
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the Ungraded SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	12
R.A.I.S.E	19
Positive Culture & Environment	21

Richbourg School

500 ALABAMA ST, Crestview, FL 32536

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Nathaniel Chatman

Start Date for this Principal: 9/21/2022

2021-22 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Function (per accountability file)	ESE
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	65%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: Unsatisfactory 2020-21: No Rating 2018-19: Unsatisfactory 2017-18: Maintaining 2016-17: No Rating
DJJ Accountability Rating	2023-24: No Rating

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Okaloosa County School Board.

SIP Authority

A Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) is a requirement for Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) ungraded schools pursuant to 1001.42 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) and for DJJ schools

receiving a rating of Unsatisfactory pursuant to Sections 1003.51 and 1003.52, F.S. and Rule 6A-1.099813, F.A.C.

CSI schools can be designated as such in 2 ways:

1. Have a graduation of 67% or lower; or
2. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

DJJ Unsatisfactory Ratings are based on percentages by program type:

- Prevention and Intervention: 0%-50%
- Nonsecure Programs: 0%-59%
- Secure Programs: 0%-53%

SIP Plans for Ungraded CSI schools and DJJ schools receiving an Unsatisfactory rating must be approved by the district and reviewed by the state.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The School Improvement Plan (SIP) provides schools and Local Educational Agencies (LEAs) the opportunity to identify the academic and priority goals along with strategies for each school. School leadership teams may refine their SIP annually to define their school's academic and priority goals to increase student achievement.

Schools and LEAs are strongly encouraged to collaborate in the development and implementation of this plan.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

By providing a caring, student-centered environment, Lance C. Richbourg School will offer educational programs that will enable all students to learn, participate, and maintain life skills that are appropriate to their individuality and uniqueness in the natural environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Lance C. Richbourg faculty and staff, in cooperation with families and the community, will ensure that each student will have the opportunity to reach his or her full educational and social potential in life.

Briefly discuss the population unique to your school and the specific supports provided to meet the mission and vision.

Richbourg School is a center school with no built-in general education population.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Chatman, Nathaniel	Principal	Curriculum support, professional development, teacher and program evaluation, personnel, administrative guidance, support for all instructional staff.
Harrington, Vanea	Assistant Principal	Supports the principal's initiatives school wide; supports teachers' instructional efficacy by providing and monitoring professional development, BPIE coordinator, member of PBIS team and responsible for monitoring and encouraging the use of PBIS strategies, etc.

Is education provided through contract for educational services?

No

If yes, name of the contracted education provider.

N/A

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 9/21/2022, Nathaniel Chatman

Total number of students enrolled at the school.

82

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school.

14

Number of teachers with professional teaching certificates?

14

Number of teachers with temporary teaching certificates?

1

Number of teachers with ESE certification?

10

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

4

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

4

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2022-23

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	2	2	4	8	4	8	5	8	12	6	2	3	16	80
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	2	3	0	2	2	2	5	3	1	2	1	24
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	1	2	7
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	3

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	12	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	5

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/2/2022

2021-22 - 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	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math 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	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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement		60%	55%					69%	61%
ELA Learning Gains								63%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile								59%	54%
Math Achievement		42%	42%					80%	62%
Math Learning Gains								73%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile								64%	52%
Science Achievement		65%	54%					73%	56%
Social Studies Achievement		64%	59%					84%	78%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2022					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	10	26		10	10		27	15			
WHT	8	17		8	4			17			
FRL	17	28		12	12						
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	15	52		32	56						
WHT	14	47		25	50						
FRL	22	57		33	67						
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	21	31		8	11		31				
WHT	20	33		10	13		23				
FRL	25	30		8	14						

ESSA Data Review

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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	15
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	90
Total Components for the Federal Index	6
Percent Tested	93%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	16
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	11
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	17
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	3

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis

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

Reflect on the Areas of Focus from the previous school year. What progress monitoring was in place related to the Areas of Focus?

ULS data shows that an upward trend in reading and math. Students are also making gains in science.

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

Grade 5-11 science continue to be an area of concern for students enrolled at Lance C. Richbourg.

What area is in the greatest need of improvement? What specific component of this area is most problematic? What is your basis (data, progress monitoring) for this conclusion?

The school has lacked a consistent curriculum to fully support students on access standards. Also, students have a deficit in academic language which prevents their ability to read and comprehend content. Strengthening information and activities in curriculum and providing age appropriate hands on learning are area for improvement.

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

Progress monitoring showed that ELA had the most improvements

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

Working and training new teachers and continued collaboration with ESE instructional coach. Instructional book study to support teacher instructional strategies. Training with ULS and ongoing training at faculty meetings with ULS. Additionally, the staffing specialist will support classroom teachers with de-escalation strategies.

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

Training in ULS, ESE instructional book study, N2y online professional development. De-escalation strategies

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

As an ESE Center School, 100% of our students are "Students with Disabilities." Therefore, focusing on instructional practices that will directly impact their abilities and learning gains is important school-wide.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Our students with disabilities will achieve academic gains that will be equivalent to showing learning gains. (Increase from 35%)

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Departments/Grade Levels will meet weekly and/or monthly to plan together and support each other as they implement the new program.

Administration will review lesson plans, ULS usage, and ULS Benchmark reports to monitor progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Vaneea Harrington
(vaneesa.harrington@okaloosaschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

The instructional practice will be related to the full implementation of Unique Learning System (ULS) as our primary curriculum school-wide. This program is designed to address a range of differentiation based on an individual student's ability and level who is on ACCESS Points.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

ULS is a researched based program for students with significant cognitive disabilities. The program is designed to address a range of learning abilities and levels, which is appropriate for our student population at Lance C. Richbourg School.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

School-wide ULS training or refresher for all Teachers and Paraprofessionals (September-October, 2022)

- Completed

through virtual modules that require a test and completion certificate or documentation to be turned in when finished. -

Administration

Teachers will work with their students during the first month of school to determine the correct level on which to place students for individual learning tracks. Student Profiles will be created. - Administration

Departments/Grade Levels will meet weekly and/or monthly to plan together and support each other as they implement the program. - Department Chairs

Student progress will be monitored through the Progress Monitoring tools and Benchmarks that are provided through ULS. Reports will be reviewed monthly and/or quarterly to determine areas of strength and need. - Administration

Person Responsible

Nathaniel Chatman
(nathaniel.chatman@okaloosaschools.com)

Monitoring ESSA Impact:

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

#2. Other specifically relating to Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
 Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Low/Poor student attendance has a direct impact on student's ability to learn and retain information. Approximately, 1/3 of our population had attendance below 90% throughout the year, a majority of which were unexcused absences. Our focus will be on getting parents to communicate with the school regarding absences and increase the number of excused absences while also increasing the attendance as a whole.

Measurable Outcome:
 State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Student attendance will increase so that no more than 25 students will have below a 90% attendance rate.
 *For the 2021-2022 school year, approximately 1/3 of students had below the 90% absences for the school year.
 This does not include absences due to isolation or quarantine, but may include students staying home due to Covid-like symptoms.

Monitoring:
 Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Communication with parents is a top priority. We will call parents to touch base regarding absences: Teachers will call after 3 or 5 absences and administration will make contact after 9.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nathaniel Chatman
 (nathaniel.chatman@okaloosaschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:
 Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

A majority of the absences from students were unexcused absences (no notes/excuses). We need to educate our parents on the importance of their children being at school and communicate that we care about their presence at Lance C. Richbourg. We also need to educate them on how to properly turn in excuses for absences so that truancy is not a factor.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
 Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

MTSS is a offered weekly and is made up of multiple school instructional staff to include, the classroom teacher, school administration, and school counselor. It may also include staffing specialist, school social worker, and/or Mental health counselor.

Action Steps to Implement:
 List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

The school will develop an attendance absentee sheet so that parents can easily write an absentees letter for students that are absent.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Monitoring ESSA Impact:

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and****Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Based on the FSAA testing data 24 out of 51 students scored a level 1 on the FSAA assessment (approximately 51%) and 18 out of 51 scored a level 2 (approximately 35 %).

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

During the 2022-2023 school year, Richbourg will utilize ULS (Symbol Sticks) to work on ELA standards and work towards improving student overall achievement in ELA (FSAA). By the end of the 2023 school year Richbourg School will reduce the number of level 1 and 2 by 10 % on the FSAA assessment.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

ULS Data Chats
Gradebook Audit on FSAA standards

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nathaniel Chatman (nathaniel.chatman@okaloosaschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

This strategy supports successful literacy learning which is essential for students with disabilities. This strategy will support individuals with significant disabilities to learn the process of acquiring and correctly using sophisticated emergent literacy.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

This strategy was selected because 85 percent of students attending Richbourg school struggles with communication and this is a leading cause of low test scores. This strategy is also important because students who are unable to communicate clearly will also struggle in other academic areas. According to research this group is 2.5 times more likely to read below basic achievement levels and 3 times less likely to read at proficiency level. Also, 14 % can only read short passages with basic literal understanding.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

The teachers will administer a benchmark assessment in during the 1st 9 week grading period.

The teacher will monitor a mid-year assessment during the mid 3rd 9-week grading period.

The teacher will administer a post-benchmark assessment by the end of the 4th 9-week grading period.

Person Responsible

Nathaniel Chatman (nathaniel.chatman@okaloosaschools.com)

Monitoring ESSA Impact:

If this Area of Focus is not related to one or more ESSA subgroups, please describe the process for progress monitoring the impact of the Area of Focus as it relates to all ESSA subgroups not meeting the 41% threshold according to the Federal Index.

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Teachers are working independently with the instructional coach to complete a coaching cycle on utilizing the ULS program and implementing the program with fidelity to best support the needs of students at Lance C. Richbourg School.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Teachers are working independently with the instructional coach to complete a coaching cycle on utilizing the ULS program and implementing the program with fidelity to best support the needs of students at Lance C. Richbourg School.

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

Utilizing the ULS program 85 % of student will show learning gain from the beginning of the year diagnostic exam.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Utilizing the FSA testing data, the school will show a 10% increase from last year data in ELA>

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

The school will monitor school wide attendance through the district truancy process weekly

The school will monitor the course completion by examining edgenuity program weekly but no less than quarterly.

The school will monitor discipline data by monitoring focus discipline screen quarterly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Chatman, Nathaniel, nathaniel.chatman@okaloosaschools.com

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

MTSS is an evidence based practice used to monitor and improve student growth in various subject areas. PBIS is an evidence based practice used proven to improve school culture and student habits (attendance and discipline).

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Due to the nature of the credit recovery program the identified practices will aid learners to succeed in the credit recovery program.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
<p>Literacy Leadership - The school leadership team will conduct weekly literacy walkthroughs to provide support to classroom teachers.</p> <p>Literacy Coaching- The school will work with the district literacy coach and school instructional coach to provide support to classroom teachers.</p> <p>Assessment - THe school will provide training to support teachers in administering class and district assessments.</p> <p>Professional Learning - The school will make opportunities available for teachers to attend dropout prevention professional development and professional development in instructional strategies.</p>	<p>Chatman, Nathaniel, nathaniel.chatman@okaloosaschools.com</p>

Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment is critical in supporting sustainable schoolwide improvement initiatives. When schools implement a shared focus on improving school culture and environment, students are more likely to engage academically. A positive school culture and environment can also increase staff satisfaction and retention.

Select a targeted element from the menu to develop a system or process to be implemented for schoolwide improvement related to positive culture and environment.

PBIS linked to classroom management strategies

Describe how data will be collected and analyzed to guide decision making related to the selected target.

The school has developed a PBIS committee that works on PBIS goals. The PBIS team will work with school administrators to view PBIS data each quarter.

Describe how the target area, related data and resulting action steps will be communicated to stakeholders.

The school will work to reduce overall school discipline by implementing a school wide PBIS. The school will post goals on the school website and around the school campus. The PBIS systems used at Richbourg will be shared with the school and with community members. This is new to Richbourg and will be implemented in stages.

Describe how implementation will be progress monitored.

School discipline referrals.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Developing PBIS goals - Ms. Wiley, Ms. Frost, Mr. Hedge, Ms. Dawson, Ms. Harrington, Ms. Green	Harrington, Vaneea, vaneesa.harrington@okaloosaschools.com
Setting school wide expectation - Ms. Wiley, Ms. Frost, Mr. Hedge, Ms. Dawson	Harrington, Vaneea, vaneesa.harrington@okaloosaschools.com
PBIS recognition system - Ms. Wiley, Mr. Hedge, Ms. Dawson, Ms. Frost	Harrington, Vaneea, vaneesa.harrington@okaloosaschools.com