Riverbend Academy

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Riverbend Academy

11301 SE TEQUESTA TER, Tequesta, FL 33469

martinschools.org/o/ra

Demographics

Principal: Gary Sparks

Start Date for this Principal: 7/25/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
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)	
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 was approved by the Martin County School Board on 8/20/2019.

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

Riverbend Academy

11301 SE TEQUESTA TER, Tequesta, FL 33469

martinschools.org/o/ra

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 PK-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	2013-14
Grade	I

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Martin County School Board on 8/20/2019.

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.

Educate in a therapeutic environment to inspire all students to reach their academic and behavioral goals.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Collaborate with partner organization in assisting each student to overcome educational, social, interpersonal, psychological and biomedical barriers, by protecting dignity, expanding opportunity, seeking strategies, and inspiring students for success.

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
Sparks, Gary	Principal	To lead and support staff and students.
Wilbanks, Susi	Teacher, K-12	
Barnett, Beth	Instructional Coach	IPS Coach
Steinle, Rachel	Other	Collaborative Partner - Sandy Pines
Goodman, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	IPS Coach
Heintzelman, Evelyn	Teacher, K-12	Teacher 4/5
Koperski, WIlliam	Teacher, K-12	Teacher 6-8
Granieri-Jaudeau, Julia	Teacher, ESE	Chair
Jennerjahn, Meghann	Instructional Coach	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/25/2019

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	
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	

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%	33%	61%	0%	35%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	46%	59%	0%	52%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	44%	54%	0%	50%	51%
Math Achievement	0%	61%	62%	0%	53%	58%
Math Learning Gains	0%	64%	59%	0%	54%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	54%	52%	0%	53%	50%
Science Achievement	0%	31%	56%	0%	33%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	95%	78%	0%	48%	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)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)

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%	54%	-54%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	57%	-57%	57%	-57%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	57%	-57%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	55%	-55%	56%	-56%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	55%	-55%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	58%	-58%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	57%	-57%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	17%	53%	-36%	52%	-35%
	2018	0%	57%	-57%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		17%				
08	2019	22%	62%	-40%	56%	-34%
	2018	0%	63%	-63%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		22%				
Cohort Comparison		22%				
09	2019	5%	61%	-56%	55%	-50%
	2018	0%	62%	-62%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
10	2019	5%	59%	-54%	53%	-48%
	2018	0%	59%	-59%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	0%	58%	-58%	62%	-62%
	2018	0%	63%	-63%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	67%	-67%	64%	-64%
	2018	0%	64%	-64%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	64%	-64%	60%	-60%

				MATH		
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2018	0%	64%	-64%	61%	-61%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	8%	64%	-56%	55%	-47%
	2018	0%	63%	-63%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
07	2019	23%	60%	-37%	54%	-31%
	2018	8%	65%	-57%	54%	-46%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		23%				
08	2019	16%	67%	-51%	46%	-30%
	2018	0%	66%	-66%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

				SCIENCE		
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	20%	58%	-38%	48%	-28%
	2018	0%	57%	-57%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison		20%				

			BIOLOGY EOC		
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019	13%	74%	-61%	67%	-54%
2018	0%	73%	-73%	65%	-65%
Compare	13%				

			CIVICS EOC		
Year	**School**	**District**	**School Minus District**	**State**	**School Minus State**
2019					
2018	16%	79%	-63%	71%	-55%

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	64%	78%	-14%	70%	-6%
2018	0%	74%	-74%	68%	-68%
Compare		64%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	75%	-75%	61%	-61%
2018	17%	70%	-53%	62%	-45%
Compare		-17%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	18%	65%	-47%	57%	-39%
2018	0%	61%	-61%	56%	-56%
Compare		18%			

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											
ELL											
WHT											

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	0
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	0
Total Components for the Federal Index	1
Percent Tested	

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	0
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	0
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	0
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	
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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.

Gains in ELA were low in several subgroups. One factor that was prevalent was attendance issues during that instructional time. This has been a trend for several academic years.

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

Learning gains for our ELL students. With the average time at RBA being 60-90 days and the sessions that are required outside the classroom, the decline continues to grow.

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.

The greatest gap would be attendance. Not only do the students miss class for therapy, but teachers must excuse students from instruction due to behavior concerns. These behaviors if not addressed would hinder the learning of other students in the classroom.

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

Math showed a small gain, the attendance rate and areas of focus were increased to allow students the time to practice the skill in small groups. This built; relationships, peer collaboration and the ability for the instructor to focus on individual student groups.

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

Classroom management and student attendance.

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

1. Student Attendance
2. Classroom Management
3. Teachers ability to attend PLCs with content/grade level peers.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Classroom Management
Rationale	The need to decrease frequent loss of instruction.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	RTiB data will reflect a decreasing trend of behavioral referrals.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Gary Sparks (sparksg@martinschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Professional Development and hospital based consultation for students that reach Tier 2 or Tier 3. Tykes and Teens training that helps promote teacher understanding of steps in the physiological awareness for student support. Increase communication with all stakeholders. Utilize a variety of evidence based academic instructional strategies
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	These professional development sessions were chosen to enhance education and understanding of the needs of students who attend RBA. To enhance communication across all environments and care givers will allow all student to have an increased continuity of care. Increase academic instructional strategies to enhance academic instructional time.

Action Step	
Description	1. Tykes and Teens Training 2. Variety of training on teacher days, early release days, and after school sessions 3. Continued implementation of behavioral intervention strategies. 4. Academic instructional strategies concentrating on stations and small group instructions 5. Improving parental communication by adding report card, peer progress reports, behavioral data and interventions for monthly treatment plan review. Teachers will welcome every new students parent/guardian to RBA.
Person Responsible	Gary Sparks (sparksg@martinschools.org)

#2	
Title	Student Attendance
Rationale	Data shows that a majority of students are missing partial or full class periods due to therapy or other student evaluation and service needs.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	RBA will collaborate with he hospital to analysis trends in the data regarding gaps in instructional time.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Gary Sparks (sparksg@martinschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Data collection and fidelity checks on collection of student data.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The most accurate method of achieving measured outcome.
Action Step	
Description	1. Educate on new procedures for attendance. 2. Increase communication with hospital on restrictions and safety. 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Gary Sparks (sparksg@martinschools.org)

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).**

Work with other comprehensive schools to allow RBA staff to collaborate during professional learning community meetings. Content and/or grade level focused. Skype into meetings due to transportation time.

Create a sub-committee to focus on evidence based instructional strategies.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Classroom Management				$3,600.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100		0070 - Riverbend Academy	School Improvement Funds		$3,600.00
			Notes: The outcome is intended to increase the number of students meeting the required learning targets, therefore increasing the schools outcome of gains for each subject area.			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Student Attendance				$819.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100		0070 - Riverbend Academy	School Improvement Funds		$819.00

	Notes: Fund materials and PBIS activities and rewards for students that meet attendance goals.
Total:	**$4,419.00**