

The School District of Lee County

Riverdale High School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

Riverdale High School

2600 BUCKINGHAM RD, Fort Myers, FL 33905

<http://rdh.leeschools.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Scott Cook

Start Date for this Principal: 7/27/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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)	99%
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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

This plan is pending approval by the Lee 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	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Riverdale High School

2600 BUCKINGHAM RD, Fort Myers, FL 33905

<http://rdh.leeschools.net/>

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)
High School 9-12	No	67%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	58%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee 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 High School will adapt to the changing face of the community while preparing to meet the needs of a global society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To be a world class school.

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
Albanese, Heather	Assistant Principal	
Budmayr, Traci	Other	IB Coordinator
Gonzalez, Misti	Other	Department Head, ESE. Intervention Specialist and Drop-out Prevention
Manetta, Heather	Teacher, K-12	Business Dept Head.
Starr, Joan	Instructional Coach	Reading Coach and Reading Dept. Head
Vonhagen, Melissa	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal of Curriculum
Cook, Scott	Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/27/2016, Scott Cook

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.*

2

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.*

10

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

96

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
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)	99%
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	528	513	537	577	2155
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	26	49	44	154
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	33	40	34	127
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	37	48	74	166
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	18	30	42	95
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110	102	137	124	473
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	89	79	42	178	388

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	81	87	88	154	410

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	4	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	3	13	4	29

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/29/2020

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	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
One or more suspensions	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
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	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 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 0

Students retained two or more times 0 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	

Number of students enrolled 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

One or more suspensions 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

Level 1 on statewide assessment 0 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 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 0

Students retained two or more times 0 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	49%	55%	56%	49%	53%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	47%	49%	51%	40%	45%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	34%	37%	42%	28%	37%	41%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	37%	50%	51%	42%	41%	49%
Math Learning Gains	32%	45%	48%	37%	34%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	28%	43%	45%	36%	33%	39%
Science Achievement	60%	62%	68%	52%	62%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	58%	67%	73%	56%	63%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey					
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
	(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
09	2019	49%	51%	-2%	55%	-6%
	2018	48%	51%	-3%	53%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	46%	48%	-2%	53%	-7%
	2018	44%	50%	-6%	53%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	58%	56%	2%	67%	-9%
2018	62%	61%	1%	65%	-3%

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		-4%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	57%	64%	-7%	70%	-13%
2018	68%	62%	6%	68%	0%
Compare		-11%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	25%	59%	-34%	61%	-36%
2018	64%	60%	4%	62%	2%
Compare		-39%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	41%	50%	-9%	57%	-16%
2018	63%	53%	10%	56%	7%
Compare		-22%			

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	16	30	24	20	38	11	37	34		95	34
ELL	13	32	27	22	26		23	39		83	53
ASN	71	55		62			67	67		91	100
BLK	40	47	33	26	27	21	42	57		94	57
HSP	45	48	32	37	33	28	59	54		96	68
MUL	46	46		28			64	64		82	
WHT	53	45	36	40	32	29	63	59		95	70
FRL	41	43	32	30	25	20	53	50		93	65

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	20	27	24	33	55		11	20		73	46
ELL	5	21	25				36			61	64
ASN	70	60									
BLK	35	39	20	62	41	54	52	53		93	55
HSP	45	44	38	65	28	30	53	67		83	67
MUL	54	44		70						100	77
WHT	51	43	34	65	37	43	73	70		95	76
FRL	42	42	33	64	32	39	56	66		86	64
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	7	20	23	9	23	26	20	19		63	26
ELL	7	29	32	16	36	36	18	7		71	40
ASN	79	57		89	65			80		100	80
BLK	29	29	21	26	31	42	30	51		82	61
HSP	42	34	27	39	35	34	55	51		91	75
MUL	57	43		42	50		64				
WHT	54	46	32	45	37	34	53	59		92	71
FRL	36	32	24	34	32	35	46	44		88	68

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	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	43
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	551
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
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	36
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	44
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	49
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	55
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 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	52
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	45
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.

Based on FY19 Data:

Math Gains in L25 28pts. Contributing factors: 1. The addition of four first year teachers. 2. Level 1 and 2 students placed in Liberal Arts math having a negative impact on possible math gains. 3. The addition of 2 teachers new to RHS.

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

Based on FY19 Data:

Achievement 25pt decrease. Contributing factors: 1. The addition of four first year teachers. 2. Level 1 and 2 students placed in Liberal Arts math.

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.

Mathematics achievement for RHS FY 2019 was 37 the State average was 61, Contributing factors: The addition of four first year teachers. 2. Level 1 and 2 students placed in Liberal Arts math having a negative impact on possible math gains. 3. The addition of 2 teachers new to RHS.

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

Based on FY19 Data:

ELA Achievement showed the most improvement. New actions were taken to align teacher strengths with the most needy students. The addition of USA test prep as a learning strategy and additional data analysis component.

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

1. The number of students with two or more early warning indicators
2. FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

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

1. FSA Math
2. FSA ELA
3. US History EOC scores

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Attendance is proven to be a strong indicator for student success.

Measurable Outcome: Riverdale High School will decrease the number of students with >10% absences from 23% to 20% by the end of school year FY21.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Julie Powell (juliesp@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Utilizing school social work for parent and student contact with chronically absent students.
2. School district MTSS early warning systems.
3. Attendance committee

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: School social worker will follow up on identified students who are absent for three consecutive school days. School administration will meet with students who reach seven or more absences quarterly. The district MTSS early warning system will be monitored to help identify at-risk students for counseling and interventions to reduce absenteeism.

Action Steps to Implement

1. School Social Worker makes contact with students with 3 or more consecutive absences
2. Administration meets with student who have 7 or more absences quarterly
3. Students with chronic absences home visits by social worker and parent/student conference
4. MTSS early warning system monitoring by attendance committee

Person Responsible Julie Powell (juliesp@leeschools.net)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: In FY19 Riverdale high school had a significant rise in out of school (OSS) and in school (ISS) suspension rates. In FY18 85 unique students received at least one day of OSS. In FY18 135 unique students received at least one day of ISS. In FY19 135 unique students received at least one day of OSS. In FY19 548 unique students received at least one day of ISS.

Measurable Outcome: Riverdale high school will reduce OSS and ISS suspension rate by 10% by the end of the school year in FY21.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tony Allen (tonyaal@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:
 1. Consistent approach to discipline for all students.
 2. Redirection
 3. Frequent progress monitoring of ISS & OSS data

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Utilize the District Code of Conduct to decrease the ISS & OSS percentages. Implementing PBS approach to behavior change that incorporates proactive, positive (non-punitive), and instructional strategies exercised over time with consistency. These strategies involve establishing settings, structures, and systems to facilitate positive behavior change.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1. Student Conferences
- 2. Parent Communication
- 3. Restorative assignment
- 4. Intervention room
- 5. Behavioral contract

Person Responsible Tony Allen (tonyaal@leeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: In FY2018 FSA ELA achievement points for school grade was 48. In FY2019 FSA ELA achievement was 49 points. Riverdale High School increased ELA achievement by 1 point due to departmental restructuring and implementation of grade level PLC's between English and Reading departments.

Measurable Outcome: Riverdale High School will gain 4 school grade points in FSA ELA achievement by the end of school year FY21 to meet the state average as measured in FY19.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Melissa Vonhagen (melissasv@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Intensive ELA/reading instruction for students performing below grade level.
2. Professional Learning Communities alignment to grade level.
3. Supplemental ELA support with USA Test Prep.
4. Leading and Learning district initiatives.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students will be placed in intensive reading class. Grade level English class will work closely with Reading Department for additional classroom support. Teachers will be in class specific Professional Learning Communities (PLC) for discussions in best practices and data driven lesson planning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Master scheduling of students into intensive reading classes
2. Implementation of classroom assignments USA Test Prep for triangulation of student data with other district data components.
3. Administrative assignments of class specific PLCs
4. Bi-quarterly progress monitoring
5. Evaluate/reflect before moving forward in PLCs

Person Responsible: Melissa Vonhagen (melissasv@leeschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: In FY18 mathematics achievement points for school grade was 65. In FY19 mathematics achievement was 37 points. The 28 point drop will be a focus in FY21.

Measurable Outcome: Riverdale High School will gain 4 school grade points in mathematics achievement by the end of school year FY21.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Melissa Vonhagen (melissav@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:
 1. Intensive mathematics instruction for students performing below grade level.
 2. Professional Learning Communities.
 3. Supplemental mathematics support with Algebra Nation and Geometry Nation

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students will be placed in blocked classes with intensive math as a support for algebra 1. Geometry class will work closely with Geometry Nation software for additional classroom support. Teachers will be in class specific Professional Learning Communities (PLC) for discussions in best practices and data driven lesson planning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Master scheduling of students into intensive math classes for algebra 1
2. Implementation of classroom assignments using geometry nation and algebra nation for triangulation of student data with other district data components.
3. Administrative assignments of class specific PLCs
4. Bi-quarterly progress monitoring
5. Evaluate/reflect before moving forward in PLCs

Person Responsible Melissa Vonhagen (melissav@leeschools.net)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: In FY18 EOC US History points for school grade was 68. In FY19 EOC US History was 57 points. The 11 point drop will be a focus in FY21.

Measurable Outcome: Riverdale High School will gain 10 school grade points in EOC US History achievement by the end of school year FY21.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Melissa Vonhagen (melissasv@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:

1. Intensive instruction for students performing below achievement level as measured in Unify.
2. Professional Learning Communities driven by data to determine individual student needs.
3. Supplemental reading support from reading department.
4. Leading and Learning district initiatives.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students will be identified and grouped based on achievement levels as determined in content area PLC's. Teachers will target specific needed areas for standard based instruction in Professional Learning Communities (PLC) for discussions in best practices and data driven lesson planning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Master scheduling of students into ELA achievement level classes for US History.
2. Implementation of classroom assignments in Unify for triangulation of student data with other district data components.
3. Administrative assignments of class specific PLCs
4. Bi-quarterly progress monitoring
5. Evaluate/reflect before moving forward in PLCs

Person Responsible Melissa Vonhagen (melissasv@leeschools.net)

#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students with Disabilities and English Language Learners students will be areas of focus in order to increase student achievement based on data from FY19.

Measurable Outcome: All ESSA subgroup performance data will increase to 42% in FY21.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Scott Cook (scottgc@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Progress monitoring data in all areas will be used to drive instructional decisions during PLCs to increase supports for Students with Disabilities and English Language Learner students at Riverdale School. Social Emotional learning opportunities will be utilized to increase social emotional wellness among our student body.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Data driven decision making has been proven to be an effective strategy for increasing student achievement. PLCs teams can make stronger connections with students to increase attendance and decrease discipline, which will improve student achievement. It is also important to focus on social and emotional wellness for our student body to increase their ability to focus on learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Data driven PLCs to drive instruction
2. Analysis of discipline and attendance data during PLCs to increase supports
3. Provide social and emotional wellness learning opportunities to increase ability to focus on learning

Person Responsible Scott Cook (scottgc@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The leadership team will discuss school wide data trends and how to implement cross-curricular instruction.

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.

The School District of Lee County is working toward certification of Marzano's High Reliability levels which is intended to produce a system that has high reliability and becomes transformational in its approach to educating its students. When a school has met the criterion indicators for a specific level in the model, it consistently monitors those indicators and makes immediate corrections when school performance falls below acceptable levels. The first level of school effectiveness is a Safe and Orderly Environment that Supports Cooperation and Collaboration. Our school is currently working through PLCs in leadership to bring forward the knowledge at the school level to begin our study of the leading indicators: (1) The faculty and staff perceive the school environment as safe and orderly. (2) Students, parents, and the community perceive the school environment as safe and orderly. (3) Teachers have formal roles in the decision-making process regarding school initiatives. (4) Teacher teams and collaborative groups regularly interact to address common issues regarding curriculum, assessment, instruction, and the achievement of all students (5) Teachers and staff have formal ways to provide input regarding the optimal functioning of the school. (6) Students, parents, and community have formal ways to provide input regarding the optimal functioning of the school. (7) The success of the whole school, as well as individuals within the school, is appropriately acknowledged (8) The fiscal, operational, and technological resources of the school are managed in a way that directly supports teachers. As this knowledge is put into action, our school will work with teachers, students, parents, and community members to engage in and study the indicators to ensure that the school culture is inclusive and positive.

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: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies	\$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00