

The School District of Lee County

# Riverdale High School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>19</b>

# Riverdale High School

2600 BUCKINGHAM RD, Fort Myers, FL 33905

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Scott Cook**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/9/2021

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	99%
<b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: C (50%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	

\* 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>19</b>

# Riverdale High School

2600 BUCKINGHAM RD, Fort Myers, FL 33905

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

## School Demographics

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	<b>2020-21 Title I School</b>	<b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	75%
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	<b>Charter School</b>	<b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	58%

## School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	B

## 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	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Cook, Scott	Principal	
Powell, Julie	Assistant Principal	
Vonhagen, Melissa	Assistant Principal	
	Assistant Principal	
Johonnett, Nicole	Assistant Principal	

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Monday 8/9/2021, 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.*

1

**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**

102

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

2,142

**Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.**

9

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.**

9

Demographic Data

**Early Warning Systems**

2021-22

**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	537	532	517	556	2142
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98	90	101	105	394
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	46	58	35	174
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	94	111	87	298
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	23	54	50	136
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140	128	130	136	534
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140	183	192	168	683
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	125	160	205	187	677

**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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	8	5	12	31

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Tuesday 9/21/2021

2020-21 - 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	528	513	537	577	2155
Attendance below 90 percent	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	20	33	40	34	127
Course failure in ELA	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	5	18	30	42	95
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	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	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	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	4	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	3	13	4	29

**2020-21 - 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	528	513	537	577	2155
Attendance below 90 percent	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	20	33	40	34	127
Course failure in ELA	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	5	18	30	42	95
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	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	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	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	4	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	3	13	4	29

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				49%	55%	56%	48%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				47%	49%	51%	43%	50%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				34%	37%	42%	34%	42%	44%
Math Achievement				37%	50%	51%	65%	54%	51%
Math Learning Gains				32%	45%	48%	33%	43%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				28%	43%	45%	39%	43%	45%
Science Achievement				60%	62%	68%	63%	70%	67%
Social Studies Achievement				58%	67%	73%	68%	66%	71%

### Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

**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	2021					
	2019	49%	51%	-2%	55%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						
10	2021					
	2019	46%	48%	-2%	53%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

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

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

<b>BIOLOGY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2021					
2019	58%	56%	2%	67%	-9%
<b>CIVICS EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2021					
2019					
<b>HISTORY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2021					
2019	57%	64%	-7%	70%	-13%
<b>ALGEBRA EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2021					
2019	25%	59%	-34%	61%	-36%
<b>GEOMETRY EOC</b>					
<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School Minus District</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School Minus State</b>
2021					
2019	41%	50%	-9%	57%	-16%

### Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

**Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.**

Data was collected through a quarterly progress monitoring cycle, which included instruments such as STAR, iReady, and district-created progress monitoring assessments.

Grade 9				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	156/43.9	129/34.2	134/40
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	7/17.1	4/8	3/7.7
	English Language Learners	1/3.7	0/0	1/3.4
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	171/43.4	177/41.6	173/41.8
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	7/17.1	4/9.1	6/16.2
	English Language Learners	12/37.5	5/15.6	10/28.6
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	111/64.9	140/80.5	154/85.1
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	2/66.7	2/66.7	2/66.7
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/50	2/100
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 10				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	53/23.8	41/18.1	44/25
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	4/26.6	2/14.3	3/27.3
	English Language Learners	1/6.3	2/9.5	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	33/17.3	36/15.8	35/16.2
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/2.9	1/3.4
	English Language Learners	4/20	3/10.3	5/21.7
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students	7/29.2	11/37.9	18/48.6
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	1/33.3	1/33.3	1/33.3
	English Language Learners	1/50	2/40	2/40
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 11				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Biology	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	4/50	2/20	5/71.4
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	1/100
US History	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	90/38.6	199/56.7	203/61.5
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	3/13	7/22.6	9/26.5
	English Language Learners	3/17.6	3/12.5	5/19.2

Grade 12					
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students		N/A	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged		N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities		N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners		N/A	N/A	N/A
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students		N/A	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged		N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities		N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners		N/A	N/A	N/A
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Biology	All Students		3/100	2/66.7	1/33.3
	Economically Disadvantaged		N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities		0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners		0/0	0/0	1/100
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
US History	All Students		7/87.5	6/75	9/81.8
	Economically Disadvantaged		N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities		0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners		0/0	0/0	0/0
		Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

**Subgroup Data Review**

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	16	27	25	15	20	11	30	24		89	32
ELL	19	27	18	16	16	11	27	28		82	54
ASN	82	64		44				55		100	80
BLK	32	34	29	22	21	22	42	36		93	51
HSP	45	39	22	25	21	18	47	43		94	71

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
MUL	53	40		54	40						
WHT	52	39	27	31	19	10	53	64		94	74
FRL	41	35	21	22	18	14	43	46		94	60
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

**ESSA Data Review**

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	38
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	481
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	93%
Subgroup Data	



<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	31
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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%	
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	71
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	38
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	42
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	47
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	46
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	39
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

**Analysis**

**Data Analysis**

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

**What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?**

ELA scores for 9th and 10th grades

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?**

ELA Learning gains for 9th and 10th grades.

**What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?**

Common planning given to all 9th and 10th grade ELA teachers.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?**

Algebra scores showed the most improvement.

**What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?**

PLC guidance by administration. Leading and learning meetings to disseminate key focus standards.

**What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?**

Cooperative learning, common planning, common assessments.

**Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.**

Data chats with PLCs, complete data analysis after exemplars, modify bellwork to reteach lowest standards

**Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.**

targeted after school tutoring, identify students not making gains after each exemplar, small groups

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

#### Areas of Focus:

*No activities were entered for this section.*

#### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

**We will decrease the percentage of ISS/OSS suspension days by 3% by utilizing ATs interventions such as after school detentions and Saturday schools.**

### 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.

Riverdale has implemented a JUST BE NICE program that allows for staff members to nominate students who consistently go above and beyond for another students or staff members. The staff looks for students that fit the mold of the what we think a Riverdale student looks like. Once the student is selected, they receive a JUST BE NICE shirt they are to wear on certain days. When we have our "pop up" JUST BE NICE days, students wearing the shirt will receive a special treat during their lunch period.

#### Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Teachers and staff nominate/select the students for the JUST BE NICE program. They also are the ones that advertise the information to students.

### Part V: Budget

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

Total:	\$0.00
--------	--------