

Brevard Public Schools

Riverside Charter High School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| SIP Authority and Purpose | 3 |
| I. School Information | 6 |
| II. Needs Assessment/Data Review | 9 |
| III. Planning for Improvement | 13 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 18 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 0 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 0 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 0 |

Riverside Charter High School

, , FL 0

[no web address on file]

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

| SIP Sections | Title I Schoolwide Program | Charter Schools |
|--|---|------------------------|
| I-A: School Mission/Vision | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1) |
| I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(2-3) | |
| I-E: Early Warning System | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-A-C: Data Review | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-F: Progress Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(3) | |
| III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection | ESSA 1114(b)(6) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4) |
| III-B: Area(s) of Focus | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii) | |
| III-C: Other SI Priorities | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9) |
| VI: Title I Requirements | ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g) | |

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Riverside Charter High School is dedicated to helping at-risk students earn a standard high school diploma and prepare for post secondary success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Riverside Charter High School understands that at-risk students have different needs, learn at different rates, and have diverse learning styles which cause many of these at-risk students to drop out of school. We believe that everyone deserves a quality education that meets his or her individual needs and aligns to their personal goals and ambitions. All students can be successful in high school and in life regardless of their life circumstances.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the 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 |
|---------------|----------------|--|
| Jones, Dianne | Principal | Leadership and Vision, External Stakeholder Partnerships, Teacher onboarding and Evaluation, Coaching and Instructional Support, Positive Behavior Support and Discipline Interventions. |

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

School data is discussed year-round with staff, students, parents, and during board meetings. We specifically discuss goals for school improvement during staff meetings and professional development. Students and staff complete surveys twice a year. The results of those surveys are analyzed and discussed with all stakeholders to identify areas of growth and need.

SIP Monitoring

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State’s academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Monthly collection and analysis of data to monitor student progress compared to target and goals. Staff continuously evaluate the effectiveness of interventions to determine whether adjustments need to be made to reach the intended student outcomes.

Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

| | |
|--|-----------------------|
| 2023-24 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | High School 7-12 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Alternative Education |
| 2022-23 Title I School Status | No |
| 2022-23 Minority Rate | 0% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 0% |
| Charter School | Yes |
| RAISE School | No |
| ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024 | |
| Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) | No |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | |
| School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | |
| School Improvement Rating History | |
| DJJ Accountability Rating History | |

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | Total | |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | | 8 |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 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 |

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

| Indicator | Grade Level | Total |
|---|-------------|-------|
| Absent 10% or more school days | | |
| One or more suspensions | | |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | | |
| Course failure in Math | | |
| Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment | | |
| Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment | | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | | |

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|-------|
| Students with two or more indicators | | |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|-------|
| Retained Students: Current Year | | |
| Students retained two or more times | | |

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | Total | |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | | 8 |
| Absent 10% or more school days | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | Total | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | | 8 |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | Total | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | | 8 |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 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 |

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

| Accountability Component | 2023 | | | 2022 | | | 2021 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement* | | 43 | 50 | | 52 | 51 | | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | | | | | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | | | | | |
| Math Achievement* | | 34 | 38 | | 40 | 38 | | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | | | | | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | | | | | |

| Accountability Component | 2023 | | | 2022 | | | 2021 | | |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Science Achievement* | | 59 | 64 | | 37 | 40 | | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | 63 | 66 | | 44 | 48 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 43 | 44 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | 87 | 89 | | 63 | 61 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | 72 | 65 | | 66 | 67 | | | |
| ELP Progress | | 57 | 45 | | | | | | |

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | |
| Percent Tested | |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|----|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | |
| Percent Tested | |
| Graduation Rate | |

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

| 2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|---|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD | | | | |
| ELL | | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | | | | |
| HSP | | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | | | | |
| FRL | | | | |

| 2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|---|--|---------------------------|--|--|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD | | | | |
| ELL | | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | | | | |
| HSP | | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | | | | |
| FRL | | | | |

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

| 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SWD | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SWD | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SWD | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Because this is Riverside's first year in operation, there is no data to compare at this time. However, the majority of Riverside's newly-enrolled students demonstrate significant deficits in reading comprehension which has negatively impacted their academic success.

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

Because this is Riverside's first year in operation, there is no data to compare at this time.

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.

Because this is Riverside's first year in operation, there is no data to compare at this time. Riverside High School serves at-risk students who are typically at least two years behind their cohort. Riverside uses a different instructional model that provides students with mastery based learning and extended time in all classes.

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

Because this is Riverside's first year in operation, there is no data to compare at this time.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

Because this is Riverside's first year in operation, there is no EWS data to compare at this time. Based on the history of the currently-enrolled Riverside students, more than half (50%) of our students have a record of at least one EWI, with most having a history of poor school attendance and failing at least one class.

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

1st-Increasing the number of students who graduate high school on time/with cohort.

2nd-Increasing daily average school attendance.

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Because this is Riverside's first year in operation, there is no prior data that can be used to identify a crucial need. However, an analysis of current students' school records indicate that more than 50% of Riverside students are below grade level in ELA/reading. We plan to focus on raising our students' ELA/reading skills through the use of small-group instruction and a supplemental reading comprehension program.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will increase the number of students who pass the ELA assessment by at least 5%.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will engage in small group instruction throughout the school year. This will be monitored during classroom walkthroughs and observations, with feedback and coaching provided by administrators during individual meetings. Reading Plus is the supplemental reading program that is used by all students. The program provides the ability for teachers and administrators to monitor student progress and needs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dianne Jones (dianne.jones@als-education.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Riverside will be implementing the Reading Plus adaptive literacy program with all of our students. This program provides an evidenced-based comprehensive K-12 curriculum that improves fluency, comprehension, and vocabulary.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Reading Plus will provide teachers and administrators with a diagnostic look and real-time data regarding students needs and progress. Using this data, teachers will work with small groups to provide targeted instruction and monitor progress.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Teachers will be trained on how to use Reading Plus data to drive small-group instruction.

Person Responsible: Dianne Jones (dianne.jones@als-education.com)

By When: September 30, 2023

Administrators will monitor small group instruction and provide ongoing feedback and coaching to teachers.

Person Responsible: Dianne Jones (dianne.jones@als-education.com)

By When: Ongoing through May 30, 2024.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Riverside High School will implement a schoolwide positive behavior recognition program that will create a positive school culture based on celebrating positive choices and building a caring school community. To monitor the effectiveness of this initiative, we will administer student satisfaction surveys in the fall and spring of each year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Because this is our first year, we have no data to compare. We plan to use the fall survey results as our baseline data, and expect that the spring survey data will show an increase in overall student satisfaction by at least 10% .

Monitoring:

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

Fall and spring student survey data will be analyzed by staff to identify areas of strengths and needs. Adjustments to our initiatives will be made based on this data and input from student leaders.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dianne Jones (dianne.jones@als-education.com)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

To ensure a positive school climate that is based on the needs of our students, every Riverside student will participate in a psychosocial needs assessment within 30 days of enrollment. The assessment and associated scales (ACES, Likert, Resiliency Scales) are administered by a licensed/license -eligible clinician or by a clinical intern under the supervision of a licensed clinician.

Based on the results of those assessments, individual support plans are created for every student. This plan may include referrals to community providers to address specific needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Knowing the individual needs of the students will allow us to create a positive and supportive school climate. By conducting the individual psychosocial assessment within the first month of enrollment, we will be able to help students overcome barriers to school success and to provide a supportive school environment.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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.

Conduct student satisfaction surveys in the fall and spring. Analyze results with staff and student leaders to identify areas of strength and need.

Person Responsible: Dianne Jones (dianne.jones@als-education.com)

By When: Ongoing through April 2024.

Conduct psychosocial assessments with every student within 30 days of enrolling at Riverside. Implement a support plan based on identified needs.

Person Responsible: Dianne Jones (dianne.jones@als-education.com)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year until May 2024.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Riverside High School administration analyzes data during the summer and creates plans based on identified areas of need. The school budget is created with a collaborative team, and monitored via monthly meetings with the ALS finance and grants teams. The school principal identifies areas of focus based on multiple sources of data. Once the areas of focus have been determined, the principal identifies appropriate research-based interventions. The chosen intervention programs are vetted through our regional directors and educational platforms teams.