

Okaloosa County School District

Richbourg School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	15
Budget to Support Goals	16

Richbourg School

500 ALABAMA ST, Crestview, FL 32536

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Amy Anderson

Start Date for this Principal: 8/21/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	<i>[Data Not Available]</i>
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Economically Disadvantaged Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: I (%)
ESSA Status	CS&I

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Okaloosa 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

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

Provide the school's vision statement

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

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
Anderson, Amy	Principal	Make educational and staffing decisions for the school to provide for continual instructional and social emotional learning/behavioral improvement.
Dye, Sandy	Teacher, K-12	
Lusk, Karen	Other	Music teacher K-12.
Rosero-Garces, Otto	Teacher, ESE	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 8/21/2020, Amy Anderson

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.*

0

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

15

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School PK-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	<i>[Data Not Available]</i>
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Economically Disadvantaged Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: I (%)
ESSA Status	CS&I

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	4	2	6	3	6	9	6	4	6	3	7	7	4	67
Attendance below 90 percent	2	2	2	2	2	3	1	1	7	0	3	3	7	35
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	3	0	1	0	1	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	1	0	2	2	1	2	1	1	10

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/21/2020

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	3	4	7	5	9	9	5	3	5	3	9	7	17	86
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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	3	4	7	5	9	9	5	3	5	3	9	7	17	86
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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	0%	69%	61%	0%	68%	60%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	63%	59%	0%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	59%	54%	0%	48%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	0%	80%	62%	0%	77%	61%
Math Learning Gains	0%	73%	59%	0%	66%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	64%	52%	0%	58%	52%
Science Achievement	0%	73%	56%	0%	67%	57%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	84%	78%	0%	85%	77%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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
03	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

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

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

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)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	20
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	100
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	94%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	20
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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	20
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	19
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

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

There is no data available in this plan. The previous plan showed ELA Writing to be lowest performing category. Contributing factors include unfamiliarity with the test for the students and unfamiliarity with testing parameters for the teachers.

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

Writing. See above.

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

There are no comparisons to the state average.

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

There are no comparisons to state average.

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

Attendance is a concern revealed from the EWS data.

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

1. ELA Writing scores
2. Standards-based instruction
- 3.

- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: ELA writing was revealed as the lowest area of growth. Student communication in written form is an important academic and life skill for our students.

Measureable Outcome: Students scoring proficient on the FSAA will increase 25% on this year's FSAA compared to the last given FSAA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Amy Anderson (andersona1@okaloosaschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Training in utilization of new curriculum for the school, ULS. The curriculum is aligned to access points, and is written in format similar to FSAA, which will familiarize students with the assessment. This will also provide training for the teachers in presentation of material which impacts how students will be assessed.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Unique Learning Skills (ULS) is a standards-based curriculum. This resource is aligned with Florida standards and access points, and is specifically designed for special needs students.

Action Steps to Implement

Initial training/professional development for teachers in ULS. This will occur during pre-planning. ULS is providing the initial training. Principal responsible for monitoring training.

Person Responsible Amy Anderson (andersona1@okaloosaschools.com)

Teachers will use the recommended monthly lesson plans embedded into ULS to make the transition smooth and as easy as possible. This will occur throughout the school year.

Person Responsible Amy Anderson (andersona1@okaloosaschools.com)

Professional development/assistance will be provided as needed to individuals or groups to ensure the program is used consistently and with fidelity. Throughout the school year as needed.

Person Responsible Amy Anderson (andersona1@okaloosaschools.com)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Through continuing dialogue with teachers and parents, school-wide alignment to standards is inconsistent. The requirement for teachers to create much of their own material due to the lack of a provided curriculum led to standards being emphasized depending on the teacher and his or her familiarity and proficiency in the standards.

Measureable Outcome: Monthly pre- and post-learning quizzes will demonstrate student proficiency in standards-based learning of at least 75% of the student population utilizing ULS for academic standards instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Amy Anderson (andersona1@okaloosaschools.com)

Evidence-based Strategy: Continual professional development relating to ULS, the curriculum providing standards-focused instruction, and refresher training on the meaning and intent of the standards, with an emphasis on essential understandings embedded in standards.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In preparation for the shift to the state's B.E.S.T. standards, a review/ refresher will help build a bridge from current standards to the coming standards. Professional Development will be ongoing, occurring in grade level department meetings throughout the school year.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers encouraged to plan together using a common curriculum; support provided by principal, guidance counselor, and ESE coach.

Person Responsible Amy Anderson (andersona1@okaloosaschools.com)

Identify teacher leaders with a clear understanding of the current standards to be part of a group introducing access points to the B.E.S.T. standards. Start training for this group in February, utilizing available district and school supports.

Person Responsible Amy Anderson (andersona1@okaloosaschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Attendance: Due to the nature of our students' varied disabilities, attendance can be a challenge. Teachers and office staff will contact prior to sending home mandatory letters to determine if illness or medical necessity resulted in attendance issues. If not, we will encourage parents to attend an MTSS meeting via online platform to find ways to be sure students get to school regularly.

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.

The school is moving to a PBIS system this year. Teacher leaders, staff members, and parents were part of the team responsible for drafting the goals and targeted expected behaviors. This team will meet monthly to review data collected and make adjustments and improvements to the team as needed.

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: ELA				\$10,384.30
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5200	519-Technology-Related Supplies	0801 - Richbourg School	Title, I Part A		\$6,384.30
<i>Notes: iPads and iPad cases will be ordered for students in order to help them access supplemental material more easily.</i>						
	6400	750-Other Personal Services	0801 - Richbourg School	Title, I Part A		\$4,000.00
<i>Notes: Training for new system (ULS) with a focus on pulling out writing standards. Substitues @\$100/day so teachers can attend.</i>						
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction				\$4,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	750-Other Personal Services	0801 - Richbourg School	Title, I Part A		\$4,000.00
<i>Notes: Professional Development focused on standards; substitute pay so teachers can attend</i>						
Total:						\$29,876.30