
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	16
Budget to Support Goals	0

Riverview Learning Center

801 N WILD OLIVE AVE, Daytona Beach, FL 32118

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/alternative-education/pages/riverview-and-highbanks-learning-centers.asp>

Demographics

Principal: Dale Johns

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2001

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
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)	
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
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 Volusia 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

We believe that all students should be provided an opportunity for educational success. Therefore, our mission is to assist in developing independent skills in students that promote graduation assurance through a structured alternative program during an unintentional break in the traditional school environment.

Alternative Education Strategies Include: Differentiated Instruction, Developing Individual Skills, Advocate Appropriately, Social Skills, Behavior Modification, Cornell Note-Taking, One Binder System, Goal Setting/Progress Monitoring, and Gradual Release Model

Provide the school's vision statement

Our greatest contribution is to be sure that there is a teacher in every classroom who cares that every student, every day, learns, grows and feels like a human being; they don't care until they know we care.

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
Johns, Dale	Principal	Administrative oversight - all 6 Alternative Ed. sites
Plummer, Michael	Teacher, Career/ Technical	Technology input / TEAMS contact
Cotto, Maggie	Teacher, K-12	Riverview contact / Department Head / TEAMS contact
Schervish, Michael	Assistant Principal	Administrative oversight - ESE Administrator - SIP contact
Kirvan, Colleen	Assistant Principal	Administrative oversight - 4 residential sites
Pelletier, Rebecca	Guidance Counselor	DAC / SAC / SIP Contact
Jenkins, Steafon	Assistant Principal	Administrative oversight - Highbanks
Whitmore, Logan	Assistant Principal	TOA Riverview - Title 1 contact
Neill, James	Guidance Counselor	Certified School Counselor / Scheduling - Riverview Learning Center
	Instructional Coach	Riverview and Highbanks teacher support
Little, Rosalind	Guidance Counselor	Counselor / Scheduling

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2001, Dale Johns

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.*

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

9

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
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)	
School Grades History	2018-19: No Grade 2017-18: No Grade 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
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	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

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

Tuesday 7/28/2020

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	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	4
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	2
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	2	2	0	0	0	4

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	1	1	0	0	0	2
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	11	24	12	4	1	4	73
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	10	19	7	4	1	1	55
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	7	20	8	4	1	3	58
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2	6	7	1	0	1	19
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	4	13	7	1	1	3	43

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	16	7	20	4	1	3	3	54

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	1	0	3	0	0	0	1	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	3	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	0%	54%	61%	0%	57%	60%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	53%	59%	0%	56%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	44%	54%	0%	50%	52%
Math Achievement	0%	55%	62%	0%	54%	61%
Math Learning Gains	0%	52%	59%	0%	50%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	45%	52%	0%	46%	52%
Science Achievement	0%	61%	56%	0%	64%	57%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Social Studies Achievement	0%	72%	78%	0%	75%	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	0%	50%	-50%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	48%	-48%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	47%	-47%	52%	-52%
	2018	0%	47%	-47%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	50%	-50%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	0%	51%	-51%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	50%	-50%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019	0%	50%	-50%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	49%	-49%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
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	0%	48%	-48%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	49%	-49%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	47%	-47%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	44%	-44%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	29%	-29%	46%	-46%
	2018	0%	37%	-37%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	0%	57%	-57%	48%	-48%
	2018	0%	60%	-60%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	72%	-72%	67%	-67%
2018	0%	65%	-65%	65%	-65%
Compare		0%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	68%	-68%	71%	-71%

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2018	0%	66%	-66%	71%	-71%
Compare		0%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	63%	-63%	70%	-70%
2018	0%	63%	-63%	68%	-68%
Compare		0%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	54%	-54%	61%	-61%
2018	0%	57%	-57%	62%	-62%
Compare		0%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	55%	-55%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	55%	-55%	56%	-56%
Compare		0%			

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)	
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	N/A
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	
Percent Tested	
Subgroup Data	

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 math/ELA proficiency. Students lack foundation in Math and reading skills, along with attendance issues, students lack positive relationships with staff and adults in general. Students lack goal setting skills.

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

Graduation assurance-through remediation and credit retrieval. Students in AE tend to lag behind other subgroups in GPA, EOC's, attendance and graduation rate. Lack of remediation of foundational skills in Math and Reading.

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

Math proficiency. Students lack foundation in math and reading skills, along with attendance issues. Students lack positive relationships with staff and adults in general; Students in AE tend to lag behind all other subgroups in GPA, EOC's FSA and graduation rate.

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

Science Proficiency. Edgenuity, course completions outnumbered other subjects. Professional development for instructors and staff, reading interventions, social-emotional training. PLC and progress monitoring tools.

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

Attendance course completion and remediation student goal setting.
Professional training of teachers in social/emotional struggles of the students.

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

1. math/ELA proficiency - Best practices in the classroom remediation of math and reading skills
2. Productive PLC's
3. Positive teacher/student relationships
4. Increase in course completions/graduation assurance through credit retrieval
5. Increase in graduation assurance rate.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Graduation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students lack positive relationships with staff, have attendance issues, and often times have trouble graduating when placed at an Alternative Education site.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase graduation rate through increased progress monitoring. Students in Alternative Education tend display early warning signs that in GPA, FSA, attendance, graduation rate, and in suspensions. Students in our program for more than 20 days will be on track to complete their courses with 70% proficiency.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	James Neill (jneill@volusia.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Social Emotional Learning is the way children and adults acquire knowledge and skills that impact their ability to manage emotions, manage behaviors, and set and achieve goals. Integrating SEL strategies can support instruction and have a positive impact on academic achievement such as graduation rate. Also using progress monitoring to detect early warning signs will help target students with interventions needed to graduate.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students lack foundation of social emotional skills, and positive relationships with staff. Students who have early warning signs such as attendance need to be addressed in ways other than academic ways.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional Development for Instructional Staff in Social Emotional Training, and EWS. - Admin. Staff
2. Emphasis on Graduation Assurance. - Mr. Jim Neill
3. Assessing individual student needs. - Dr. Maggie Cotto
4. Goal setting and emotional assistance. - Mr. Jim Neill.

Person Responsible James Neill (jneill@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students lack foundation in math skills, and often have trouble earning course completions. Math is a critical component of a students academics often determining whether the student is promoted.

Measureable Outcome: Students in our program for more than 20 days will be on track to have a course completion with 70% proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Maggie Cotto (macotto@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: The Math proficiency from last year showed low performance. Using effective progress monitoring, PLC's, EWS, and interventions we will try to promote higher learning in students, and promote course completions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The data from the previous year showed that our lowest performance according to course completions was Math. We want to further use progress monitoring to identify students with our early warning system's and use targeted interventions for those identified students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Emphasis on effective PLC's using academic and behavioral data. - Dr. Maggie Cotto / Mr. Logan Whitmore
2. Progress monitoring through Edgenuity - Dr. Maggie Cotto / Mr. Karl Yackel
3. Emphasis on graduation assurance through credit retrieval. - Mr. Jim Neill
4. Remediation of skills in ELA/Math - Dr. Maggie Cotto / Mr. Karl Yackel
5. Using targeted interventions in classroom. - Dr. Maggie Cotto / Mr. Karl Yackel

Person Responsible Maggie Cotto (macotto@volusia.k12.fl.us)

1. Emphasis on effective PLC's using academic and behavioral data. - Dr. Maggie Cotto / Mr. Logan Whitmore
2. Progress monitoring through Edgenuity - Dr. Maggie Cotto / Mr. Karl Yackel
3. Emphasis on graduation assurance through credit retrieval. - Mr. Jim Neill
4. Remediation of skills in ELA/Math - Dr. Maggie Cotto / Mr. Karl Yackel
5. Using targeted interventions in classroom. - Dr. Maggie Cotto / Mr. Karl Yackel

Person Responsible Maggie Cotto (macotto@volusia.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students lack foundation in reading skills, and often have trouble earning course completions. ELA is a critical component of a students academics often determining whether the student is promoted.

Measureable Outcome: Students in our program for more than 20 days will be on track to have a course completion with 70% proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Maggie Cotto (macotto@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: The ELA proficiency from last year showed low performance. Using effective progress monitoring, PLC's, EWS, and interventions we will try to promote higher learning in students, and promote course completions.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The data from the previous year showed that our second lowest performance according to course completions was ELA. We want to further use progress monitoring to identify students with our early warning system's and use targeted interventions for those identified students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Emphasis on effective PLC's using academic and behavioral data. - Dr. Maggie Cotto / Mr. Logan Whitmore
2. Progress monitoring through Edgenuity - Dr. Maggie Cotto
3. Emphasis on graduation assurance through credit retrieval. - Mr. Jim Neill
4. Remediation of skills in ELA. - Dr. Maggie Cotto
5. Using targeted interventions in classroom. - Dr. Maggie Cotto

Person Responsible Maggie Cotto (macotto@volusia.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Attendance course completion and remediation student goal setting. Attendance course completion and remediation student goal setting.

Professional training of teachers in social/emotional struggles of the students. over awareness and cultural sensitivity

Professional training of teachers in social/emotional struggles of the students. Professional development for teachers in social emotional training, blended learning ,

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.

Riverview Learning Center builds a positive school culture, and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved in a multitude of ways. Leadership makes sure to involve all proximal stakeholder groups in decision making by having many meetings, surveys, and discussions. With broad stakeholder groups we partner with businesses to provide engaging field trips and events at the school to promote a positive school environment. Along with that we partner with community colleges to provide free seminars and information for students interested in continuing higher education. With all of the stakeholders input and collaboration we strive to provide the students of Riverview Learning Center a positive school culture.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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