

St. Johns County School District

Valley Ridge Academy



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Valley Ridge Academy

105 GREENLEAF DR, Ponte Vedra, FL 32081

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

Demographics

Principal: Sandra Mcmandon

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	11%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (79%) 2017-18: A (75%) 2016-17: A (78%) 2015-16: A (74%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* 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.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

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

Provide the school's vision statement

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
McMandon, Sandra	Principal	
Hudson, Julie	Assistant Principal	
Lee, James	Assistant Principal	
Allred, Debra	Assistant Principal	
Dail, Ellen	Guidance Counselor	
MacNaught, Erica	Guidance Counselor	
Nover, Holly	SAC Member	
Narin, Matthew	Dean	
Reynolds, Brooke	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2016, Sandra Mcmandon

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

11

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

17

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

31

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	11%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (79%) 2017-18: A (75%) 2016-17: A (78%) 2015-16: A (74%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems**Current Year**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	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	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	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 6/19/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	155	134	148	156	143	155	148	171	182	0	0	0	0	1392
Attendance below 90 percent	3	4	2	1	3	4	5	9	11	0	0	0	0	42
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	4	3	4	3	8	18	0	0	0	0	43
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	4	8	8	12	15	0	0	0	0	48

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	6	6	0	0	0	0	16

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	1	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	155	134	148	156	143	155	148	171	182	0	0	0	0	1392
Attendance below 90 percent	3	4	2	1	3	4	5	9	11	0	0	0	0	42
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	4	3	4	3	8	18	0	0	0	0	43
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	5	1	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	4	8	8	12	15	0	0	0	0	48

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	6	6	0	0	0	0	16

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	3	1	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	84%	84%	61%	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%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey										
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)								Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		8
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	91%	78%	13%	58%	33%
	2018	82%	78%	4%	57%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	85%	77%	8%	58%	27%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	80%	74%	6%	56%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	84%	76%	8%	56%	28%
	2018	81%	73%	8%	55%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
06	2019	84%	74%	10%	54%	30%
	2018	78%	71%	7%	52%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
07	2019	78%	72%	6%	52%	26%
	2018	74%	70%	4%	51%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	81%	71%	10%	56%	25%
	2018	81%	76%	5%	58%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	90%	82%	8%	62%	28%
	2018	88%	80%	8%	62%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	96%	82%	14%	64%	32%
	2018	91%	83%	8%	62%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
05	2019	90%	80%	10%	60%	30%
	2018	88%	79%	9%	61%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
06	2019	83%	74%	9%	55%	28%
	2018	79%	73%	6%	52%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
07	2019	88%	80%	8%	54%	34%
	2018	90%	80%	10%	54%	36%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
08	2019	87%	78%	9%	46%	41%
	2018	72%	73%	-1%	45%	27%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

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

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

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	93%	90%	3%	71%	22%
2018	93%	89%	4%	71%	22%
Compare		0%			

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

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	79%	21%	61%	39%
2018	99%	79%	20%	62%	37%
Compare		1%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	100%	81%	19%	57%	43%
2018	100%	77%	23%	56%	44%
Compare		0%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	47	60	53	69	78	71	40	64	18		
ASN	94	82		96	88		93	100	97		
BLK	60	56	50	77	72	78	31				
HSP	80	71	67	82	79	71	85	92	53		
MUL	84	60		92	84			91			
WHT	84	70	64	92	81	79	78	95	68		
FRL	70	67	61	73	75	74	54	81	36		

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
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

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	79
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	714
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	56
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	93
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	61
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	76
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	82
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	79
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	66
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

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

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

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

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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

Action Steps to Implement

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

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

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

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

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

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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

Action Steps to Implement

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

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

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

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

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

Person Responsible

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

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Measureable Outcome:

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Action Steps to Implement

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

Person Responsible

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

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

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

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

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

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

It was through this ongoing dialogue with the community that led Valley Ridge Academy to implement a Positive Behavior Intervention and Support (PBIS) program in 2016-2017 school year. Since that time, the faculty, staff, students and parents have worked diligently to create a culture and environment in which positive choices and displays of good character are recognized, rewarded and set as an example for others to follow. During the 2019-2020 school year, Valley Ridge Academy was one of only 4 SJCSD schools to be recognized as a Bronze Level Model PBIS School by the Florida Positive Behavioral Interventions & Support Project. This recognition not only validates the hard work of the Valley Ridge Academy community but also inspires us to stay the course knowing that we are doing what is right for our students. Finally, a school environment can only be considered truly inclusive and accepting if everyone is made to feel connected. There are pockets of every school's population that struggle to see the educational environment as welcoming and rewarding. To meet the needs of these families, Valley Ridge Academy created and continues to host the Soaring High Camp throughout the year and over the summer. Soaring High, provides mentors, educational

support, material support and most importantly a fun and energetic experience for some of our communities most needy families to build solid, lasting relationships between home and school. Students who participate are made to feel that school is a positive environment in which they are safe, welcomed and loved. As the program has grown, so has the recognition as Valley Ridge Academy was recognized by the Florida Department of Educations as the 2019-2020 State of Florida Region Four Community Outreach Award recipient. While the recognition is wonderful and validating, knowing that we are making the school more inclusive, more welcoming and more accessible to all our community, is truly rewarding.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget			
1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	\$0.00
			Total: \$0.00