

School District of Indian River County

IR PREP



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	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

IR PREP

1426 18TH ST, Vero Beach, FL 32960

www.indianriverschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Dariyall Brown

Start Date for this Principal: 6/22/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 5-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	<i>[Data Not Available]</i>
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
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	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Indian River County School Board on 11/17/2020.

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.

The Alternative Center for Education is dedicated to creating a safe, structured, and uniformed educational environment that models positive student social-emotional behavior.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of the Alternative Center for Education is to enhance student achievement through teacher collaboration to support success for all students.

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
Brown, Dariyall	Principal	As the instructional leader, it my primary responsibility to provide a safe and productive educational environment for all students and staff members. It's my responsibility as Principal to build capacity in our teachers to provide an equitable classroom model system that will enhance our climate and cultural at the Alternative Center for Education.
Wilson, Kathleen	Teacher, ESE	As an ESE Support Facilitator, Mrs. Wilson job duties and responsibilities are provide the required support to all ESE students in the course recovery lab. She will also provide direct service to all ESE and NON-ESE students as an Academic advisor ensure they are on track to graduate.
Smith, Windfred	Teacher, ESE	As an ESE Support Facilitator, Mrs. Wilson job duties and responsibilities are provide the required support to all ESE students in the classroom setting. Mr. Smith is the lead teacher of our Positive Behavior Intervention System, who monitors the behavior and academic reinforcement system at the Alternative Center for Education.
joseph, katia	Teacher, K-12	The Success Coach is primarily responsible for social skills training which includes peer counseling and personal, social, career development for all students. Her responsibility also entails managing our Self-Reflection Room (Time-Out) to ameliorate the maladaptive behavior of our students after temporary removal from the classroom.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/22/2020, Dariyall Brown

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

11

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 5-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Alternative Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	[Data Not Available]
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	
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	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	CS&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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	1	5	4	2	26
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	0	0	9	0	2	3	1	15
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	1	5	4	2	26
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14	1	5	4	2	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	2	3	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	1	0	0	7
	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	14	1	5	4	2	26

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	13	1	3	3	1	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	1	5

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/23/2020

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	1	7	14	9	10	4	12	57
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	7	8	3	8	39
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	2	1	0	9
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	3	3	1	0	15
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	3	2	1	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	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	3	3	1	0	19

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

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	1	7	14	9	10	4	12	57
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	9	7	8	3	8	39
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	3	1	2	1	0	9
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	3	3	1	0	15
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	5	3	2	1	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	0	0	0	0	0	1	5	6	3	3	1	0	19

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

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%	58%	56%	0%	55%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	54%	51%	0%	49%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	40%	42%	0%	34%	41%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	0%	48%	51%	0%	44%	49%
Math Learning Gains	0%	46%	48%	0%	38%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	39%	45%	0%	31%	39%
Science Achievement	0%	68%	68%	0%	64%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	68%	73%	0%	74%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey										
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)								Total	
	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
	(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
05	2019	0%	54%	-54%	56%	-56%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
06	2019	0%	52%	-52%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	48%	-48%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	51%	-51%	52%	-52%
	2018	0%	44%	-44%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	53%	-53%	56%	-56%
	2018	8%	55%	-47%	58%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	0%	55%	-55%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	52%	-52%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
10	2019	0%	51%	-51%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	0%	57%	-57%	60%	-60%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
06	2019	0%	53%	-53%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	51%	-51%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	53%	-53%	54%	-54%
	2018	30%	52%	-22%	54%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		-30%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	47%	-47%	46%	-46%
	2018	9%	51%	-42%	45%	-36%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-30%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	0%	53%	-53%	53%	-53%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	10%	49%	-39%	48%	-38%
	2018	0%	53%	-53%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	64%	-64%	67%	-67%
2018	13%	61%	-48%	65%	-52%
Compare		-13%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	69%	-69%	71%	-71%
2018	21%	65%	-44%	71%	-50%
Compare		-21%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	40%	64%	-24%	70%	-30%
2018	0%	70%	-70%	68%	-68%
Compare		40%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	58%	-58%	61%	-61%
2018	0%	61%	-61%	62%	-62%
Compare		0%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	53%	-53%	57%	-57%
2018	0%	50%	-50%	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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
2017 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	0
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	0

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	3
Percent Tested	75%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
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

Native American Students	
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	
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	1

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.

Our economically disadvantaged were the lowest-performing students. The contributing factors are attendance, behavior issues, lack of fundamental skills, substance abuse and lack of parental support. Furthermore, many of our students are involved in the legal system which contributes to poor attendance and grades/credits.

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

The school data shows that the component with the greatest decline was Civics. The passing rate declined from 21% to 0%. According to FSA Reading test scores, the majority of our students scored at level 1, which negatively affects test performance. The transient nature of the population has a negative effect on student achievement. Many of our students are actively involved in the legal system which has caused absences and missing grades. The data shows that 84% of the students enrolled had an attendance below 90% for the year.

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 school data shows that the component with the greatest gap was Civics. The school minus state gap was -71%. A major contributing factor is the transient nature of our student population. We are testing students who have not been enrolled with us throughout the academic year.

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

According to the data presented, we currently have one category showing improvement. The passing rate for EOC History improved from zero to forty percent. Our school minus district gap improved from -70% to -24%. We attribute this improvement to the implementation of SIMS strategies. A research-based program designed to achieve a high yield effect on low performing students who have 3 or more early warning indicators. Also, professional development included Tykes and Teens, which is a program for trauma-informed care to help guide staff in understanding students' crisis and emotional needs. We used CHAMPS, which is a classroom management system designed to assist students in understanding the expectations of the school-wide behavior goals.

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

Our two greatest areas of concern is the attendance rate is below 90% and a high failure rate in our ELA and Algebra 1 & Geometry courses.

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

1. Standards-based Instruction with emphasis on reading and math scores
2. Attendance above 90%
3. Progress monitoring through data chat meetings
4. Collective Efficacy and Collaborative Planning Cycle
5. Professional Development

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

According to our school's needs assessment, students who are considered economically disadvantaged have been identified and will be our targeted population for potential growth. After reviewing the Early Warning Indicators (EWI) and based on our test results for the 2019-2020 school year, we will focus on improving and maximizing our instructional practices by using a blended learning model which will include standard based instruction, differentiated instruction and a supportive culture and climate, which will increase student engagement. The blended learning model will be infused in our daily small and whole group instruction, computer based learning, push-in services and peer to peer modeling. We believe the blended learning model will increase each students level of engagement by rotating them every 30 minutes in a learning module which will equate to 90 minutes in each core subject area.

Measurable Outcome:

The Alternative Center for Education will maximize instructional time to 90 minutes, which will provide more opportunities for whole group instruction, small group instruction, computer-based learning and more time for remediation with our struggling students. Also, our school goal is to increase our economically disadvantage student's level of engagement by introducing standard based lessons that are aligned to the task and rigor of each core subject area. We predict all areas of testing will increase by 3% in ELA, Algebra, US History & Biology by the end of the school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dariyall Brown (dariyall.brown@indianriverschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Wilson and Peterson stated (2006), classroom community-based learning brings thoughtful knowledge and ideas based on students' personal observation and social interaction in the classroom; it brings depth to the learning experience for each student to the content areas and is motivated all students have intrinsic education assets and resources that educators can use to enhance learning experience for students. To improve our scores in Biology, ELA, American History, Civics, Algebra I, and Geometry, teachers will use strategies, such as small groups, whole group, and purposeful technology in an environment of collaboration to increase the intensity of learning and the likelihood that students will transfer knowledge and skills to improve their scores.

Wilson, S. M., Peterson, P. L., & National Education Association, W. D. (2006). Theories of Learning and Teaching: What Do They Mean for Educators? Working Paper. In National Education Association Research Department. National Education Association Research Department.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Research has shown that in order to engage students, teachers must do more than lecture. Blended learning, a student-centered approach, emphasizes the importance of peer-to-peer interaction, group collaboration, self-assessment and reflection (Longo, 2016). While teaching the concepts and skills, teachers must help students draw on their experiences to build a framework on which they can understand and interpret new ideas (Parsons, Nulan & Parsons, 2014). As a result, students will be more actively engaged, and will focus on what is being taught and process new information more effectively. Therefore, a blended learning class will involve all students in activities that encourage them to develop a deeper understanding of the content being presented. In order words, they will become the holders of knowledge whereas teachers are the facilitators. Hence, in a blended learning

environment, students transition from being mere recipients of information to being actively engaged with new information (Longo, 2016).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Instructors will use differentiated instruction as apart of the blended learning model.
2. Instructors will use standards-based instruction for each lesson.
3. Instructors will submit lesson plans on a weekly basis.
4. Administrator will monitor and evaluate evidence-based instruction.
5. Administrator will show evidence of impact reviews and provide feedback to teachers for improvements.

Person Responsible Dariyall Brown (dariyall.brown@indianriverschools.org)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Student attendance is significantly below average at 70%, which had a negative effect on student achievement last year. The ACE program will use the Positive Behavioral Intervention System (PBIS) program, which is a researched-based program to address the attendance issues that are problematic to student achievement. We will address all student attendance issues in our MTSS weekly meetings by using all problem solving techniques.

Measurable Outcome: The ACE will use PBIS strategies to improve student attendance by 5%. All staff members will use our school-wide expectations model to create a positive school culture that rewards students for good attendance on a weekly basis.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Windfred Smith (windfred.smith@indianriverschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will use Early Warning and Monitoring Systems data to raise awareness and focus our interventions. The ACE will use the PBIS program to address our low attendance rate from previous years. We recognize all students who consistently come to school at 90% rate. Recognizing students on a weekly and monthly basis will improve their grades and sense of morale and more importantly their willingness to regularly attend school.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Researchers have examined the effects of strategies such as Early Warning and Monitoring Systems data, community collaboration, and parent/guardian involvement. According to Lara, Noble, and Pelika (2018), all these strategies have evidential proof of success. Hence, school districts are attending to chronic absenteeism by using these strategies simultaneously. The practices when implemented and use with fidelity will increase students attendance and eventually enhance their academic growth.

Reference (s)
Lara, J., Noble, K., Pelika, S., Coons, A., & National Education Association. (2018). Chronic Absenteeism. NEA Research Brief. NBI No. 57. In National Education Association. National Education Association.

Action Steps to Implement

1. All teachers will monitor FOCUS attendance data and report their findings to the MTSS committee.
2. Reward students on a weekly basis with 100% attendance rate.
3. Develop a network of community partners to mentor our students.
4. Presentations on Attendance data to parents and students at our monthly School Advisory Committee Meetings.

Person Responsible Windfred Smith (windfred.smith@indianriverschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Professional Learning Communities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The ACE will focus on Culturally Responsive Teaching in the classroom to enhance our efforts in promoting an environment that is socially acceptable for all students. The learning environment ACE will reflect building positive relationships, school community based activities and social skills activities.

Measurable Outcome: Teachers will be introduced to the Culturally Responsive Teaching book and will implement strategy based activities in the classroom. All students will be able to recognize and speak to how culturally based assignment have impacted their learning. The faculty and staff will continue to promote school-wide activities to promote cultural unity on a monthly basis. The expected outcome will lead to 20% decrease in OSS and ISS disciplinary administrative action. We will monitor the outcome on a monthly basis to determine the effectiveness of our social-emotional programming.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: katia joseph (katia.joseph@indianriverschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Researchers have found that culturally responsive classrooms motivate students to learn. "The essentials of this motivational framework are that it 1), respect diversity; 2) engages the motivation of a abroad range of students; 3) create a safe, inclusive, and respectful learning environment; 4) derives teaching practices form across disciplines and cultures; and 5) promotes equitable learning."

Teel, Karen Manheim., and Obidah, Jennifer E. Building Racial and Cultural Competence in the Classroom : Strategies from Urban Educators. New York, NY: Teachers College Press, 2008.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: "Culturally responsive teaching can be defined as using cultural knowledge, prior experiences, frames of reference, and performance styles of ethnically diverse students to make learning encounters more relevant and effective for them. It teaches to and through the strengths of these students. Culturally responsive teaching is the behavioral expression of knowledge, beliefs, and values that recognize the importance of racial and cultural diversity in learning. It is contingent on a set of racial and cultural competencies amply summarized by Teel and Obidah (2008).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will have PLC's every Monday which will focus on Culturally Responsive Teaching.
2. Teachers will have lessons that demonstrate cultural education and equity.
3. Students will be involved in activities that are aligned to cultural and social emotional activities.

Person Responsible katia joseph (katia.joseph@indianriverschools.org)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The area of focus will be to eliminate in- school and out of school suspensions by using Restorative practices, Self-Reflection Center and Ripple Effects as alternative measures of consequences for minor and mid-range infractions. The Alternative Center for Education school produced 126 office discipline referrals, which were recorded in the 2019-2020 school year, which included 65% African-American students who received office referrals. African-American students were 2.93 times more likely to be given OSS than their White and Hispanic counterparts.

Measurable Outcome: The Alternative Center for Education will use the Multi-Tiered System and Positive Behavioral Intervention of Support to address our disproportionate amount of OSS and ISS between subgroups. By using researched based interventions our primary goal is to decrease all ODR's by 40% among our African-American students. Our overall plan is to decrease minor disciplinary referrals by 30% for all students and decrease major infractions by 20% by using our PBIS and MTSS tiered behavioral programs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: katia joseph (katia.joseph@indianriverschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: In the Pittsburgh study, published in December 2018, suspension rates fell at the 22 schools that tried restorative justice. But suspension rates also fell at 22 comparison schools in the city that didn't adopt restorative justice, echoing the dramatic decline in suspensions across the nation. During the second year of the Pittsburgh experiment, 12.6 percent of the kids at the restorative justice schools had been suspended during the 2016-17 school year, compared with 14.6 percent of the students at traditional discipline schools. (Teachers in the treatment schools were trained in restorative justice techniques and encouraged to talk with students instead of punishing them but suspensions were still a discipline option.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Restorative justice (RJ) is a broad term that encompasses a growing social movement to institutionalize non-punitive, relationship-centered approaches for avoiding and addressing harm, responding to violations of legal and human rights, and collaboratively solving problems. RJ has been used extensively both as a means to divert people from traditional justice systems and as a program for convicted offenders already supervised by the adult or juvenile justice system. In the school setting, RJ often serves as an alternative to traditional discipline, particularly exclusionary disciplinary actions such as suspension or expulsion. RJ proponents often turn to restorative practices out of concern that exclusionary disciplinary actions may be associated with harmful consequences for children (e.g., Losen, 2014). More recently, it has also been embraced as a preventative intervention for building an interconnected school community and healthy school climate in which punishable transgressions are less common (e.g., Brown, 2017).

Action Steps to Implement

1. The ACE teachers will receive specialized training in Restorative practices.
2. The ACE teachers will use the Self-Reflection Center as a temporary placement as a level 3 intervention.
3. The Self-Reflection staff member will counsel and redirect student behavior for 15-20 minutes and return the student to class.
4. Student will use Ripple Effects and other Social Emotional Learning to reduce maladaptive behaviors.

Person Responsible Dariyall Brown (dariyall.brown@indianriverschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The school leadership team will have weekly meetings to address our school improvement plan goals as it relates to our African-American Achievement plan and our school's overall academic and behavioral performances toward earning an "A" school.

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.

At our school, positive culture and environment plays an integral role in building a school community climate that includes all stake holders. Our school culture and climate is rooted in building relationships between staff and students. The Alternative Center for Education has been a school with a smaller population enjoys the opportunity of developing one-to-one relationships. There are various cultural activities that are included in our daily school operations that enhance a positive school culture, as follows; weekly students recognition for academics and attendance, teacher recognition for student achievements, Odyssey night celebrations (student success celebration involving parents), positive behavior intervention and support celebration as well as celebration our students' success through field day and cook outs.

There is also the inclusion of broader community stake holders such as winners walk tall weekly motivational talks, Tykes and Teens in the area of staff professional development and united against poverty which co taught a class on job skills, and job success three days per week with our upper class students.

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: Differentiation				\$4,255.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0033 - IR PREP	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$2,875.00
<i>Notes: After school tutoring on Tuesdays and Thursdays</i>						
	3492	330-Travel	0033 - IR PREP	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$1,380.00
<i>Notes: Transportation for afterschool tutoring on Tuesdays and Thursdays</i>						
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance				\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Professional Learning Communities				\$406.45
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6100	120-Classroom Teachers	0033 - IR PREP	Title, I Part A	1.0	\$406.45
<i>Notes: Culturally Responsive Teaching & The Brain</i>						
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline				\$0.00
					Total:	\$4,661.45