

Brevard Public Schools

Riverdale Country Day School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	17
Budget to Support Goals	17

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: 8/18/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	0%
2019-20 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
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

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)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Combination School KG-12	Yes	%
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 behavioral 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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 8/18/2020, Mary Bland M

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	0%
2019-20 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
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 .	

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	1	0	0	5	4	2	3	5	5	9	12	8	54	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	0	0	3	3	0	2	3	1	1	6	1	21	
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	4	1	2	1	3	3	0	4	1	20	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	1	1	1	3	6	0	16	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	2	2	4	4	1	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	1	0	0	3	3	2	2	4	4	3	7	1	30

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	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	4	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/16/2020

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	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

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	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

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	
	(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.

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%
	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
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%	2
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
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
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%	0
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%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	

Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
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%	2
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%	2

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 percent 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?

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

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:**#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities****Area of Focus
Description and
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.

Measurable Outcome:

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
Purchase Social and Emotional curriculum through CARES Act: "Overcoming Obstacles Life Skills Curriculum"

**Rationale for
Evidence-based
Strategy:**

A student's past truancy can be a notable predictor of future truancy.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Truancy notifications to truancy officer and parent following third absence
2. Attendance meetings with parents and students
3. Parent/Guardian phone calls daily to absent students
4. Sending Letters home to parents
5. Counselors meet with students to discuss attendance issues
6. Weekly PLC meetings to discuss student data

Person Responsible

Nick Torma (torma.nick@brevardschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and 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.
Measurable Outcome:	50% of students in grades 3-12 participating in the iStation program for the 2019-2020 school made a learning gain of 1 tier or more in reading comprehension. Riverdale will continue to use iStation in conjunction with iReady to increase student learning gains in Reading from 50% to 75% across all grade levels for the 2020-2021 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nick Torma (torma.nick@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	PLC'S COMMON FORMATIVE ASSESSMENTS
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to DOINGWHATWORKS, Districts and schools should be prepared to provide professional development that is focused on how to efficiently and reliably administer assessments, apply decision rules, interpret data, and use the information for planning purposes. This is the basis for Riverdale's PLC meetings.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Riverdale teachers use formative assessments, pre and post assessment data for progress monitoring and to identify gaps in student learning
2. Purchase iReady; including professional development for appropriate progress monitoring
3. Renew licenses: Freckle program (100 licenses); Renaissance Math (100 licenses); Scholastic Magazine subscriptions for ELA; Mathematics; and Science to continue to collect pre and post student proficiency data
4. Purchase additional Promethean Smart Board through CARES Act. Will be used in conjunction with purchased programs (ie. Scholastic) to increase student engagement.
5. Weekly PLC meetings to discuss data and effective and ineffective practices.
6. Formal and informal walk-throughs and classroom observations to assess effective delivery of instruction and provide feedback to teacher
7. Use available data (iReady; Freckle; Renaissance Math) to aide in developing differentiated instruction

Person Responsible Nick Torma (torma.nick@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

N/A

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.

Riverdale employs 2 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. We are also looking to hire a CBA to assist with our InD and ASD population. We have allocated Title 1 funds specific to our Social Emotional instruction and expect these new programs to have a positive effect. "Overcoming Obstacles Life Skills Curriculum" will be purchased and implemented by teachers and counselors during daily instruction social and personal skills classes

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

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00