Riverdale Country Day School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Riverdale Country Day School

1975 PALM BAY RD NE, Palm Bay, FL 32905

http://www.brevarddayschoolprogram.com

Demographics

Principal: Mary Bland M

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Closed: 2023-06-30
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	0%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities*
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade 2014-15: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* 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 Brevard County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Riverdale Country Day School

1975 PALM BAY RD NE, Palm Bay, FL 32905

http://www.brevarddayschoolprogram.com

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2018-19 Title I School**	**2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-12	No	%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
Special Education	No	%

School Grades History

Year	2011-12	2011-12
Grade		F

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard 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.

Riverdale Country School exists to effectively meet the individual educational, therapeutic, and behvioral needs of children in the middle and south area of the Brevard County School District.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Riverdale Country School we will meet the needs of students, families, the Brevard County School Board, and the community by providing educational services that integrate responsibility, compassion and achievement. We will establish a learning environment that is creative, and encourages feelings of joy and accomplishment. We will form meaningful relationships with our students that they may succeed academically, develop autonomy, and reach out to others in the spirit of altruism. Our interactions with one another will be characterized by honest communication, professional integrity, and kindness. We will know that we are successful when our students come to school eager to achieve personal goals, with hope for the future, and faith in themselves and others.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Torma, Nick	Principal	I review input from the Administration team as well as Teacher and Staff to write and develop Riverdale's School Improvement Plan
Boyd, Shannon	Assistant Principal	Gathers and reviews all student academic and behavioral data. Conducts weekly PLC meetings to provide staff important curricular updates as well as professional development.
Black, Mason	Dean	Completes classroom observations to monitor Teacher and Teacher Assistant effectiveness in the delivery of instruction and to ensure proper data collection.
Cobb, Anny	Administrative Support	Tracks and assists with data entry, compliance and student-parent communication.

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	0	0	0	3	4	4	4	0	8	13	10	4	17	67
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	3	3	4	3	0	5	9	2	3	9	41
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	3	3	2	2	0	5	6	3	1	3	28
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	4	9
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	4	4	4	0	7	10	10	3	16	61

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	3	4	4	0	5	9	3	3	9	43

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	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	1	4	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2	3	0	3	6	15

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)
9

Date this data was collected or last updated
Monday 7/29/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	0%	65%	61%	0%	67%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	58%	59%	0%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	54%	54%	0%	53%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	67%	62%	0%	63%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	62%	59%	0%	60%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	59%	52%	0%	55%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	62%	56%	0%	62%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	80%	78%	0%	82%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	4 (0)	4 (0)	4 (0)	0 (0)	8 (0)	13 (0)	10 (0)	4 (0)	17 (0)	67 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	3 ()	3 ()	4 ()	3 ()	0 ()	5 ()	9 ()	2 ()	3 ()	9 ()	41 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	3 (0)	2 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	5 (0)	6 (0)	3 (0)	1 (0)	3 (0)	28 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	2 (0)	1 (0)	4 (0)	9 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	4 (0)	4 (0)	4 (0)	0 (0)	7 (0)	10 (0)	10 (0)	3 (0)	16 (0)	61 (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.

NOTE: 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**
03	2019	0%	64%	-64%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	63%	-63%	57%	-57%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	61%	-61%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	57%	-57%	56%	-56%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	60%	-60%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	60%	-60%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	63%	-63%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	58%	-58%	52%	-52%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	63%	-63%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	65%	-65%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	0%	62%	-62%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	60%	-60%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019	0%	59%	-59%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	61%	-61%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	0%	61%	-61%	62%	-62%
	2018	0%	62%	-62%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	64%	-64%	64%	-64%
	2018	0%	59%	-59%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	60%	-60%	60%	-60%

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2018	0%	58%	-58%	61%	-61%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	67%	-67%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	68%	-68%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	62%	-62%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	62%	-62%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	43%	-43%	46%	-46%
	2018	0%	41%	-41%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	0%	56%	-56%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	57%	-57%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	0%	53%	-53%	48%	-48%
	2018	0%	55%	-55%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	0%	66%	-66%	67%	-67%
2018	0%	67%	-67%	65%	-65%
Compare	0%				

CIVICS EOC					
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	0%	74%	-74%	71%	-71%
2018	0%	73%	-73%	71%	-71%
Compare	0%				

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	71%	-71%	70%	-70%
2018	0%	70%	-70%	68%	-68%
Compare		0%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	61%	-61%	61%	-61%
2018	0%	62%	-62%	62%	-62%
Compare		0%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	60%	-60%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	60%	-60%	56%	-56%
Compare		0%			

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD		35		4	26						
WHT				7							
FRL		29		4	25						
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
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	9
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	64
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	80%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	11
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	4
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	15
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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.

The English Language Arts Achievements (ELA Proficiency) for our Students with Disabilities (SWD) went down from 7 percent to 0 percent.

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

The English Language Arts Achievements (ELA Proficiency) for our Students with Disabilities went down from 7 percent to 0 percent.

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.

N/A

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

ELA learning gains for our Students with Disabilities went from 22 to 35 percednt and our Math learning gains went from 22 to 26 percent.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Out of 67 students enrolled 41 students had attendance below 90 percent. Out of 67 students enrolled 28 had 1 or more suspensions.

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

1. ELA Proficiency
2. Social Emotional components for Attendance, Behavior and Discipline.
3. Math Proficiency
4. Science Curriculum
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	On grade level Standards-Aligned Instruction
Rationale	SWD (whole school) demonstrate 0 percent ELA proficiency and 4 percent Math proficiency. Riverdale teachers use formative assessments, pre and post assessment data, formal and informal walk-throughs and classroom observations, student checklists and weekly PLC meetings to discuss effective and ineffective practices. Riverdale uses a variety of methods to monitor instructional practices are aligned with student data. Common formative assessment disaggregation in data PLC's, classroom walkthroughs (both formal and informal), feedback from students, instructional rounds to include discussion of instructional shifts put into practice and school-wide data analysis based off of learning targets along with differentiated mentoring and modeling for effective school engagement.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy	PLC'S DIFFERENTIATED INSTRUCTION COMMON FORMATIVE ASSESSMENTS
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	

Action Step	
Description	1. Riverdale teachers use formative assessments, pre and post assessment data, formal and informal walk-throughs and classroom observations, student checklists and weekly PLC meetings to discuss effective and ineffective practices. 2. 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#2	
Title	Social Emotional addressing student behavior and discipline
Rationale	EWS data shows 41 out of 67 students have attendance below 90 percent and 28 out of 67 students have 1 or more suspensions.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	EWS suspension data will show a 10 percent decrease in 2019-20. The number of students with attendance below 90 percent will decrease by 10 percent.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Nick Torma (torma.nick@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Attendance tracking
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	A student's past truancy can be a notable predictor of future truancy.
Action Step	
Description	1. Truancy notifications 2. Attendance meetings 3. Parent/Guardian phone calls 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Shannon Boyd (shannon.boyd@uhsinc.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

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

All parent meeting days (such as the Title 1 Annual Meeting) will be flexible to help meet all parent travel and work restrictions. Our meeting times will be from 8:30am-6:30 pm.

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Riverdale employs 3 full time counselors who specifically work with all of our students on the social emotional domain of their IEP as well as aspects of their Behavior Intervention Plans. Additionally, with

our student to staff ratio at 3:1 our auxiliary staff work with each student on a daily/weekly basis assisting in meeting their social emotional needs.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

Students meet with their Teacher, Teacher Assistants and school administration prior to being placed into their classroom. Individual student needs are considered to help place the student in the most appropriate classroom. When students successfully transition out of Riverdale they are placed in a school environment that can best meet their needs based upon the latest student data during IEP team meetings including the new school contacts, the student, and the student families.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

The school's leadership team meets once a week with the staff to address the academic and social/emotional needs of our students. Title 1 funding is used to provide academic and instructional materials across all subject areas. Formal PLC meetings happen once a week to review data, monitor student progress and problem solve the issues identified in the student data. The school leadership team also identifies which staff members would benefit from attending certain professional development opportunities. These determinations are based upon a review of our classroom observation checklists for each teacher.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

N/A

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: On grade level Standards-Aligned Instruction	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Social Emotional addressing student behavior and discipline	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00