

Pasco County Schools

# New River Elementary School



## 2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# New River Elementary School

4710 RIVER GLEN BLVD, Wesley Chapel, FL 33545

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Colleen Wilkinson**

Start Date for this Principal: 1/22/2018

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	58%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: B (55%) 2014-15: B (60%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Central
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

### 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

## New River Elementary School

4710 RIVER GLEN BLVD, Wesley Chapel, FL 33545

<https://nres.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	No	55%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	54%

### School Grades History

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

### 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.**

New River Elementary School Community is a safe, positive, collaborative, learning environment focused on creating life-long learners who will achieve their highest potential.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

The vision of New River Elementary School is that all students achieve success in college, career and life.

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**

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

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Job Duties and Responsibilities</b>
Bordner, Sarah	Principal	Facilitator of the School Leadership Team
Furman, Jolene	Teacher, K-12	This member will collaborate in the school decision making process as a member of the School Leadership Team.
Lane, Hannah	Teacher, K-12	This member will collaborate in the school decision making process as a member of the School Leadership Team.
Giorgetti, Colleen	Teacher, K-12	This member will collaborate in the school decision making process as a member of the School Leadership Team.
Moline, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	This member will collaborate in the school decision making process as a member of the School Leadership Team.
Gallahue, Ayleen	Teacher, K-12	This member will collaborate in the school decision making process as a member of the School Leadership Team.
Jones, Dianna	Teacher, K-12	This member will collaborate in the school decision making process as a member of the School Leadership Team.
Wilkinson, Colleen	Assistant Principal	Facilitator of the School Leadership Team
Robb, Sara	Teacher, K-12	This member will collaborate in the school decision making process as a member of the School Leadership Team.
Martin, Ellen	Instructional Coach	This member will collaborate in the school decision making process as a member of the School Leadership Team.
Leidy, Jon	Teacher, K-12	This member will collaborate in the school decision making process as a member of the School Leadership Team.
Romano, Stella	Teacher, ESE	This member will collaborate in the school decision making process as a member of the School Leadership Team.
Dolatowski, Laura	Teacher, ESE	This member will collaborate in the school decision making process as a member of the School Leadership Team.
Mitchell, Holly	Teacher, K-12	This member will collaborate in the school decision making process as a member of the School Leadership Team.
Smith, Megan	Teacher, K-12	This member will collaborate in the school decision making process as a member of the School Leadership Team.



**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	138	125	136	146	135	148	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	828
Attendance below 90 percent	16	4	9	15	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	2	2	1	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	41	47	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	144

**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	6	2	2	12	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

**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	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

43

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Wednesday 7/24/2019

**Prior Year - As Reported****The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Attendance below 90 percent														
One or more suspensions														
Course failure in ELA or Math														
Level 1 on statewide assessment														

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Students with two or more indicators														

**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	
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	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	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

**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	
Students with two or more indicators	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	55%	58%	57%	58%	56%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	51%	56%	58%	58%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%	54%	53%	52%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	52%	60%	63%	63%	57%	61%
Math Learning Gains	50%	61%	62%	66%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	50%	51%	45%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	50%	53%	53%	49%	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	138 (0)	125 (0)	136 (0)	146 (0)	135 (0)	148 (0)	828 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	16 ( )	4 ( )	9 ( )	15 ( )	7 ( )	9 ( )	60 (0)
One or more suspensions	1 ( )	1 ( )	1 ( )	4 ( )	2 ( )	2 ( )	11 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	3 ( )	2 ( )	2 ( )	1 ( )	4 ( )	5 ( )	17 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ( )	0 ( )	0 ( )	41 ( )	47 ( )	56 ( )	144 (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.

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	56%	60%	-4%	58%	-2%
	2018	56%	57%	-1%	57%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	53%	59%	-6%	58%	-5%
	2018	56%	55%	1%	56%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	49%	55%	-6%	56%	-7%
	2018	61%	56%	5%	55%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	50%	59%	-9%	62%	-12%
	2018	57%	59%	-2%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	46%	62%	-16%	64%	-18%
	2018	54%	59%	-5%	62%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
05	2019	53%	57%	-4%	60%	-7%
	2018	64%	58%	6%	61%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	49%	53%	-4%	53%	-4%
	2018	55%	56%	-1%	55%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
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	17	40	47	24	45	48	43				

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
ELL	71	64		46	57						
BLK	53	53	50	54	43	38	48				
HSP	46	49	48	40	46	30	34				
MUL	39	29		39	47		33				
WHT	63	54	35	59	54	52	63				
FRL	44	49	46	45	53	43	37				
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	25	53	45	28	48	47	40				
ELL	29			29							
BLK	54	49	36	54	49	45	55				
HSP	48	57	50	49	44	20	45				
MUL	55	63		30	38						
WHT	64	52	41	68	68	38	62				
FRL	50	45	42	50	53	27	48				
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	18	45	44	24	52	46	8				
ELL	44	47		56	60						
BLK	47	59	82	57	67	64	22				
HSP	53	52	53	57	66	58	44				
MUL	53	67		43	60		60				
WHT	63	59	41	71	66	33	56				
FRL	49	53	50	55	60	46	34				

### 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	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	29
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	369
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	53
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	48
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	40
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	37
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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	54
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	44
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 Subgroups that were below 41% included Hispanic Students, Multiracial Students, and Students with Disabilities. We have a decline in both ELA and math achievement.

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

Math achievement was the greatest decline from the prior year. Our Tier III groups focused primarily on ELA.

**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.**

.

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

Math lowest 25th percentile had the most improvement. We focused on ELA intervention groups for grade-levels and an additional layer for remediation. We wonder if the additional support with reading had an effect on the lowest 25th percentile when it came to reading the math questions.

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

.

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

### Part III: Planning for Improvement

#### Areas of Focus:

#1

<b>Title</b>	Hispanic Students
<b>Rationale</b>	Only 40% of the hispanic subgroup were meeting proficiency.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	In 2019-20, 50% of students will be meeting proficiency.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Sarah Bordner (sbordner@pasco.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	For ELA and math, essential standards are chosen, taught, and assessed. Targeted interventions are developed, implemented and monitored.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	The strategy was selected because it aligns with our district key priorities under high impact instruction and data-driven decisions.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Essential Standards are determined for ELA and math by PLC's.</li> <li>2. PLC's will determine how they will assess the essential standards.</li> <li>3. PLC's will choose a date to analyze the data and develop targeted interventions.</li> <li>4. PLC's will monitor the targeted interventions during TBIT time.</li> <li>5.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Sarah Bordner (sbordner@pasco.k12.fl.us)

<b>#2</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Multiracial Students
<b>Rationale</b>	Only 37% of the multiracial subgroup were meeting proficiency.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	In 2019-20, 47% of students will be meeting proficiency.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Sarah Bordner (sbordner@pasco.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	For ELA and math, essential standards are chosen, taught and assessed. Targeted interventions are developed, implemented, and monitored.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	This strategy was selected because it aligns with our district key priorities under high impact instruction and data-driven decisions.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Essential standards are determined for ELA and math by PLC's.</li> <li>2. PLC's will determine how they will assess the essential standards.</li> <li>3. PLC's will choose a date to analyze the data and develop interventions.</li> <li>4. PLC's will monitor the targeted interventions during TBIT time.</li> <li>5.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Sarah Bordner (sbordner@pasco.k12.fl.us)
<b>#3</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Students with Disabilities
<b>Rationale</b>	Only 38% of the students with disabilities subgroup were meeting proficiency.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	In 2019-20, 48% of students will be meeting proficiency.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Sarah Bordner (sbordner@pasco.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	For ELA and Math, essential standards are chosen, taught and assessed. Targeted interventions are developed, implemented and monitored.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	The strategy was selected because it aligns with our district key priorities under high impact instruction and data-driven decisions.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Essential standards are determined for ELA and math by PLC's.</li> <li>2. PLC's will determine how they will assess the essential standards.</li> <li>3. PLC's will choose a date to analyze the data and develop targeted interventions.</li> <li>4. PLC's will monitor the targeted interventions during TBIT time.</li> <li>5.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Sarah Bordner (sbordner@pasco.k12.fl.us)
<b>Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)</b>	



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

Our New River Priorities for the 2019-20 school year will be PLC's, ELA: Core Action 2 and 3; IRLA Growth; MTSS; and Gallup. The school has a specific rubric that determines the level of expertise of a staff member in each priority. The different levels are novice, apprentice, practitioner, and expert. PD will be developed throughout the year to help staff members advance on the rubric.