

Duval County Public Schools

River City Science Academy



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	20

River City Science Academy

7565 BEACH BLVD, Jacksonville, FL 32216

www.rivercityscience.org

Demographics

Principal: Alisher Kutatov

Start Date for this Principal: 7/15/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
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)	49%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
School Grades History	2018-19: A (70%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	
* 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 Duval 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

To ensure all students reach their maximum potential in a diverse, structured, and nurturing environment and to prepare students for a future in the areas of science, technology, engineering, and math.

Provide the school's vision statement

To ensure that students become successful in their subsequent education and responsible and productive citizens in a rapidly changing world

To apply innovative methods and interdisciplinary instruction and rigor, creating a stimulating and student-centered learning environment

To model, educate and engage students in critical thinking and problem solving by teaching the whole child extending beyond the classroom

To be a catalyst for change in STEM education

To graduate every student college or career ready

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
Kuvatov, Alisher	Principal	<p>Principal- Alisher Kuvatov: Serves as the educational leader and chief executive of the school; responsible for the direction of the instructional program, operation of the school plant, participates in staff and student activities along with community leadership. Sets the general tone of the school; coordinates parent groups and school advisory committee; represents the school to the community at large. Works with assistant principals, counselors and faculty to establish and maintain educational program. Prepares school budgets; approves expenditures within the school; responsible for the financial solvency of the school. Interviews, selects, supervises and evaluates all school personnel. Establishes rules and regulations for proper student conduct; maintains student discipline; prosecute discipline cases of a serious nature. Assesses strengths of the school, identifies its weaknesses and takes corrective action. Oversees maintenance of the school, beautification of the grounds, and general upkeep of the school plant. Identifies and provides in-service opportunities for faculty members. Establishes an effective school administration organization with clear lines of responsibility and with necessary delegation of authority. Makes periodic appraisals of student progress. Makes plans for the most effective use of curriculum materials, instructional supplies, equipment, building facilities, school grounds and community resources.</p>
Ferrari, Amanda	Instructional Coach	<p>Dean of Academics & Literacy Coach- Amanda Ferrari: Mrs. Ferrari is responsible for coordinating school-wide professional development, overseeing the mentor-mentee induction of all new teachers, conducting classroom observations and helping to teach formulate and address goals related to their teaching practice, organizing and implementing lesson studies and action research, and leading observation lessons as needed. She also coordinates the Literacy Leadership team, whose focus is to develop school-wide goals related to literacy and to work with teachers to address those school-wide literacies goals.</p>
Jackson, Megan	Dean	<p>Dean of Discipline- Megan Jackson: Monitors the hallway/ restroom along with security in the morning, during class time and during bell change throughout the day - ensuring that students are entering and exiting the cafeteria in a safe and orderly manner; Processes</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>referrals and complete investigations of various student situations; Speaks with students that are having issues with other students (cocounsel with Ms. Lewis); Handles any bus referrals to ensure the safety of bus riders; Run discipline report weekly to assess consequences; Monitors the cafeteria; After school/Saturday detentionorganizing and running detention; Building security- assists in walking the building and the campus grounds to ensure the safety of the school, students and staff; Conducts monthly fire drills in accordance with the district regulations; Issues lockers and handles any issues that may arise; Conducts periodic drills to make sure students are wearing their ID</p>
<p>Williamson, Katrina</p>	<p>Guidance Counselor</p>	<p>Guidance Counselor- Katrina Williamson: Provides curriculum information in classrooms, small groups, or individual settings: promotion requirements, graduation requirements, EOC/FSA score information, safety net/tutoring opportunities. Assists students with acquiring the necessary attitudes, knowledge, and skills that contribute to effective learning in school and across their lifespan. Supports students to complete school with the academic preparation essential to choose from a wide range of substantial post-secondary options. Assists students with understanding the relationship of academics to the world of work, life at home, and in the community. Assist students to acquire the knowledge, attitudes, and interpersonal skills, to help them understand and respect self and others. Supports students to make good decisions, set goals, and take necessary actions to achieve goals. Counsels individual students or small groups with their personal concerns. Provides follow up counseling for bullying referrals. Facilitate or follow up abuse reports. Meets with school district 504 team to determine students who may need 504 plans. Updates 504 plans on a yearly basis; Leads school ELL program including providing CELLA test to ELL students</p>

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/15/2020, Alisher Kutatov

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
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)	49%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (70%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (65%) 2015-16: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA

ESSA Status	
* 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	159	140	153	143	118	98	0	811
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	16	10	13	13	12	14	0	78
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	11	10	18	10	7	2	7	65
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	12	0	15	14	0	45
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	10	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	16	7	13	15	0	1	57
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	2	6	4	0	0	0	18

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

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
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

Wednesday 7/15/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	149	147	143	132	133	115	112	931
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	27	25	18	15	9	4	113
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	9	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4	10	14	3	3	53

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	3	6	2	0	0	0	11

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	3	3	3	1	19	2	9	40
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	149	147	143	132	133	115	112	931
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	27	25	18	15	9	4	113
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	9	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	15	4	10	14	3	3	53

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	3	6	2	0	0	0	11

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	3	3	3	1	19	2	9	40
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	2

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	75%	47%	56%	74%	47%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	62%	48%	51%	65%	49%	53%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	42%	42%	61%	42%	44%
Math Achievement	79%	51%	51%	76%	51%	51%
Math Learning Gains	64%	52%	48%	59%	55%	48%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	47%	45%	61%	50%	45%
Science Achievement	68%	65%	68%	64%	61%	67%
Social Studies Achievement	83%	70%	73%	80%	67%	71%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey								
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(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
06	2019	69%	47%	22%	54%	15%
	2018	67%	44%	23%	52%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	79%	44%	35%	52%	27%
	2018	80%	41%	39%	51%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
08	2019	80%	49%	31%	56%	24%
	2018	70%	51%	19%	58%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	66%	48%	18%	55%	11%
	2018	80%	48%	32%	53%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
10	2019	82%	48%	34%	53%	29%
	2018	75%	49%	26%	53%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	90%	51%	39%	55%	35%
	2018	90%	42%	48%	52%	38%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	88%	47%	41%	54%	34%
	2018	84%	50%	34%	54%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
08	2019	74%	32%	42%	46%	28%
	2018	56%	31%	25%	45%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	59%	40%	19%	48%	11%
	2018	35%	44%	-9%	50%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		24%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	68%	67%	1%	67%	1%
2018	81%	63%	18%	65%	16%
Compare		-13%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	82%	69%	13%	71%	11%
2018	89%	84%	5%	71%	18%
Compare		-7%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	84%	68%	16%	70%	14%
2018	68%	64%	4%	68%	0%
Compare		16%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	56%	57%	-1%	61%	-5%
2018	70%	61%	9%	62%	8%
Compare		-14%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	83%	61%	22%	57%	26%
2018	68%	57%	11%	56%	12%
Compare		15%			

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	36	41	36	48	47	52		58			
ELL	64	65	62	76	73	78	48	68			
ASN	87	58		97	83		80	89			
BLK	66	58	45	72	57	67	54	73	68	96	73
HSP	71	63	54	74	68	69	63	73	61	100	47
MUL	86	66		82	69			100			
WHT	79	64	53	82	64	58	75	89	71	91	62
FRL	71	61	49	74	62	61	63	77	68	93	43

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	35	60	63	44	55	47	40	77			
ELL	50	71	64	67	55	50	50	61	18		
ASN	89	68		96	85		92	80			

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
BLK	61	52	57	62	54	62	44	68	48	93	71
HSP	71	70	70	75	56	45	64	73	28		
MUL	87	71		83	65		79	92	83		
WHT	78	68	60	80	59	60	68	86	66	96	69
FRL	69	65	67	72	57	58	59	77	51	94	50

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	41
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	813
Total Components for the Federal Index	12
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
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	64
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	82
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	66

Black/African American Students	
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	65
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	81
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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
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	70
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	63
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

The data component that showed the lowest performance was ELA Lowest 25th Percentile. The contributing factors that led to this low performance include the number of ESL and ESE students that are part of this cohort.

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

The component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was also ELA Lowest 25th Percentile. The contributing factors that led to this low performance include the number of ESL and ESE students that are part of this cohort.

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 data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was Math Achievement. Our school was 26% above the state average in our Math Achievement. Factors that contributed to this include after-school tutoring, weekend study/tutoring opportunities, highly-effective teachers in these classes. We also include many individualized support programs in Math that adapt to each student's areas of weakness.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was Math learning gains. We provided after-school tutoring, weekend study/tutoring opportunities, highly-effective teachers in these classes. We also include many individualized support programs in Math that adapt to each student's areas of weakness. These are all things that we have always offered. In addition, students are part of Math and Science Olympiad teams that allow for more application of their knowledge than rote memory.

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

One area of concern is the number of students who had attendance lower than 90%. Another area of concern is the number of students who scored a 1 on the ELA FSA.

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

1. Increase learning gains for our bottom quartile.
2. Decrease the number of classroom-based referrals
3. Increase our graduation percentage
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: An adjusted academic improvement target that we would choose to focus on is increasing the ELA Achievement percentage specifically for the bottom quartile population. In the 2018-2019 school year, only 23.1% of our ELL population earned passing scores on the Florida State Assessment for English Language Arts. This is in comparison to 77.2% passing for our non-ELL population (FSA English Language Arts; Student Performance by Subgroup). An area of opportunity to improve this data would be to develop a program that would promote further ELL-parent involvement.

Measureable Outcome: Within the current School Improvement Plan, River City Science Academy targeted the bottom quartile overall population with the goal in mind of increasing learning gains from 50% to 52%, representing a 5% increase.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Amanda Ferrari (aferrari@rivercityscience.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will utilize team meetings, department meetings, data chats, PLCs, and even the application element of PD sessions to discuss progress, resources, challenges, etc. to meet the needs of the specific bottom quartile students they see in class. Achieve 3000/Benchmark/progress monitoring data. Additionally, The monthly data chats that are held between the Dean of Academics and Reading/ELA teachers will engage discussion around the initial data that was collected, the initial action plan that was developed for these students, and the subsequent, less formal classroom data that helps to determine if adequate progress is being made toward the goals for these students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Data chats with teachers will focus heavily on the implications that the data results have for the specific bottom-quartile students identified with each teacher.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: If we take a proactive and responsive approach to discipline issues and safety risks, then our disciplinary referrals will decrease. In addition, RCSA will implement a Character Education program that will focus on traits selected by the RCSA students, staff, parents, and community. It is often the case that more discipline issues arise in classes where teachers are newer or have less experience in management strategies and proactive interventions for resolving discipline-related issues.

Measureable Outcome: Last year, we had 199 referrals for lower-level infractions. The goal for this year will be a total of no more than 190.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Megan Jackson (mjackson@rivercityscience.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students who are flagged for discipline intervention will be placed on a behavioral RtI plan by the Dean of Discipline. In addition, a stricter code of conduct will be enforced that increases the progression from Level I to Level II infractions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: It is often the case that more discipline issues arise in classes where teachers are newer or have less experience in management strategies and proactive interventions for resolving discipline-related issues. This intervention can be a guide for some teachers to help them identify and implement classroom interventions for students with behavioral challenges. Students will be flagged for a behavioral RtI following their first referral.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#3. Other specifically relating to Graduation Rate

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: If we provide responsive and pro-active guidance counseling and support, then our four-year graduation rate will increase.

Measureable Outcome: An increase in the percentage of the four-year graduation rate to 97%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Alisher Kuvatov (akuvatov@rivercityscience.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Finding solutions to the causes that lead individual students to drop out are often deeper issues and require more extensive involvement than a traditional classroom teacher is able to address. The use of faculty guidance counselors to address and remedy the situations that cause students to contemplate dropping out can help us to continue the success we have seen and even increase our graduation rate closer to 100%.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In the area of guidance counseling, we want to do more for our high school students than just offering annual check-ins for scheduling/credit purposes and offering opportunities for college visits. Particularly, for those students who are flagged by our faculty and/or administration as being considered "at risk," we intend for our guidance counselors to take a pro-active approach to establish their own goals and plans for earning their diploma, and then working on a regular basis with students and teachers to make sure there is follow-through with the plans to order to make sure every one of our students make it to graduation.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

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.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Graduation Rate	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00