

Broward County Public Schools

Riverside Elementary 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	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	17
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Riverside Elementary School

11450 RIVERSIDE DR, Coral Springs, FL 33071

[no web address on file]

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Broward County School Board on 10/17/2023.

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 Elementary School, in partnership with parents and the community, is committed to developing well-rounded students with the ability to contribute to society and envision a better future.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Educating today's students to succeed in tomorrow's world.

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
White, Jonathan	Assistant Principal	

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.

Administration has created a platform during our weekly support staff meetings to receive insight and input from our stakeholders directly involved in this work. This includes our ESE specialist, ESE support facilitator, literacy coach, school counselor, and special-program teachers.

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))

Implementation and fidelity will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs along with student performance data from both the FAST PM (progress monitoring) assessments and the iReady Diagnostic assessments.

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)	Elementary School PK-5

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	65%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	45%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
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)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
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	21	20	38	28	26	25	0	0	0	158
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	2	2	3	0	0	0	8
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	9	16	18	21	16	12	0	0	0	92
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	4	17	29	21	17	0	0	0	88
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	9	17	33	31	16	16	0	0	0	122

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	6	12	25	31	17	21	0	0	0	112

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	2	1	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	16	36	26	26	17	17	0	0	0	138
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	3	6	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	20	20	13	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	22	15	24	0	0	0	61
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	8	9	3	10	3	0	0	0	33

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	3	5	11	24	18	0	0	0	61

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	5	0	1	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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 days	16	36	26	26	17	17	0	0	0	138
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	3	6	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	20	20	13	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	22	15	24	0	0	0	61
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	8	9	3	10	3	0	0	0	33

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	3	5	11	24	18	0	0	0	61

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	5	0	1	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	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*	63	56	53	68	58	56	58		
ELA Learning Gains				73			50		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53			37		
Math Achievement*	70	62	59	69	54	50	49		
Math Learning Gains				78			40		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				63			20		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	69	48	54	60	59	59	53		
Social Studies Achievement*					71	64			
Middle School Acceleration					60	52			
Graduation Rate					45	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	52	59	59	68			60		

* 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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	64
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	318
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	532
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98
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	34	Yes	2	
ELL	55			
AMI				
ASN	72			
BLK	58			
HSP	60			
MUL	70			
PAC				
WHT	73			
FRL	56			

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	38	Yes	1	
ELL	61			
AMI				
ASN	94			
BLK	70			
HSP	57			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	66			
FRL	64			

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	63			70			69					52
SWD	25			34			41				4	
ELL	48			61			63				5	52
AMI												
ASN	72			72							2	
BLK	53			67			60				4	
HSP	57			67			59				5	53
MUL	70			70							2	
PAC												
WHT	71			73			81				4	
FRL	54			61			59				5	49

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	68	73	53	69	78	63	60					68
SWD	23	43	36	39	59	47	21					
ELL	56	61	38	64	75		64					68
AMI												
ASN	93	90		93	100							
BLK	67	82	71	66	80	76	50					
HSP	61	61	42	59	69	42	54					66
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	70	69	43	75	77	64	67					
FRL	63	76	54	58	75	69	46					67

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	58	50	37	49	40	20	53					60
SWD	22	27	22	17	17	16	17					60
ELL	42	56	50	51	44		56					60

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	53			76								60
BLK	49	40		39	32		43					
HSP	52	51	33	41	28	20	48					59
MUL	30											
PAC												
WHT	72	49		58	51	27	63					
FRL	46	37	37	38	29	19	37					71

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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	68%	56%	12%	54%	14%
04	2023 - Spring	69%	61%	8%	58%	11%
03	2023 - Spring	61%	53%	8%	50%	11%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	68%	62%	6%	59%	9%
04	2023 - Spring	76%	65%	11%	61%	15%
05	2023 - Spring	70%	58%	12%	55%	15%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	69%	46%	23%	51%	18%

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.

Our SWD subgroup is performing below that 41% maker and below our other student subgroups.

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

Measuring only for proficiency put our SWD subgroup at a disadvantage during the 22/23 school year. Measuring for ELA and Math proficiency on the FAST assessment, 21% of our SWD students achieved proficiency scores.

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.

Measuring only for proficiency put our SWD subgroup at a disadvantage during the 22/23 school year. Measuring for ELA and Math proficiency on the FAST assessment, 21% of our SWD students achieved proficiency scores.

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

Science Achievement increased nine percentage points, from 60% in 2022, to 69% in 2023.

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

Our lowest quartile learning gains appear to be a historic concern along with our SWD student subgroup.

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

*Increasing our SWD subgroup to a federal index above 50%.

*Increasing our ELA lowest 25th percentile above 60%.

Area of Focus

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**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.

During the 21/22 school year, our SWD subgroup had a significantly lower federal index (38%) than our all-student federal index (67%). During the 22/23 school year, our SWD federal index unfortunately fell below 30% when measured exclusively for proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By June of 2024, the federal index for students with disabilities (SWD) at Riverside Elementary will increase to 50%.

Monitoring:

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

Student-by-student progress monitoring using the FAST PM (progress monitoring) assessments and the iReady Diagnostic assessments, along with intervention performance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jonathan White (jonathan.white@browardschools.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.)

Progress monitoring to diagnose student learning gaps, create instructional goals, and then monitor performance toward the goal.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

An effective progress monitoring plan will allow us to identify, instruct, and celebrate the identified student subgroup.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

Identification of all students in our SWD subgroup, collecting baseline student performance data, goal setting, altering schedules to the needs of our SWD subgroup, initiating mentor groups to motivate our SWD subgroup students, evaluating growth using FAST PM data along with iReady Diagnostic data.

Person Responsible: Jonathan White (jonathan.white@browardschools.com)

By When: 09/29/23

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

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.

School-based mentoring will be utilized for our SWD subgroup. School leadership will be assigned to mentor, motivate, monitor learning and attendance, and build relationships with each identified student they are assigned to.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By June of 2024, the federal index for students with disabilities (SWD) at Riverside Elementary will increase to 50%.

Monitoring:

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

Administration will conducted frequent check-ins with our support staff members who will serve as mentors for our targeted subgroup.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jonathan White (jonathan.white@browardschools.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.)

School-based mentoring program.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

School-based mentoring will be utilized for our SWD subgroup. School leadership will be assigned to mentor, motivate, monitor learning and attendance, and build relationships with each identified student they are assigned to.

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.

Create mentor groups and assign support staff members to each group

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: 09/29/23

Monitor how mentor groups are proceeding and how administration can support mentors and mentees.

Person Responsible: Jonathan White (jonathan.white@browardschools.com)

By When: 10/27/23

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).

Consideration for allocation for our school improvement plan (SIP) funds are presented to our school advisory council (SAC). Quorum must be met for any votes to take place. All meetings are shared with our entire Riverside community monthly. Meetings are also held in-person and via Teams. The School Advisory Council must be composed of stakeholders from specific subgroups, one being a parent of an ESE student. Administration, along with our School Advisory Council Chair and Secretary, will continue to emphasize our SIP goal of increasing the federal index for our SWD student subgroup. Funding allocations will be based on student and school needs – ensuring our stakeholder groups are in attendance will ensure funding is allocated based on these needs.