

Wakulla County Schools

Riversink 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	21
Budget to Support Goals	23

Riversink Elementary School

530 LONNIE RAKER LN, Crawfordville, FL 32327

<https://res.wakullaschooldistrict.org/>

Demographics

Principal: Catherine Cutchen

Start Date for this Principal: 8/12/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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)	68%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (59%) 2014-15: A (68%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&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 Wakulla County School Board on 10/21/2019.

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	21
Budget to Support Goals	23

Riversink Elementary School

530 LONNIE RAKER LN, Crawfordville, FL 32327

<https://res.wakullaschooldistrict.org/>

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 KG-5	Yes	88%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	16%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Wakulla County School Board on 10/21/2019.

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 mission of Riversink Elementary School is to facilitate the development of all students to their fullest potential by providing research-based instructional strategies and promoting the love of learning and community pride in a safe, positive environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every student will reach his or her highest potential in our positive learning environment provided by highly qualified professionals; every child, every chance, every day.

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
Nelson, Simeon	Principal	n/a
Salib, Bonita	School Counselor	
Harden, Holly	Instructional Coach	
Cutchen, Catherine	Assistant Principal	
Revell, Beverly	Teacher, ESE	.

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	96	82	73	92	62	84	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	489
Attendance below 90 percent	9	7	5	9	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	4	2	5	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	1	1	2	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	6	5	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
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)

28

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
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	14	15	9	17	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
One or more suspensions	3	6	3	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	11	5	6	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	12	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	2	7	3	4	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	14	15	9	17	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	79
One or more suspensions	3	6	3	1	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	11	5	6	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	12	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	2	7	3	4	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	69%	68%	57%	67%	61%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	59%	58%	57%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	47%	53%	37%	55%	52%
Math Achievement	67%	68%	63%	74%	66%	61%
Math Learning Gains	63%	69%	62%	75%	67%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	52%	51%	53%	55%	51%
Science Achievement	54%	56%	53%	66%	60%	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	96 (0)	82 (0)	73 (0)	92 (0)	62 (0)	84 (0)	489 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	9 (14)	7 (15)	5 (9)	9 (17)	4 (12)	6 (12)	40 (79)
One or more suspensions	0 (3)	0 (6)	1 (3)	0 (1)	0 (1)	1 (5)	2 (19)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (0)	4 (11)	2 (5)	5 (6)	3 (4)	5 (3)	19 (29)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (1)	9 (12)	6 (15)	17 (28)

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	72%	67%	5%	58%	14%
	2018	71%	66%	5%	57%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	73%	66%	7%	58%	15%
	2018	63%	59%	4%	56%	7%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	53%	61%	-8%	56%	-3%
	2018	62%	61%	1%	55%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	61%	64%	-3%	62%	-1%
	2018	81%	65%	16%	62%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	83%	71%	12%	64%	19%
	2018	58%	54%	4%	62%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		25%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	48%	60%	-12%	60%	-12%
	2018	70%	66%	4%	61%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-22%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	55%	53%	2%	53%	2%
	2018	75%	62%	13%	55%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
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	45	43	35	50	50	43	8				
BLK	60			50							
HSP	50										
WHT	71	58	45	68	65	55	53				
FRL	62	52	42	59	62	46	45				

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	39	45	64	56	73	86	55				
BLK	70			80							
MUL	40			80							
WHT	70	61	46	71	61	58	79				
FRL	63	60	45	65	67	57	57				
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	36	39	36	45	45		45				
BLK	86	67		71	67						
HSP	50			60							
MUL	55			64							
WHT	66	56	34	76	78	54	70				
FRL	53	47	35	60	66	52	47				

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	58
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	404
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A

English Language Learners	
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	55
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	50
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	59
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	53
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 data component showing the lowest performance was ELA lowest quartile at 46 percent. This was down 1% from the previous year. Factors contributing include a significant drop in 5th grade student proficiency and lack of direction with the Title I teacher and ESE Resource teacher. In addition, the lowest quartile did not make learning gains.

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

Grade 5 FCAT 2.0 science achievement fell from 78% to 54%. One factor which contributed to this was lack of vertical teaming in this department. Also science teaching time was constrained by CTE requirements. There was a direct correlation between reading deficiency and science deficiency.

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.

RES is 7% below the state average in ELA when considering the lowest quartile. Factors contributing include a significant drop in 5th grade student proficiency and lack of direction with the Title I teacher and ESE Resource teacher. In addition, the lowest quartile did not make learning gains.

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

Grade 4 Math Achievement Levels improved 25 percent from 2018-2019 (58% to 83%). A "Highly Effective" Math Teacher was moved to this grade level and more emphasis was placed on standards-based instruction. Student motivation was increased through Math Facts celebrations. iReady was implemented for grade 4 math students.

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

One area of concern is the number of students who achieved Level 1 on FSA.

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

1. SWD students identified through ESSA.
2. ELA Lowest Quartile grades 3-5.
3. Proficiency on FSA in Math and ELA

4. Learning Gains on FSA in Math and ELA
5. Proficiency in FCAT 2.0 Science.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Increase Achievement of Students with Disabilities
Rationale	Riversink's Federal % of Points Index for SWD is 39% which is 2% lower than the state's threshold of 41%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	To increase the Federal % of Points Index of Students with Disabilities from 39% to 41% or higher.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Bonita Salib (bonita.salib@wcsb.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Collaborative Planning with Instructional Coach. Training in standards-based teaching and test specs understanding. Leveled remediation at every grade level. Implementation of an Inclusion Model. Use of iReady with all SWDs. Additional training for teachers in Kagan strategies. Training and implementation of High Yield routines in Math. Teacher coaches meet weekly with teachers for collaborative planning. Title I teacher provides supplemental, differentiated instruction to students performing below grade level expectations.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Implementation of BPIE to increase achievement for SWDs Research shows that SWDs perform best when in inclusive environments. Kagan use in classroom provides cooperative learning structures to support inclusive practices and complement academic and social skill development. High Yield routines offer students access to big ideas of mathematics and allow deeper understanding of concepts. Collaborative planning is identified as best practice and has an effect size of .90 and ensures teacher credibility. Strategies aligned with our collaboration model support the use of teacher coaches.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Placed students in testing grades with Highly Effective teachers. 2. Professional development in Kagan strategies, High Yield Routines and Standards-based instruction by reading coach. 3. Bi-monthly meeting with Instructional Coach to support instruction and review data. 4. Bi-weekly meetings with Team Coaches for instructional planning. 5. Progress monitoring by Team Coaches through weekly meetings and maintaining an on-going progress monitoring spread sheet. 6. Faculty Meeting to cover 504's and ESE procedures and documentation. ESE staff will attend quality IEP training and Matrix training. A school "how to" shared videos has been created for all ESE staff to support training and documentation. 7. Implementation of i-Ready computerized instruction and teacher small group intervention for SWDs grades K- 2. 8. Implementation of high yield routines in grades K-5 school-wide. 9. Hearbuilder reading program (computerized instruction and teacher small group intervention) for SWDs in grades 1 - 2. 10. IEP progress reports go home every 9 weeks with noted progress. If lack of progress is being made then an IEP team meeting is convened with staff to determine next steps to help students succeed.
Person Responsible	Bonita Salib (bonita.salib@wcsb.us)

#2	
Title	Social-Emotional Learning
Rationale	Riversink had 36 students who received mental health referrals and four students who were Baker Acted during the 2018-19 school year.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	As a result of SEL education, discipline referrals will decrease by 20% and Baker Act evaluations will decrease by 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Bonita Salib (bonita.salib@wcsb.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	The Sanford-Harmony Curriculum was adopted by the school district to be used in all schools. Classroom teachers will hold daily Meet-Ups/Buddy Ups with their students. Teacher training on Kognito. Tiered Mental Health Protocol.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Understanding the needs of the whole child will help teachers improve student learning. Evidence shows that students who have experienced trauma can experience difficulty focusing on instruction. Students learn best in a safe learning environment.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mental Health training for all staff. (Kognito) 2. Sanford-Harmony Training. 3. Implementation of the tiered Mental Health Protocol by School Guidance Counselor. 4. Development of SEL schedule. 5. Curriculum mapping of Sanford Harmony Curriculum. 6. Utilization of mentors, community outreach programs and school-based counseling.
Person Responsible	Bonita Salib (bonita.salib@wcsb.us)

#3	
Title	Increase Math Learning Gains in Grades 3-5.
Rationale	RES was below the district average in Math Proficiency and Math Learning Gains on the 218-2019 FSA Mathematics assessment .
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	In 2019-2020 Sixty-five percent of all students tested in grades 3-5 on FSA/FSAA math will make learning gains.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Catherine Cutchen (catherine.cutchen@wcsb.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>High Yield Routines. Collaborative planning with Instructional Coach and Teacher Coaches. Mentoring by our sister school Shadeville. Training in standards-based instruction and test specs. Use of iReady in Grades 3-4 with all students and students in lowest quartile in grade 5. Moved SWDs to inclusion setting. Additional training in Kagan structures. Math Fact incentives school-wide.</p> <p>Worked with District Instructional Coaches and Leaders to identify Best Practices. The use of instructional coach and teacher coaches will increase student achievement by providing teachers with support in data analysis, instructional planning and program implementation. Walk-throughs and observations have identified areas needing improvement. Information from FIN guided our practice of inclusion. Implementation of an Inclusion Model as research shows that SWDs perform better in inclusion settings. Collaborative Planning with Instructional Coach for standards-based teaching. Training in standards-based teaching and test specs understanding. Leveled remediation at every grade level to address individual academic student needs. Use of iReady, a research based computerized program with all SWDs. Additional training in Kagan strategies as cooperative learning structures support inclusion practices and complement academic and social skills development. Training and implementation of High Yield routines in Math. Teacher coaches meet weekly with teachers for collaborative planning. Title I teacher provides supplemental, differentiated instruction to students performing below grade level expectations. Students who are performing below grade level will be identified through the Response to Intervention Process (RTI) which will provide supports as determined by the district's RTI process.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Training of Teacher Coaches by district. 2. Targeted and systematic interventions as outlined in the district's RtI Handbook. 3. Bi-monthly meetings with Instructional Coach. 4. Implementation of iReady Math school wide with data day training (Sept. 18) on i-ready best practices. 5. Training in High Yield Routines and implementation grades k-5. 6. RTI semester meetings to review i-ready data, STAR and FSA assessments. Development of interventions based on that data and RTI meetings. 7. Implementation of a Title 1 teacher to work with students performing below grade level. Small group differentiated instruction is provided by this teacher to address learning gaps. 8. Training on Kagan in kindergarten and 1st grade. Implementation of Kagan structures

would include Round Robin, Rally Table, Think Pair Share, Quiz-Quiz Trade, etc. for Grades K-5.

Person Responsible Holly Harden (holly.harden@wcsb.us)

#4	
Title	Increase ELA Learning gains for the Lowest Quartile.
Rationale	Riversink's lowest quartile learning gains in ELA continues to be below 50%. This subgroup is not making the necessary growth to be proficient.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	In 2019-2020, ELA learning gains of the lowest 25% will increase from 46% to 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Catherine Cutchen (catherine.cutchen@wcsb.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Bi-monthly collaborative planning with Instructional Coach. Levelled SIPPS/Rewards in all grade areas. Use of iReady for the lowest quartile. Support from Title I Resource Teacher. Implementation of the Inclusion Model. Kagan strategies and structures. Implementation of Learning Walks. Progress Monitoring of lowest quartile by Teacher Coach.</p> <p>Worked with District Instructional Coaches and Leaders to identify Best Practices. Walk-throughs and observations have identified areas needing improvement. Learning Walks will allow teachers to observe best practices. Information from FIN guided our practice of inclusion as it has been shown to improve performance of SWDs. Collaborative Planning with Instructional Coach to help increase student achievement by providing teachers with support in data analysis, instructional planning and program implementation. Training in standards-based teaching and test specs understanding. Leveled remediation at every grade level to address individual student academic needs. Implementation of an Inclusion Model. Use of iReady, a research-based program, with all SWDs. Additional training in Kagan strategies which provide cooperative learning structures which support inclusive practices and complement academic and social skill development. Training and implementation of High Yield routines in Math. Teacher coaches meet weekly with teachers for collaborative planning. Title I teacher provides supplemental, differentiated instruction to students performing below grade level expectations.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Training of Teacher Coaches by district. 2. Targeted and systematic interventions for students in the RTI process as outlined in the district's RtI Handbook. 3. Bi-monthly meetings for teachers with Instructional Coach. 4. Training in High Yield Routines and implementation grades k-5. 5. RTI semester meetings to review i-ready data, STAR and FSA assessments. Development of interventions based on that data and RTI meetings. 6. Implementation of a Title 1 teacher to work with students performing below grade level. Small group differentiated instruction is provided by this teacher to address learning gaps. 7. Training on Kagan in kindergarten and 1st grade. Implementation of Kagan structures would include Round Robin, Rally Table, Think Pair Share, Quiz-Quiz Trade, etc. for Grades K-5. 8. Implementation of iReady Reading for ESE students and students in RTI. 9. Professional Development for Grades 4-5 ELA Teachers on Data Day by Instructional Coach.

Person Responsible Catherine Cutchen (catherine.cutchen@wcsb.us)

#5

Title Increase Proficiency of Grade 5 Students on Science FCAT 2.0.

Rationale Grade 5 students decreased in FCAT 2.0 Science proficiency by 24%.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve

Seventy percent of Grade 5 students taking Science FCAT 2.0 or FSAA will be proficient (level 3 or higher) for the 2019-20 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome

Catherine Cutchen (catherine.cutchen@wcsb.us)

Evidence-based Strategy

Worked with District Instructional Coaches and Leaders to identify Best Practices. Implemented Vertical Planning between science teachers of grades 4-5 for seamless learning. Use of Performance Matters for Progress Monitoring of student progress. Use of Study Island for research-based computerized learning. Professional Development for grade 5 Science Teacher who attended conference for fifth grade item specifications for science. Implementation of Inclusion Model for SWD students as research shows that SWDs perform best when in inclusive environments. Increased usage of STEM activities for hands-on activities and improved learning. Increased training and implementation of Kagan structures and strategies which uses cooperative learning structures to support inclusive practices and complements academic and skill development.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy

Walk-throughs and observations have identified areas needing improvement. Information from FIN guided our practice of inclusion. Implementation of an Inclusion Model as research has shown SWDs perform better in inclusive settings. Collaborative Planning with Instructional Coach bi-weekly to review standards taught. Training in standards-based teaching and test specs understanding to better deliver Florida State Standards. Additional training in Kagan strategies which uses cooperative learning structures to support inclusive practices and complements academic and skill development. Teacher coaches meet weekly with teachers for collaborative planning.

Action Step

Description

1. Implementation and training for Study Island for grades 5.
2. Bi-monthly training with Instructional Coach for teachers k-5.
3. STEM night for Parents and Students grades k-5.
4. On-going Kagan training for teachers in faculty meetings.
5. Implementation of Kagan structures in grades k-5.
5. Vertical Teaming for Science teachers in Grades 4-5.
6. Progress monitoring through performance matters for grade 5 with pre-test, mid-year review and post-test.

Person Responsible

Catherine Cutchen (catherine.cutchen@wcsb.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).

Fourth and fifth grade students will receive training in a CTE Program which will allow them the opportunity to earn digital tools certifications and prepare them for advanced certifications in middle school and high school.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

Parents are invited and encouraged to attend regularly scheduled School Advisory Council Meetings as well as Parent Teacher Organization (PTO) meetings. Both meetings occur approximately four times per year at varied times to accommodate parent work schedules. School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings are the forum for continuous improvement of school operations, programs, events, and meetings. During regularly scheduled SAC Meetings parents and families assist with the planning, review and evaluation of the parent and family engagement plans, including the SIP, PFEP, and parent and family engagement project application. The PTO is another governing board which focuses on school-based events and activities in which parent volunteers are needed to facilitate to ensure success. Such events include the annual Fall Festival, Red Ribbon Celebrate Success Day, and BINGO for Books Family Night. Parent input is sought, recognized, valued, and strongly considered in the decision making process, including decisions involving Title I programs and funding. In addition, parental feedback is solicited via the annual school climate survey as well as at each parental involvement activity hosted by the school. A parent volunteer orientation is held annually within the first two weeks of school to recruit new volunteers and mentors and to review the district and school policies regarding signing in and out, confidentiality, dress code, duties and tasks, as well as restrictions and limitations while volunteering. A staff volunteer orientation is held prior to the assignment of any classroom parent

PFEP Link

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

SEL Curriculum (Sanford-Harmony) implemented weekly. Mental Health Protocol followed through School Counselor and District Social Worker. District Mentoring Program utilized. Certified Social Worker on campus one day a week or as needed for emergency situations. Student advocate for each student through Homeroom teacher, SEL curriculum and Kognito training for all faculty and staff.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

Administrators meet annually with teachers at the preschool to discuss upcoming kindergartners and preschool students visit the school to become familiar with the school environment. Upon entering kindergarten, students are screened using FLKRS during the first 30 days. Students who are identified as having a reading deficiency are remediated according to the District reading Plan. In addition, the

school provides four Title 1 Parent nights that address transitioning from grade to grade. In the final months of school, transitioning fifth graders are taken to visit and preview the middle school they will attend. Opportunities open to middle school students are presented to help them with the transition. Parents may access school zones on the district website.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

School leadership follows guidelines provided by the district for use of curriculum for all students. The needs of the lower quartile students identified by the MTSS team are met by using research based programs. Students who exhibit a reading deficiency will be provided remediation according to the District's Reading Plan.

Personnel are selected based experience, certification, background and need. District leadership attend job fairs at the local universities to recruit new teachers. Teachers are provided ongoing professional development to increase instructional success.

School leaders meet quarterly to assess school needs through input from the SACs team (including community members, parents, and teachers).

This plan is developed in coordination and integration of all applicable federal programs listed below.

Title 1, Part A: Title 1 funds provide for an Instructional Coach and professional development, supplemental materials, equipment, smaller teacher pupil ratio, staff development, remediation through a part-time teacher, and family engagement activities.

Title 1, Part C-Migrant: PAEC coordinates services for migrant students.

Title II: Part A funds are used to fund professional development for teachers from all schools based on needs determined by analyzing assessment data.

Title IV: Part A funds are used to provide professional development for teachers in computer aided instructional programs, mentoring through teacher coaches, as well as assisting in the implementation of AVID and Kagan structures within the classroom.

Title X- Homeless: The District Student Services Department will assist in providing resources for students identified as homeless.

Violence Prevention Programs: Schools offer violence prevention programs which are supported by the community and Sheriff's Department through SAVE and Sanford Harmony curriculum..

Nutrition Programs: Wellness Program includes nutrition, physical activities, health and safety, and family and community involvement goals.

Head Start: Students participate in Pre-K transition visits. Transition meetings are held between preschool and elementary teachers to discuss student needs.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

Career Education class within Guidance Curriculum. Fourth and fifth grade students are given the opportunity to earn computer industry certifications that will prepare them for advanced certifications in middle and high school.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase Achievement of Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Social-Emotional Learning	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase Math Learning Gains in Grades 3-5.	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase ELA Learning gains for the Lowest Quartile.	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Increase Proficiency of Grade 5 Students on Science FCAT 2.0.	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00