

Orange County Public Schools

Riverside Elementary



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

Riverside Elementary

3125 PEMBROOK DR, Orlando, FL 32810

<https://riversidees.ocps.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Kimberly Hankerson

Start Date for this Principal: 6/13/2017

2019-20 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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: D (36%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: D (39%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success.

Provide the school's vision statement

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hankerson, Kimberly	Principal	Provides a common vision through the use of data-based decisions making in order to structure the instructional focus for the planning process, delivery of lessons and assessment of standards so that students are making progress toward proficiency.
Kelly, Carla	Teacher, ESE	Meets all requirements and compliance items for ESE students. Converses and meets regularly with classroom teachers regarding students that may need a behavior/discipline plan. Monitors ESE students EWI signals.
Oakes, Lindsey	Instructional Coach	Facilitate the "New to Riverside Teachers" and beginning teacher programs. Conducts non-evaluation feedback, completes coaching cycle (observations, model lessons, provide feedback), classroom throughs, provides professional development.
Scott Smith, Tameika	Instructional Coach	Instructional support for Math and Science. Supports teachers in building lessons plans, and assessments. Conducts non-evaluation feedback, completes coaching cycle (observations, model lessons, provide feedback), classroom throughs, provides professional development.
Delucia, Stephanie	Dean	Instructional support for ELA. Support teachers in building lessons and assessments. Conducts non-evaluation feedback, completes coaching cycle (observations, model lessons, provide feedback), classroom throughs, provides professional development.
Hurdle, Charisse	Assistant Principal	Provides support and guidance for the common vision and monitors for student growth and teacher planning.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 6/13/2017, Kimberly Hankerson

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

43

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: D (36%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: D (39%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	Diane Leinenbach
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	31	77	90	77	86	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	450
Attendance below 90 percent	7	21	27	22	25	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	117
One or more suspensions	0	2	4	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	18	24	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	23	22	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	4	21	25	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68

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	2	0	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 6/22/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	52	77	84	89	98	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	490
Attendance below 90 percent	15	25	24	21	23	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124
One or more suspensions	2	9	8	5	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Course failure in ELA or Math	13	21	24	22	20	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	40	46	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118

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	3	11	10	28	30	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104

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	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	52	77	84	89	98	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	490
Attendance below 90 percent	15	25	24	21	23	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124
One or more suspensions	2	9	8	5	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Course failure in ELA or Math	13	21	24	22	20	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	125
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	40	46	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	118

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	3	11	10	28	30	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104

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	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	42%	57%	57%	42%	56%	56%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Learning Gains	53%	58%	58%	41%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	52%	53%	29%	48%	48%
Math Achievement	54%	63%	63%	43%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains	63%	61%	62%	35%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	48%	51%	23%	46%	47%
Science Achievement	42%	56%	53%	39%	55%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	40%	55%	-15%	58%	-18%
	2018	43%	55%	-12%	57%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	39%	57%	-18%	58%	-19%
	2018	32%	54%	-22%	56%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	43%	54%	-11%	56%	-13%
	2018	46%	55%	-9%	55%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	54%	62%	-8%	62%	-8%
	2018	46%	61%	-15%	62%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	49%	63%	-14%	64%	-15%
	2018	38%	62%	-24%	62%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	49%	57%	-8%	60%	-11%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	35%	59%	-24%	61%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	41%	54%	-13%	53%	-12%
	2018	36%	53%	-17%	55%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	22	46	53	24	54	47					
ELL	24	50	55	38	52	60	13				
BLK	38	56	56	51	66	61	34				
HSP	36	53	64	50	60	71	38				
MUL	18			27							
WHT	55	49		66	63		62				
FRL	37	52	64	49	58	65	34				

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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	21	22	9	21	11	15					
ELL	29	35		29	33	30					
BLK	38	38	19	42	33	22	42				
HSP	45	46		35	37	21	27				
MUL	17			23	40						
WHT	48	38	15	58	35		46				
FRL	39	42	31	41	36	26	35				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	54

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	49
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	428
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
----------------------	--

Students With Disabilities	
-----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - English Language Learners	43
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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	52
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
--------------------------	--

Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
-----------------------------	--

Federal Index - Multiracial Students	23
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

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
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	59
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	51
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Students in grades 3-5 performed lowest in ELA and Science Achievement with 42% in each category for the 2018-2019 school year. However, Science Achievement increased by 3% points and ELA Achievement maintained their scores from the prior year. Factors that contributed to this low performance is some students in these grade levels are reading two or more years below grade level according to iReady data. During the 2018-2019 school year, fourth grade students increased in ELA Achievement by 7% points while third and fifth grade ELA Achievement went down by 3% points. There was a large focus on ELA mediation for these grade levels which decreased the allotted time for enrichment for ELA. Also, the focus on Science was split between Science and Math during PLCs.

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

Overall, Riverside either maintained or increased in all areas during the 2018-20019 school year. The ELA Achievement was maintained at 42%. All other areas increased.

Students in 4th grade increased in ELA Achievement by 7% points while third and fifth grade ELA Achievement went down by 3% points

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

The greatest gap compared to the state is ELA Achievement in 3rd and 4th grade. In the 2018-2019 school year, Riverside's third grade ELA Achievement scores was 40%; however the states average was 58%. That was a 18% gap. Also, Riverside's 4th grade ELA achievement was 39% and the state average was 58%. That was a 19% gap. A factor for fourth grade gap was many students lacked knowledge for the writing process. Some third grade students were working on closing foundation gaps for the majority of the school year during intervention time. This prevented teachers for extending grade level standard instruction.

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

Students increased by 28% in Math Learning gains, from 35% last year to 63% during the 2018-2019 school year. Students also increased 42% in Lowest 25% Learning Gains for Math. This was the first year with a Math/Science Coach. Teachers also meet weekly to discuss Math lessons and Small group lessons. Teachers also discussed Math interventions and Acaletics was purchased for class use.

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

After analyzing the EWS data, two areas of concern are students scoring Level 1 on FSA and course failure. However, FSA Level 1 scores went down for this year. Identified students will be monitored for these two areas throughout the year by reviewing iReady data and Report Cards.

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

1. Increase ELA Achievement.
2. Increase Science Achievement.
3. Strengthen MTSS structure and support with a heavy focus on multiracial students.
4. Continue the structure of common planning for grade levels.
5. Improve Social Emotional Learning (SEL) support.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Standard-based differentiated instruction in ELA, Math and Science is an area of focus due to needing to individually intervene based on student's needs to close gaps and increase student proficiency was identified as a critical need. 42% of students demonstrated proficiency in ELA, 53% demonstrated proficiency on Mathematics and 42% of students demonstrated proficiency in Science.

Measureable Outcome: By increasing the rigor of standard-based differentiated instruction through close reading, engagement strategies, and small groups; we anticipate seeing proficiency increase from 42% to 50% in English Language Arts, from 54% to 57% in Mathematics and from 42% to 50% in Science. In addition, by implementing the action steps, the learning gains in ELA for our lowest 25% will increase from 60% to 65%, and Mathematics learning gains in our lowest 25% will increase from 65% to 68%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kimberly Hankerson (kimberly.hankerson@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students systematically engage in processing content to generate conclusions through collaborative interactions with other students. This will be monitored through interactive notebooks and informal walk tthroughs with actionable feedback provided to teachers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In order for effective student construction of meaning to occur, students must be actively engaged in the processing of information through a teaching and learning process that involves an interaction among the teacher, the students and the content.

Action Steps to Implement

1. After-school tutoring will be provided to the lowest 25% of students in grades 3-5.

Person Responsible Stephanie Delucia (stephanie.delucia@ocps.net)

2. Weekly Math Principal Quizzes will be given to grades 3-5.

Person Responsible Tameika Scott Smith (tameikam.scottsmith@ocps.net)

3. Provide mini-assessments for 5th grade science.

Person Responsible Tameika Scott Smith (tameikam.scottsmith@ocps.net)

4. Grades 4-5 will be assigned weekly science vocabulary words.

Person Responsible Tameika Scott Smith (tameikam.scottsmith@ocps.net)

5. Students will attend WIN (What I Need) for grades 3-5 ELA and math. 5th grade will attend WIN or science.

Person Responsible Stephanie Delucia (stephanie.delucia@ocps.net)

6. Close reading strategies learned through the District Professional learning Community training will continue to be implemented.

Person Responsible Stephanie Delucia (stephanie.delucia@ocps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: By placing a priority on the MTSS process and establishing an understanding of expectations for implementation, the identification of students' needs will occur and can be addressed. In targeting the specific needs of our student, overall student achievement will increase.

Measureable Outcome: Currently, 58% of students in K-2 are performing on grade level according to ELA iReady End of year (EOY) Diagnostic for 2018-2019. Also, students scoring proficient in FSA ELA is 42% in the 2018-2019 school year. By strengthening and monitoring the effectiveness of ELA MTSS process, our percentage of students reading on grade level will increase to 70% performing on grade level in K-2 according to iReady Diagnostic and 50% proficient on FSA ELA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Stephanie Delucia (stephanie.delucia@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Providing intensive instruction (Standards and reading Instruction). This will be monitored through iReady Diagnostic results.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers match the intensity of instruction to the intensity of the student's learning. Intensive instruction involves working with students with similar needs on a small number of high priority, clearly defined skills or concepts critical to academic success. Teachers group students based on common learning needs; clearly define learning goals; and use systematic, explicit and well-paced instruction. They frequently monitor students' progress and adjust their instruction accordingly. Within intensive instruction, students have many opportunities to respond and receive immediate, corrective feedback with teachers and peers to practice what they are learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. A classroom walk-through schedule will be developed and executed during reading intervention and small ELA group time.

Person Responsible Stephanie Delucia (stephanie.delucia@ocps.net)

2. Instructional coaches and administration will meet weekly to analyze ELA data to make instructional decisions about small group lessons and intervention groups.

Person Responsible Kimberly Hankerson (kimberly.hankerson@ocps.net)

3. As a Culturally Responsive School, we plan to train our parents on what it means to be trauma-informed and about self-regulation and mindfulness. Our monthly parent meetings led by PEL will include both information on reading and trauma-informed care.

Person Responsible Kimberly Hankerson (kimberly.hankerson@ocps.net)

4. In response to ESSA outcomes regarding students of multi-racial ethnicity, we plan to monitor their academic growth and intervene as needed.

Person Responsible Lindsey Oakes (lindsey.oakes@ocps.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Riverside will build and establish a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with adults and students. Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to their academic work. By ensuring that our school has a positive culture for social and emotional learning, we will consequently see an increase in student achievement and a decrease in student discipline. We will also see an improvement in teacher attendance. will decrease.

Measurable Outcome: During the 2019-2020 school year, Riverside Elementary we had _____ (___%)level ___ referrals. We plan to decrease this percentage by 5%, by implementing, social skills groups, quarterly code of conduct reviews, and restorative practices. During the 2019-2020 school year, Riverside Elementary had ___ "threats to others" reported. With a focus on social skills groups, we will decrease the number of "threat to others" by 5%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kimberly Hankerson (kimberly.hankerson@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise with all students. Our school will plan and implement cycles of professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data. Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of culture and climate survey data, needs assessments, classroom observations, and school environment observations. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, and adult needs

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building. To create a culture of social and emotional learning with adults and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school. Through a distributive leadership model, our school will strengthen the team dynamics necessary to collectively support positive organizational improvement and change. Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary. Through a distributive leadership model our school can implement efficient and sustainable continuous improvement practices that will support the social, emotional, and academic development of every student.

Action Steps to Implement

Riverside Elementary will continue to utilize the house system as modeled by Ron Clark Academy to build a sense of community across the school and help students gain a sense of belonging. Students will work collaboratively with other house members to earn points school-wide towards a greater goal as a method to increase student engagement and positive behaviors in the learning environment. House points will be posted weekly and the house with the most points will receive a celebration each nine weeks. House meetings will focus on diving deeper into the character trait of the month with practical hands-on activities and discussions.

Person Responsible Tameika Scott Smith (tameikam.scottsmith@ocps.net)

Riverside will implement the Sanford Harmony curriculum during the Health block. The school guidance counselor will provide professional development on the appropriate use of the materials. The implementation of the lessons will be monitored and the teachers will receive feedback.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school will work to bolster all students and subgroups, while also focusing on the priority areas of focus noted above.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate, Riverside engages in ongoing, district-wide professional learning in leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, Riverside use social

and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration on order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, Riverside uses the CASEL Core Competences as a common language to support a positive culture of social and emotional learning and connect cognitive and conative strategies to support student success. A core team of teachers, which includes a mental health designee, will attend this district-wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team will works with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for school stakeholders, based on school and community needs. School leadership teams collaborate with stakeholders, through processes such as as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine next steps. Development of positive culture and environment is further enhances through district programs sch as the Parent Academy, School utilize staff sch as Parent Engagement Liaison and bridge the community and school culture.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget			
1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00