased ELA curriculum.

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

By When: Ongoing

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Due to the number of students that are one or more grade levels below in Mathematics, there is a need to provide additional support and extend learning opportunities in this area.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

The school improvement goal for this initiative is to increase the number of Tier 1 students to 75% overall while decreasing the number of students needing Tier 2 and Tier 3 support.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

School leadership, instructional staff, and interventionists will monitor progress three times per year through i-Ready Mathematics diagnostic assessments and FAST Mathematics PM scores.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dottie Trapnell (dottie.trapnell@rgsa.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Support team (teacher, interventionist, Math Coach, and other staff as appropriate) will analyze data to provide intervention and personalized support to target Tier 2/3 students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Data from 2022-2023 school year progress monitoring tool identifies the need. Research shows that the more personalized instruction students receive, the more likely they are to achieve.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Use Title 1 funds to hire additional staff (Math interventionists, ESE teachers, paraprofessionals, and a Math Coach) to support identified students and mathematics instructors.

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

By When: August 2023

Identify students who need additional support in Mathematics through progress monitoring tools, state assessments, and course grades.

Person Responsible: Dottie Trapnell (dottie.trapnell@rgsa.com)

By When: August 2023 (and ongoing)

Purchase supplemental curriculum that helps identify gaps in student learning with recommended lessons for accelerating learning forward (i-Ready).

Person Responsible: Dottie Trapnell (dottie.trapnell@rgsa.com)

By When: August 2023

Interventionists and support staff provide personalized instruction and interventions, support, and monitor the progress of identified students.

Person Responsible: Dottie Trapnell (dottie.trapnell@rgsa.com)

By When: Ongoing

Provide tutoring as an extended learning opportunity for students below grade level in Mathematics.

Person Responsible: Dottie Trapnell (dottie.trapnell@rgsa.com)

By When: Fall/Spring after school; Summer during normal school hours

Provide instructional staff with training related to the new Mathematics benchmarks and newly purchased Mathematics curriculum.

Person Responsible: Dottie Trapnell (dottie.trapnell@rgsa.com)

By When: Ongoing

Provide instructional staff with on-going training and support through the hiring of a full-time site-based Mathematics Coach.

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

By When: August 2023

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

RGSA disseminates our SIP plan to our schools' families as well as school staff and leadership by posting it on our website (<https://sites.google.com/view/rgsatitle1/title-1-homepage>). There is a notebook in the front office that allows anyone who comes into the front office an opportunity to read our SIP plan. It is also shared at our Title I annual meeting and at the end of the year in survey form, we ask for feedback from our parents concerning the goals of our SIP plan.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

RGSA prides itself on the positive relationship building we have with our parents, families and other community stakeholders in fulfilling our schools mission and supporting the needs of our students as well as keeping parents informed of their child's progress. Along with our Family Engagement Plan on our webpage (<https://sites.google.com/view/rgsatitle1/documents>), we have several events throughout the schoolyear that engage our families (Title I Annual Meeting/Open House, Building Capacity Events for Curriculum and Instruction, Family Interactive Meeting and our culminating school event-Global Fiesta). To help parents stay informed about their child's progress, we hold Parent Report Card Pick Up/Conferences, send home iReady progress monitoring family reports, and have transition meetings for our 5th grader families as they move to the middle school.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

Refer to Section III. Planning for Improvement.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

N/A

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No