

Pasco County Schools

Richey Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Richey Elementary School

6850 ADAMS ST, New Port Richey, FL 34652

<https://res.pasco.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Amy Denney Haskedakes

Start Date for this Principal: 3/3/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	89%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: D (35%) 2014-15: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pasco 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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Richey Elementary School

6850 ADAMS ST, New Port Richey, FL 34652

<https://res.pasco.k12.fl.us>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	91%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	43%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	D	C	D

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://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 Richey elementary staff accepts the responsibility to be exemplary in every way and to provide educational opportunities to help each child reach their highest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The expectation for Richey Elementary is that ALL students, through collaboration and differentiation, will be successful on the path of college, career and life readiness.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Allen, Keri	Principal	The members of the leadership team, including Administration, Instructional Coaches, PLC Facilitators, and members from the Student Support Services Team, work collaboratively to analyze a variety of data in order to inform decisions related to impacting student achievement. While considering the whole child, decisions are made to build capacity with standards aligned instruction and utilizing best practices to improve engagement.
Iarussi, Trisha	Assistant Principal	

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	77	88	108	119	108	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	600
Attendance below 90 percent	10	26	24	25	38	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158
One or more suspensions	0	8	10	16	14	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	6	34	15	10	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
Level 1 on statewide assessment	2	11	24	23	30	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	126

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	2	11	24	23	26	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114

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	3	1	0	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

60

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/29/2019

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	7	21	21	39	21	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140
One or more suspensions	1	10	7	9	8	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	1	24	32	9	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	58	23	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129

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	2	7	18	41	14	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	7	21	21	39	21	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	140
One or more suspensions	1	10	7	9	8	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	1	24	32	9	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	58	23	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129

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	2	7	18	41	14	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	110

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	45%	58%	57%	50%	56%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	56%	58%	51%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	54%	53%	58%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	44%	60%	63%	50%	57%	61%
Math Learning Gains	51%	61%	62%	51%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	50%	51%	52%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	40%	53%	53%	18%	49%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	77 (0)	88 (0)	108 (0)	119 (0)	108 (0)	100 (0)	600 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	10 (7)	26 (21)	24 (21)	25 (39)	38 (21)	35 (31)	158 (140)
One or more suspensions	0 (1)	8 (10)	10 (7)	16 (9)	14 (8)	7 (11)	55 (46)
Course failure in ELA or Math	1 (1)	6 (1)	34 (24)	15 (32)	10 (9)	24 (25)	90 (92)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	2 (0)	11 (0)	24 (0)	23 (58)	30 (23)	36 (48)	126 (129)

Grade Level Data

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

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	47%	60%	-13%	58%	-11%
	2018	37%	57%	-20%	57%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	40%	59%	-19%	58%	-18%
	2018	43%	55%	-12%	56%	-13%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	38%	55%	-17%	56%	-18%
	2018	38%	56%	-18%	55%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	41%	59%	-18%	62%	-21%
	2018	28%	59%	-31%	62%	-34%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	45%	62%	-17%	64%	-19%
	2018	47%	59%	-12%	62%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		17%				
05	2019	31%	57%	-26%	60%	-29%
	2018	49%	58%	-9%	61%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-18%				
Cohort Comparison		-16%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	35%	53%	-18%	53%	-18%
	2018	44%	56%	-12%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	34	52	53	37	53	55	30				
ELL	29	50		30	57	67	8				
BLK	29	47		33	27						
HSP	40	49	56	36	52	62	28				
MUL	52	75		52	46						
WHT	49	49	50	49	55	57	47				
FRL	45	50	57	44	51	58	41				

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
SWD	21	29	40	29	35	32	42				
ELL	28	47		26	29						
BLK	29	42		33	46						
HSP	33	45	50	37	40	25	50				
MUL	45	33		39	38						
WHT	49	30	19	48	50	48	48				
FRL	42	36	34	41	45	30	46				
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
SWD	23	51	59	29	44	50	4				
ELL	30	46		50	77						
BLK	53	40		39	27						
HSP	42	47	50	51	53	64	10				
MUL	55	60		59	70						
WHT	52	52	56	50	50	46	21				
FRL	48	49	58	50	50	53	18				

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	412
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	48
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	44
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	34
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	56
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	51
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	52
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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 Black/African American subgroup performed lower than 41%, performing at 34%.

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

The area of Science Achievement had the greatest decline overall, as well as the most subgroups decreasing from the 17-18 school year to the 18-19 school year. The subgroups that decreased were White, Free and Reduced Lunch, Students with Disabilities, and the Hispanic subgroups. Targeted interventions were implemented for ELA and Math throughout the school year and may have contributed to the decrease in science since the focus was more on reading and math.

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.

Our science achievement was 13% below the state average. Additionally, the overall ELA and Math Achievement were lower than the state average as well with ELA being a 12% gap and math being a 19% gap. Furthermore, the science gap grew from 17-18 school year when compared to the state average from an 8% gap to a 13% gap.

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

Our learning gains within ELA and Math, as well as the Lowest 25th Percentile gains showed improvement for the 18-19 school year. Targeted and consistent interventions were implemented with a high response to data that led to reflective and intentional conversations on student achievement.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Based upon our EWS data we have 114 students that have 2+ areas of concern with EWS. Attendance continues to be a concern as one of the indicators.

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

1. High Impact Instruction
2. Data Driven Decisions
3. Actively Engage ALL Richey Tigers

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title	High Impact Instruction
Rationale	We will provide well-planned, high impact instruction while rigorously teaching standards.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>Increase Quarterly Check data proficiency to align with district average or above (Math/Science).</p> <p>Increase projected proficiency as measured by MAP Assessment by Spring 2020 to 54%.</p> <p>Increase Rigor in classrooms as measured by the IPG to a 60% overall by the end of the year. (CA 1: 100%, CA 2: 80%, CA 3: 60%)</p> <p>Decrease the percentage of IRLA "Emergency" students in K-2 from 17% to 12%.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Keri Allen (klallen@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Use a variety of strategies to build background knowledge.</p> <p>Anticipate student needs and plan for instructional supports.</p> <p>Conduct formative assessment/instructional conferences to increase reading and writing proficiency.</p> <p>Hold all students accountable for engaging in the work of the lesson.</p> <p>Engage all students in daily writing instruction.</p> <p>Provide high-quality vocabulary instruction throughout the day.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Staff will meet regularly in PLCs to analyze NWEA Maps data, common formative assessments, student work samples, and other various data in order to determine next steps for instruction and intervention.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. NWEA small group sessions 2. Training aligned with Taking Action for SLT 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Keri Allen (klallen@pasco.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Data Driven Decisions
Rationale	We will regularly analyze data and adjust instructional plans for all tiers in a timely manner.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	At least 95% of students will master the essential standards identified for their grade level. 83% of teams will successfully demonstrate implementation of PLC actions via deliverables during the quarterly external reviews.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Trisha Iarussi (tiarussi@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Analyze and respond to data aligned to instruction at the three tiers. Identify essential standards for mathematics, ELA foundational standards and writing, monitor for understanding of the standard, intervene or enrich when necessary. SLT/SIT will analyze subgroup data to further problem-solve for tiered supports. Engage in the problem-solving process using data to monitor SMART goals and the effectiveness of core instruction. Build capacity and distribute leadership around the work of Taking Action.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Staff members will reflect and plan for instruction after analyzing NWEA Maps data, informal and formative assessment data, as well as intervention data. Instructional coaches will work alongside staff to lead coaching efforts.
Action Step	
Description	1. NWEA Map small group sessions 2. Training on work aligned with Taking Action for SLT 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Keri Allen (klallen@pasco.k12.fl.us)

#3	
Title	Enagage ALL Richey Tigers
Rationale	We will promote professional and personal growth and a sense of community and belonging as outlined in the Pride Promises and School-Wide Expectations.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Gallup Staff Engagement will increase from 3.59-3.70. Behavior ODR Decrease from 347 to 250. 75% of teachers will demonstrate 67 % of indicators at the "Good" level for Composure on the Conscious Discipline Rubric Progress Assessment by the end of the first quarter.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Keri Allen (klallen@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Frequently celebrate student accomplishments CDAT Selected non-negotiable/essential strategies/structures fro Conscious Discipline roll out: Brain Smart Start, Safekeeper Ritual, Friends and family board, Safe Place and Greeting/Goodbye Ritual Integrate social-emotional learning, discipline an self-regulation into daily instruction Teach 30 days of lessons at the begining of the school year for Conscious Discipline roll out
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Staff will engage in learning around Conscious Discipline to learn better and more effective responses to behavior and positive engagement strategies for students. Doing so will help to build relationships that foster learning and persevering through challenging academic tasks. As a staff we will also work to build a culture for professional and personal growth through regular coaching and feedback cycles with administration and instructional coaches.
Action Step	
Description	1. Build capacity with Trauma informed strategies to develop self-regulation for both adults and students. 2. 3. 4. 5.
Person Responsible	Keri Allen (klallen@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

Attendance will be addressed through the relationships that will be fostered through the use and implementation of Conscious Discipline. Attendance will also be monitored and intervened upon with the Student Support team, SIT and SLT.