Duval County Public Schools

River City Science Academy Innovation School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

River City Science Academy Innovation School

8313 BAYCENTER RD, Jacksonville, FL 32256

www.rivercityscience.org

Demographics

Principal: Mesut Erdogan

Start Date for this Principal: 7/3/2013

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	43%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

School Board Approval

N/A

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

River City Science Academy Innovation School

8313 BAYCENTER RD, Jacksonville, FL 32256

www.rivercityscience.org

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-8	No	44%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	57%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	B	B

School Board Approval

N/A

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.

To ensure all students reach their maximum potential in a diverse, structured, and nurturing environment and to prepare students for a future in the areas of science, technology, engineering, and math.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure that students become successful in their subsequent education and responsible and productive citizens in a rapidly changing world
To apply innovative methods and interdisciplinary instruction and rigor, creating a stimulating and student-centered learning environment
To model, educate and engage students in critical thinking and problem solving by teaching the whole child extending beyond the classroom
To be a catalyst for change in STEM education
To graduate every student college or career ready

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
Erdogan, Mesut	Principal	Principal- Mesut Erdogan: Serves as the educational leader of the school; responsible for the direction of the instructional program, operation of the school plant, participates in staff and student activities along with community leadership. Sets the general tone of the school; coordinates parent groups and school advisory committee; represents the school to the community at large. Works with academic deans, counselors and faculty to establish and maintain educational program. Prepares school budgets; approves expenditures within the school; responsible for the financial solvency of the school. Interviews, selects, supervises and evaluates all school personnel. Establishes rules and regulations for proper student conduct; maintains student discipline; prosecute discipline cases of a serious nature. Assesses strengths of the school, identifies its weaknesses and takes corrective action. Oversees maintenance of the school, beautification of the grounds, and general upkeep of the school plant. Identifies and provides in-service opportunities for faculty members. Establishes an effective school administration organization with clear lines of responsibility and with necessary delegation of authority. Makes periodic appraisals of student progress. Makes plans for the most effective use of curriculum materials, instructional supplies, equipment, building facilities, school grounds and community resources.
Milton, Marion	Dean	Dean of Discipline- Marion Milton: Monitors the hallway/restroom along with security in the morning, during class time and during bell change throughout the day - ensuring that students are entering and exiting the cafeteria in a safe and orderly manner; Processes referrals and complete investigations of various student situations; Monitors the cafeteria; After school/Saturday detention organizing and running detention; Building security- assists in walking the building and the campus grounds to ensure the safety of the school, students and staff; Conducts monthly fire drills and lock downs in accordance with the district regulations; Issues lockers and handles any issues that may arise; Conducts periodic drills to make sure students are wearing their ID
Medina, Juleah	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach for Elementary School : Mrs.Medina is responsible for coordinating school wide professional development, overseeing the mentor-mentee induction of all new teachers, conducting

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		classroom observations and helping teaching formulate and address goals related to their teaching practice, organizing and implementing lesson studies and action research, and leading observation lessons as needed. She also coordinates all Elementary events, activities and coordinates parent meetings.Her focus is to develope school-wide goals related to literacy and to work with teachers to address those school-wide literacy goals. Monitors lesson plans and provides feedback to department heads concerning Florida Standards; participates in student data collection; assists reading teachers with providing best practices for their subject area; leads 'data chats' with all teachers sharing their individual student data and examining areas that need improvement; participates in classroom walkthroughs looking for areas to improve curriculum; participates in official teacher evaluations throughout the school year; ensures statewide assessments are scheduled properly and within prescribed time constraints; organizes student schedules during the summer to ensure proper classes for the student body.
Jones, Roshanda	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach for Middle School: Mrs.Jones is responsible for coordinating school wide professional development, Monitors lesson plans and provides feedback to department heads concerning Florida Standards; participates in student data collection; assists math teachers with providing best practices for their subject area; leads 'data chats' with all teachers sharing their individual student data and examining areas that need improvement; participates in classroom walk throughs looking for areas to improve curriculum; participates in official teacher evaluations throughout the school year; ensures statewide assessments are scheduled properly and within prescribed time constraints; organizes student schedules during the summer to ensure proper classes for the student body.
Rose, Katie	School Counselor	Guidance Counselor- Katie Rose : Makes schedule for Middle School Students. Assists and advises students about academic and personal decisions. Provide private counseling to students, assess the ability and potential in students, and coordinate with fellow professionals on student matters. Coordinators 504 meetings with parents and teachers. Organizes career, academic and life skill based opportunities to students. Trains staff on mental health

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/3/2013, Mesut Erdogan

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.*

12

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.*

23

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

35

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	43%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (59%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: B (58%) 2015-16: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca

Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&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	56	56	57	66	59	54	88	77	62	0	0	0	0	575
Attendance below 90 percent	6	4	2	2	0	4	3	2	3	0	0	0	0	26
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	2	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	18	35	28	24	0	0	0	0	105
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	13	8	0	0	0	0	36

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	1	4	12	13	8	0	0	0	0	39

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/18/2020

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	53	61	64	60	62	75	80	68	72	0	0	0	0	595
Attendance below 90 percent	7	12	4	6	10	7	9	5	5	0	0	0	0	65
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	0	0	0	0	8
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	1	0	0	0	0	1

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	2	1	0	3	3	3	3	5	6	0	0	0	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	53	61	64	60	62	75	80	68	72	0	0	0	0	595
Attendance below 90 percent	7	12	4	6	10	7	9	5	5	0	0	0	0	65
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	0	0	0	0	8
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	1	0	0	0	0	1

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	2	1	0	3	3	3	3	5	6	0	0	0	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	54%	54%	61%	63%	50%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	56%	59%	63%	54%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	53%	54%	47%	47%	51%
Math Achievement	66%	57%	62%	66%	52%	58%
Math Learning Gains	61%	57%	59%	58%	52%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	52%	52%	50%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	59%	50%	56%	42%	47%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	78%	76%	78%	74%	76%	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	
	(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	58%	51%	7%	58%	0%
	2018	46%	50%	-4%	57%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	50%	52%	-2%	58%	-8%
	2018	56%	49%	7%	56%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	57%	50%	7%	56%	1%
	2018	48%	51%	-3%	55%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
06	2019	57%	47%	10%	54%	3%
	2018	58%	44%	14%	52%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
07	2019	49%	44%	5%	52%	-3%

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	2018	58%	41%	17%	51%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
08	2019	49%	49%	0%	56%	-7%
	2018	71%	51%	20%	58%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-22%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	76%	61%	15%	62%	14%
	2018	65%	59%	6%	62%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	64%	64%	0%	64%	0%
	2018	62%	60%	2%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	63%	57%	6%	60%	3%
	2018	60%	61%	-1%	61%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
06	2019	65%	51%	14%	55%	10%
	2018	59%	42%	17%	52%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
07	2019	63%	47%	16%	54%	9%
	2018	54%	50%	4%	54%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
08	2019	57%	32%	25%	46%	11%
	2018	84%	31%	53%	45%	39%
Same Grade Comparison		-27%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	63%	49%	14%	53%	10%
	2018	53%	56%	-3%	55%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	25%	40%	-15%	48%	-23%
	2018	37%	44%	-7%	50%	-13%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-28%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	87%	67%	20%	67%	20%
2018	91%	63%	28%	65%	26%
Compare		-4%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	77%	69%	8%	71%	6%
2018	76%	84%	-8%	71%	5%
Compare		1%			

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	86%	57%	29%	61%	25%
2018	100%	61%	39%	62%	38%
Compare		-14%			

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

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	22	42	36	39	28		33				
ELL	38	58	38	59	76	57	33				
ASN	62	76		81	71						

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
BLK	41	43	39	52	49	45	44	93			
HSP	55	46	36	73	76	55	57	73			
MUL	58	40		53	60						
WHT	61	56	41	74	64	46	74	69			
FRL	47	50	40	60	58	43	58	68			

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
SWD	32	20	20	40	43						
ELL	38	52	55	50	65	50					
ASN	81	57		82	67						
BLK	45	41	41	52	54	58	46	54			
HSP	60	59		67	52		73				
MUL	58	60		55							
WHT	64	55	46	73	67	70	67	93	67		
FRL	50	49	43	58	60	61	55	61	65		

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
SWD	33			44							
ELL	48	47		48	53						
ASN	42			50							
BLK	49	58	52	53	48	33	25	60			
HSP	67	65		73	65						
MUL	80			80							
WHT	71	67	50	72	65	62	64	81			
FRL	55	61	52	56	53	36	46	73			

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	75
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	609
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	33
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	54
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	73
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	51
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	61
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	53
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial 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	62
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	55
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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance (based on I-Ready Spring Data instead of FSA data) was the middle school math (grades 6th - 8th) data points. The contributing factors to last year's performance was based on a switch in curriculum (unit based instead of spiraled), a lack of classroom management from math classroom teachers, and the removal and replacement of math instructors in middle school.

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 the prior year were the middle school math data points. The contributing factors to last year's performance was based on a switch in curriculum (unit based instead of spiraled), a lack of classroom management from math classroom teachers, and the removal and replacement of math instructors in middle school.

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 data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was the language arts scores of the students in the lowest 25th percentile (-12). The factors that contributed to this gap includes the introduction of a new curriculum with assessments that were not clearly aligned to tested standards, and small group supports being provided more to "bubble kids" than students scoring in the lowest 25th percentile.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was the Social Studies achievement. In this area, we included more real world connections and experiences for students to relate to content and used benchmark and assessment data to drive instruction.

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

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), students scoring a Level 1 on the statewide assessment is a potential area of concern, specifically the ESE population and those students scoring in the lowest 25th percentile in both reading and math.

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

1. Language Arts Proficiency and Bottom Quartile gains in Language Arts
2. Math Proficiency and Bottom Quartile gains in Math
3. ESE population
4. 8th grade Science proficiency

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Middle math is math content that pertains to students in grades six through eight with courses that include General Math, Math Honors, Pre-Algebra, and Algebra. From the data reviewed, middle school math proficiency was identified as a critical need because it showed the lowest proficiency rates compared to the other grade level subjects in the school and from previous school year's math data.
Measurable Outcome:	For Middle School Math proficiency scores to have at least a 65% proficiency rate by Spring 2021. Lowest 25th Percentile scores to have at least 62% proficiency rate by Spring 2021
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Roshanda Jones (rjones@rivercitysience.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus is the use of a research based and rigorous curriculum paired with consistent, experienced and knowledgeable instructors.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for selecting this specific strategy is the simple fact (based on research) that the most pivotal factor in achievement for a learner is the classroom teacher. With the security of a knowledgeable and dependable educator in the classroom implementing rigorous and research based content, improvement should be evident.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional Development
2. Increased Paraprofessional Support
3. Hire a Math Coach
4. Provide additional small group instruction for students
5. Quarterly Data Reviews
6. Department Head Utilization and Meetings
7. Targeted Instruction (MTSS accountability)
8. Using i-Ready data, students from the bottom quartile in Math will be grouped into profiles.
9. For 30 minutes each day, students will receive instruction from one of the grade level teachers on their specific targeted skill. By the end of the week, students from the lowest quartile will have received intensive, explicit instruction from each domain of math and all from different teacher

Person Responsible	Roshanda Jones (rjones@rivercitysience.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Language Art Proficiency
Measurable Outcome:	RCSA Innovation plans to increase the overall ELA proficiency score score to 62% by the end of 2021 Lowest 25th Percentile to have 62% by spring 2021
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Juleah Medina (jmedina@rivercityscience.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will work together to create instructional groups and lesson plans for small group instruction focusing on standards where weaknesses are evident. Teachers will meet with small groups, tracking process. Progress will be monitored by administration and discussed at grade level and department meetings to reevaluation the program, curriculum, effectiveness, and make any necessary changes Monthly data meetings with teachers
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	RCSA Innovation's ELA proficiency score and low 25th percentile proficiency is below the state average and with action plan our goal is to increase at least 62% by the end of year.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will work together to create instructional groups and lesson plans for small group instruction focusing on standards where weaknesses are evident.
Teachers will meet with small groups, tracking process.
Progress will be monitored by administration and discussed at grade level and department meetings to reevaluation the program, curriculum, effectiveness, and make any necessary changes
Monthly data meetings with teachers
Each teacher will be assigned a specific domain of ELA - phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension, and plan targeted lesson
By the end of the week, students from the lowest quartile will have received intensive, explicit instruction from each domain of reading and all from different teacher

Person Responsible	Juleah Medina (jmedina@rivercityscience.org)

#3. Other specifically relating to ESE Proficiency	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ESE student scores were below target based on State Report Card.
Measurable Outcome:	By Spring 2021, the ESE population will have at least 62% proficiency based on statewide assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Juleah Medina (jmedina@rivercityscience.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Progress Monitoring
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on research, the constant monitoring of student progress (and adapting instruction) helps to boost assessment scores. Teachers will participate in monthly data chats with administration as well as separate data chats with their students to stay aware of progression and regression. 1. Professional Development for general ed teachers 2. Potentially hiring more support in the ESE Department 3. Provide additional small group instruction for students 4. Monthly Administrative Data Chats with general ed teachers 5. Targeted instruction (RtI accountability) 6. Classroom observations, lesson plan monitoring/feedback, student progress monitoring

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	8th Grade Science Proficiency. While our Biology score is above the state average our 8th Grade science score is below the state average and it does no meet our expectations
Measurable Outcome:	our target is 55% at the end of school year
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Roshanda Jones (rjones@rivercitysience.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will implement the evidence-based strategies of targeted small group instruction and data chats to attempt to improve our overall proficiency scores. These strategies will be implemented in all our 6th, 7th, and 8th grade science classrooms not only because the test covers an accumulation of standards, but to ensure that our scores will increase consistently overtime. In order to successfully implement these strategies, we will also be putting into place standards-based benchmark assessments and standards-based documentation tools to help the teachers and students increase awareness of achievement as the year progresses.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Monthly Mentor/Coaching of teachers through lesson planning and delivery to implement highly effective collaborative strategies for engagement and student success conducted by Mrs.Jones 2. Science Department meet to locate and analyze the test item specifications and identify the critical concepts with vertical alignment. Members will analyze data individually and collaboratively to create goals and develop high quality proficiency scales. Successes will be celebrated upon completion of goals. The data used will consist of Test item specification,

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school leadership team will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities by implementing intentional and useful Professional Development, building staff morale, increasing paraprofessional support, department head utilization and management, data and curriculum review, and implementation of standards based assessments.

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.

At River City Science Academy Innovation, we strive to create a positive and collaborative environment for all. We encourage our teachers and staff to be creative, humble, open-minded, passionate, and determined to deliver excellent results. Our staff and administration take pride in their work in attaining our goals and ensuring our student's success, and the overall success of our school. RCSA provides equal and fair opportunities for all our students, and fully believe in their potential. RCSA is well known for welcoming and embracing diversity among its staff, students, and parents.
At RCSA, we work closely with our teachers, stakeholders, parents, business partners and students in many of the decisions and goals that we have implemented to improve our school.. These decisions may include surveys with the final say to our character trait list, school wide votes for major decisions, and which philanthropy projects we will participate in during the school year. These are just a few examples of the surveys in which we ask for the involvement of our proximal stakeholder groups. The community and school work together as a team and are valued like family.
Our primary focus is to teach each student to the best of his/her ability while fostering personalized attention and providing the resources necessary to meet their individual needs. This statement, as well as our character trait list, was founded by our proximal stakeholders since they play a key role in our overall school performance. Having the support and involvement of teachers, families and community members is pivotal in implementing the roadmap to our success. This mission not only is the driving force for attaining our goals, it also keeps us in alignment with our monthly positive character traits.
In an effort to expand our positive school culture, we also have a team of administrators and stakeholders that collaborate and meet either weekly or monthly from all RCSA campuses to discuss our school's "character traits", community involvement projects, fundraising partnerships when disaster strikes, and so much more!
Each month there is a different character trait that we incorporate into our curriculum with exercises, announcements, activities, bulletin boards, and books that exemplify the featured character trait of the month. Some examples of character traits that were voted most important to our students, families and staff include: Respect, Gratitude, Perseverance, Leadership, and Honesty just to name a few.
RCSA, across all campuses, has been very fortunate to have very strong relationships with our business partners and community. We have been fortunate enough to have special guests visit our school for the students to meet, including the local police and fire departments, the Jacksonville Icemen Hockey Team, two Action News meteorologists, several book authors, even the Mayor of Jacksonville! It heightens morale and is a positive and healthy way to build our relationships with our local leaders and celebrities.
We will continue to evolve and strengthen our current partnerships with our stakeholders, teachers, students, parents, and community. We are proud to be members of the RCSA family.

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: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: ESE Proficiency	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00