**Broward County Public Schools** 

# **Riverland 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               | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement       | 15 |
| Title I Requirements           | 19 |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 20 |

## **Riverland Elementary School**

2600 SW 11TH CT, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33312

[ no web address on file ]

## **Demographics**

Principal: Oslay Gil Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2011

| <b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)   | Active  |
|---|---|
| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5   |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| 2018-19 Title I School  | Yes   |
| 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)   | 100%  |
| 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* Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
|   | 2018-19: C (49%)  |
|   | 2017-18: C (47%)  |
| School Grades History   | 2016-17: C (49%)  |
| ·   | 2015-16: C (41%)  |
|   | 2014-15: D (38%)  |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info  | ormation*   |
| SI Region   | Southeast   |
| Regional Executive Director   | <u>LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</u>   |
| 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 is pending approval by the Broward 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 <a href="https://www.floridacims.org">www.floridacims.org</a>.

#### **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               | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement       | 15 |
| Title I Requirements           | 19 |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 20 |

## **Riverland Elementary School**

2600 SW 11TH CT, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33312

[ no web address on file ]

#### **School Demographics**

| School Type and Gi<br>(per MSID |          | 2018-19 Title I Schoo | l Disadvan | Economically<br>taged (FRL) Rate<br>ted on Survey 3) |
|---------------------------------|----------|-----------------------|------------|--|
| Elementary S<br>PK-5            | School   | Yes                   |            | 95%  |
| Primary Servio<br>(per MSID I   | • •      | Charter School        | (Reporte   | Minority Rate<br>ed as Non-white<br>Survey 2)        |
| K-12 General E                  | ducation | No                    |            | 96%  |
| School Grades Histo             | ory      |                       |            |  |
| Year                            | 2018-19  | 2017-18               | 2016-17    | 2015-16  |

C

C

C

#### **School Board Approval**

**Grade** 

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

C

#### **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 <a href="https://www.floridaCIMS.org">https://www.floridaCIMS.org</a>.

#### **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 Riverland Elementary School is that all students will be instructed by a highly qualified teacher, who will meet the present needs of the students and work collaboratively with parents/guardians so that students become college and career ready. All students will demonstrate at least one year's worth of growth. Program offerings such as the World Languages program are directly aligned to the school's vision statement. Additionally, high expectations in all classrooms and content areas are held by administration and teachers to meet the needs of all students through individualized, quarterly achievement goals, and individualized instruction through

innovative programs such as the Digital 5 Initiative, the balanced literacy model for literacy instruction, and a 90-minute block of math instruction infused with individualized center-based performance tasks to build automaticity, fluency, and critical thinking skills. Further evidence of the school's program offerings alignment to the vision and mission statements include Riverland Elementary School's magnet program not only being recognized as the second highest rated elementary school magnet program in the district, but also students' abilities showcased at an exemplary level by taking home gold medals in nearly all categories at the annual World Languages Competition held by the Innovative Programs Department.

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

The vision of Riverland Elementary School is to provide a world-class education to all students, preparing them to live, work, and compete in a global economy.

#### 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   |
|-------------------------------|------------------------|---|
| Gil, Oslay                    | Principal              | The duties and responsibilities of the principal include supervising the daily operations of the school ensuring compliance with all local, state and federal guidelines. Additionally, Mr. Gil implements instructional curricular programs to meet the individual needs of students at Riverland Elementary. Moreover, he is charged with recruiting, hiring and retaining highly qualified teachers and providing the appropriate professional development to further develop the staff.   |
| Familia,<br>Katherine         | Assistant<br>Principal | As assistant principal, Mrs. Familia's duties and responsibilities include supporting Mr. Gil in the daily operations of the school ensuring compliance with all local, state and federal guidelines. Additionally, she will support the implementation of instructional curricular programs to meet the individual needs of students at Riverland Elementary. Moreover, she is charged with supporting Mr. Gil's efforts in the recruitment, hiring and retention of highly qualified teachers and providing the appropriate professional development to further develop the staff.  |
|                               | Teacher,<br>ESE        | The role of the ESE Specialist is to provide information and support to students, families, and professionals about local resources and support groups. The ESE Specialist works with general education teachers regarding their role and responsibility to students with disabilities (SWD) and the gifted. The ESE Specialist maintains all records, test data, Educational Plans (EP), for gifted students, and Individual Education Plans (IEP) for the students with disabilities at the school.   |
| Galloway,<br>Ashley           | Other                  | The responsibilities of Ashley Galloway as curriculum facilitator and magnet coordinator are to collaborate with teachers and provide support with planning, implementing lessons, and providing resources. Moreover, I am responsible for coordinating and planning our magnet open house to provide parents with information regarding our magnet program.  |
| Ashley,<br>Sandra             | School<br>Counselor    | As the school counselor, Ms. Ashley, aligns her Annual School Counseling Plan (ASCP) with the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) Model and the School Principal's vision. She continues to build relationships with her staff and school community to maximize her ability to serve students. She is responsible for the utilization of BASIS to review academic, behavioral, and attendance data to identify students in need of school counseling services in addition to supporting the needs of our most fragile students. Based on data, Ms. Ashley conducts small group counseling sessions and conducts classroom school counseling lessons to each class. Ms. Ashley serves as the Rtl Manager and the Testing Coordinator. |
| Ahkin<br>Chin Tai,<br>Leonora | Instructional<br>Coach | As the literacy coach, Ms. Chin Tai is responsible for working collaboratively with both the leadership team and teachers. Her responsibilities include classroom-based modeling, one-on-one support, observing instructional delivery and providing feedback to enhance instruction, facilitating teachers'  |

| Name            | Title                  | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|-----------------|------------------------|--|
|                 |                        | requests for professional development as well as monitoring students' progress based on Florida's state standards.   |
| Smith,<br>Quana | Instructional<br>Coach | As the curriculum facilitator, Ms. Smith collaborates with the leadership team as well as team leaders to provide a comprehensive approach to implementing curriculum and instruction. |

#### **Early Warning Systems**

#### **Current Year**

#### The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

| Indicator                       |    |    |    |    | Gr | ade | Le | vel |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|---------------------------------|----|----|----|----|----|-----|----|-----|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                       | K  | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5   | 6  | 7   | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled     | 97 | 74 | 96 | 91 | 80 | 96  | 0  | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 534   |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 8  | 14 | 12 | 19 | 14 | 8   | 0  | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 75    |
| 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  | 6  | 13 | 24  | 0  | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 43    |
|                                 | 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                            |   |   |   |   |   | Gr | ade | e Le | vel |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| mulcator                             | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6   | 7    | 8   | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 2  | 0   | 0    | 0   | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8     |

#### The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator                           |   | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |  |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| Indicator                           | K | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |  |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0 | 0           | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 7     |  |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |  |

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

26

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

Wednesday 8/21/2019

#### 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 |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| mulcator                        | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 8           | 14 | 12 | 19 | 14 | 8  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 75    |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0  | 2  | 7  | 4  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 15    |
| 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  | 6  | 13 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 41    |

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

| La dia atao                          |   |   |   |   |   | Gr | ade | e Le | evel |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|------|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator                            | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6   | 7    | 8    | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3  | 0   | 0    | 0    | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8     |

## 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 Grade Component      | School | District | State | School | District | State |  |  |  |  |
| ELA Achievement             | 46%    | 59%      | 57%   | 40%    | 55%      | 55%   |  |  |  |  |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 45%    | 60%      | 58%   | 56%    | 58%      | 57%   |  |  |  |  |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 46%    | 54%      | 53%   | 70%    | 53%      | 52%   |  |  |  |  |
| Math Achievement            | 62%    | 65%      | 63%   | 53%    | 61%      | 61%   |  |  |  |  |
| Math Learning Gains         | 61%    | 66%      | 62%   | 48%    | 63%      | 61%   |  |  |  |  |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 41%    | 53%      | 51%   | 34%    | 52%      | 51%   |  |  |  |  |
| Science Achievement         | 39%    | 46%      | 53%   | 39%    | 45%      | 51%   |  |  |  |  |

#### **EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey**

| Indicator                       | Grade Level (prior year reported) |        |        |        |        |        |         |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|
| indicator                       | K                                 | 1      | 2      | 3      | 4      | 5      | Total   |
| Number of students enrolled     | 97 (0)                            | 74 (0) | 96 (0) | 91 (0) | 80 (0) | 96 (0) | 534 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 8 ()                              | 14 ()  | 12 ()  | 19 ()  | 14 ()  | 8 ()   | 75 (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)  | 6 (0)  | 13 (0) | 24 (0) | 43 (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)   |

#### **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-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |  |
| 03           | 2019                  | 47%    | 60%      | -13%                              | 58%   | -11%                           |  |
|              | 2018                  | 56%    | 59%      | -3%                               | 57%   | -1%                            |  |
| Same Grade C | omparison             | -9%    |          |                                   |       |                                |  |
| Cohort Com   | parison               |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |
| 04           | 2019                  | 54%    | 62%      | -8%                               | 58%   | -4%                            |  |
|              | 2018                  | 37%    | 58%      | -21%                              | 56%   | -19%                           |  |
| Same Grade C | omparison             | 17%    |          |                                   |       |                                |  |
| Cohort Com   | parison               | -2%    |          |                                   |       |                                |  |
| 05           | 2019                  | 31%    | 59%      | -28%                              | 56%   | -25%                           |  |
|              | 2018                  | 42%    | 56%      | -14%                              | 55%   | -13%                           |  |
| Same Grade C | Same Grade Comparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |
| Cohort Com   | parison               | -6%    |          |                                   |       |                                |  |

| MATH         |                       |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |
|--------------|-----------------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|
| Grade        | Year                  | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |  |
| 03           | 2019                  | 58%    | 65%      | -7%                               | 62%   | -4%                            |  |
|              | 2018                  | 59%    | 63%      | -4%                               | 62%   | -3%                            |  |
| Same Grade C | Same Grade Comparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |
| Cohort Com   | parison               |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |
| 04           | 2019                  | 65%    | 67%      | -2%                               | 64%   | 1%                             |  |
|              | 2018                  | 49%    | 63%      | -14%                              | 62%   | -13%                           |  |
| Same Grade C | 16%                   |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |
| Cohort Com   | 6%                    |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |
| 05           | 2019                  | 50%    | 64%      | -14%                              | 60%   | -10%                           |  |

| MATH                  |            |     |          |                                   |       |                                |  |
|-----------------------|------------|-----|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|
| Grade                 | Grade Year |     | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |  |
|                       | 2018       | 51% | 62%      | -11%                              | 61%   | -10%                           |  |
| Same Grade Comparison |            | -1% |          |                                   |       |                                |  |
| Cohort Com            | 1%         |     |          |                                   |       |                                |  |

| SCIENCE      |      |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |
|--------------|------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|--|
| Grade Year   |      | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |  |  |
| 05           | 2019 | 34%    | 49%      | -15%                              | 53%   | -19%                           |  |  |
|              | 2018 |        | 51%      | -18%                              | 55%   | -22%                           |  |  |
| Same Grade C | 1%   |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |
| Cohort Com   |      |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |

## Subgroup Data

|           |             | 2019      | SCHOO             | DL GRAD      | E COMF     | PONENT             | S BY SU     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2017-18 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2017-18 |
| SWD       | 20          | 39        | 43                | 21           | 42         | 25                 | 20          |            |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 45          | 43        | 45                | 60           | 62         | 53                 | 38          |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 46          | 49        | 64                | 60           | 60         | 38                 | 30          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 46          | 40        | 32                | 66           | 63         | 50                 | 43          |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 45          | 44        | 47                | 61           | 61         | 41                 | 36          |            |              |                         |                           |
|           |             | 2018      | SCHO              | OL GRAD      | E COMP     | ONENT              | S BY SU     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2016-17 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2016-17 |
| SWD       | 11          | 26        | 24                | 13           | 25         | 25                 | 8           |            |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 45          | 48        | 59                | 51           | 39         | 46                 | 6           |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 41          | 39        | 38                | 48           | 43         | 25                 | 24          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 56          | 61        | 61                | 68           | 59         | 60                 | 45          |            |              |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 40          | 29        |                   | 43           | 33         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 47          | 50        | 50                | 55           | 48         | 41                 | 33          |            |              |                         |                           |
|           |             | 2017      | SCHO              | OL GRAD      | E COMP     | PONENT             | S BY SU     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2015-16 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2015-16 |
| SWD       | 9           | 36        | 61                | 16           | 15         | 18                 | 6           |            |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 30          | 50        | 69                | 47           | 39         | 38                 | 22          |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 34          | 49        | 68                | 44           | 45         | 32                 | 31          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 44          | 62        | 75                | 63           | 54         | 35                 | 47          |            |              |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 45          | 54        |                   | 40           | 21         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 40          | 54        | 73                | 54           | 48         | 36                 | 38          |            |              |                         |                           |

## **ESSA Data**

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

| 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  | 50   |  |  |  |  |  |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    |      |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    |      |  |  |  |  |  |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 62   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 402  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8    |  |  |  |  |  |
| Percent Tested  | 99%  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Subgroup Data   |      |  |  |  |  |  |
| Students With Disabilities  |      |  |  |  |  |  |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 32   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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                                       | 51   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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                                 | 51   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 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?                          |     |  |  |  |  |
| 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?                  |     |  |  |  |  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%           |     |  |  |  |  |
| 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%                      |     |  |  |  |  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |     |  |  |  |  |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 50  |  |  |  |  |
| 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.

Riverland Elementary demonstrated a 2% decrease in the overall proficiency in ELA from 2018 to 2019, 48 to 46.

Moreover, there was a 4% decrease in the percentage of students demonstrating overall learning gains and lowest quartile learning gains, 49 to 45 and 50 to 46 respectively.

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

Based on our data, the greatest decline was evident in the overall learning gains and lowest quartile learning gains. Three of our nine intermediate teachers were new to the grade level. Additionally, 22

of our fourth and fifth grade students were chronically absent with at least 18 absences for the school 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 greatest gap when compared to the state average was evident in English Language Arts learning gains with a gap of 13%. In addition to three of nine teachers new to the grade level and chronic absenteeism, our leadership team and teachers identified teacher expertise and comfort in the content area as contributions to this gap.

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

The area which demonstrated the most improvement was Math overall learning gains. The integration of centers and the designation of 90 minutes for Math instruction were contributing factors to this improvement.

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

Our greatest area of concern is chronic absenteeism followed by the percentage of students scoring an achievement level 1 in English Language Arts. As per our data these areas have a direct correlation.

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

- 1. Increasing the percentage of students who demonstrate learning gains in English Language Arts
- 2. Increasing the percentage of students in our lowest quartile who demonstrate learning gains in English

Language Arts

3. Increase student attendance

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#### #1

#### Title

Increasing the percentage of students who demonstrate learning gains in English

Language Arts

#### Rationale

Riverland Elementary had a 4% decrease in English Language Arts learning gains from 2018 to 2019, also demonstrating a 13% gap between our school and the state.

## State the measurable

school

plans to achieve

outcome the By June 2020 Riverland Elementary will increase the English Language Arts learning gains from 45% to 55%.

#### Person responsible

for monitoring outcome

Oslay Gil (oslay.gil@browardschools.com)

## Evidencebased Strategy

Riverland Elementary will continue to implement the four literacy instructional contexts within balanced literacy during the 120 minute English Language Arts block. This school year we will be giving special attention to and designating specific times to small group quided reading where teachers will differentiate instruction to meet the individual needs of students. Accordingly, we have also planned and begun to deliver professional development centered around the successful implementation of small group guided reading. Subsequently, we will be engaging in a Guided Reading professional learning community book study.

## Rationale for Evidencebased Strategy

Although we were able to maintain our overall proficiency in English Language Arts, there was a significant decrease in learning gains. Our data reflects the need to provide strategic instructional supports during small group guided reading instruction to address the academic deficiencies of students in order to maintain their instructional momentum towards proficiency.

#### Action Step

- 1. Disaggregate and analyze student data to determine curricular and instructional needs.
- 2. Provide small group guided reading professional development during planning week.

#### **Description**

- 3. Provide ongoing support and feedback to teachers on the implementation of small group quided reading.
- 4. Provide opportunities for teachers, via small group guided reading professional learning communities, to reflect and discuss best practices.

#### Person Responsible

Leonora Ahkin Chin Tai (leonora.ahkin-chin-tai@browardschools.com)

#### #2

#### **Title**

Increasing the percentage of students in our lowest quartile who demonstrate learning gains in English Language Arts

Students in the lowest quartile had a 4% decrease in English Language Arts from 2018 to 2019, also demonstrating a 13% gap between our school and the state. Moreover, 37% of students in the lowest quartile consist of students with learning disabilities (SWD), which

only met 32% of the Federal Index.

## Rationale

## State the measurable

outcome the school plans to achieve

**outcome the** By June 2020, the students in the lowest quartile will increase in English Language Arts **school** from 46% to 60%.

## Person responsible

for monitoring outcome

Oslay Gil (oslay.gil@browardschools.com)

Evidencebased Strategy Riverland Elementary will continue to implement the four literacy instructional contexts within balanced literacy during the 120 minute English Language Arts block. This school year we will clearly identify students in our lowest quartile, as well as our students with disabilities, and give special attention to these students via enriched learning opportunities (tutoring), where we will provide strategic interventions and instruction to meet the specific needs of these students.

Additionally, we have designated specific times for small group guided reading, where teachers will differentiate instruction. Quarterly data chats will take place with these students' teachers and conferences will be held with students to establish goals and monitor progress.

#### Rationale for Evidencebased Strategy

Small group guided reading is utilized to strategically address the instructional needs of the students. The continuous improvement process will be facilitated through progress monitoring via quarterly data chats and student conferencing.

#### **Action Step**

- 1. Disaggregate and analyze student data to determine curricular and instructional needs
- 2. Establish meeting dates for quarterly data chats
- 3. Provide small group guided reading professional development during planning week

#### **Description**

- 4. Provide ongoing support and feedback to teachers on the implementation of small group quided reading
- 5. Provide opportunities for teachers, via small group guided reading professional learning communities, to

reflect and discuss best practices

#### Person Responsible

Katherine Familia (katherine.familia@browardschools.com)

| #3   |  |
|--|--|
| Title  | Increase student attendance  |
| Rationale  | Chronic absenteeism prevents students from receiving the full benefits of our instructional program. Moreover, 29% of the students chronically absent are students with disabilities, who only met 32% of our Federal Index.   |
| State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve | By June 2020, Riverland Elementary overall chronically absent percentage will decrease from 20.6% to 15%.  |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome                | Katherine Familia (katherine.familia@browardschools.com)   |
| Evidence-based<br>Strategy                               | Furthermore, we will ensure that these students are in the Response to Intervention process and are receiving emotional, behavioral and academic supports. We will hold quarterly data chats to monitor student progress.  |
| Rationale for<br>Evidence-based<br>Strategy              | The students who are identified as chronically absent make up 29% of our students with disabilities.   |
| Action Step  |  |
| Description  | <ol> <li>Identify students chronically absent</li> <li>Review students presently in Rtl and ensure that all students have been referred</li> <li>Ensure the provision of emotional, behavioral and academic supports and interventions as needed</li> <li>Provide quarterly incentives for students with perfect attendance</li> </ol> |
| Person Responsible                                       | Sandra Ashley (sandra.ashley@browardschools.com)   |
|  |  |

#4

Title Students with Disabilities

Rationale During the 2018-2019 our Students with Disabilities were rated at 32% FPPI.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to

By June of 2020 our Students with Disabilities will be rated at or above 41% FPPI.

Person responsible for

monitoring outcome

achieve

Peggy Montiel (tonya.montiel@browardschools.com)

Evidencebased Strategy Riverland Elementary will continue to implement the four literacy instructional contexts within balanced literacy during the 120 minute English Language Arts block. This school year we will be giving special attention to and designating specific times to small group guided reading where teachers will differentiate instruction to meet the individual needs of students. Accordingly, we have also planned and begun to deliver professional development centered around the successful implementation of small group guided reading. Subsequently, we will be engaging in a Guided Reading professional learning community book study.

Rationale for Evidencebased Strategy Although there was an overall increase of 11 points in the English Language Arts proficiency rate for the subgroup of Students with Disabilities, our data reflects the need to provide strategic instructional supports during small group guided reading instruction to address the academic deficiencies of students in order to maintain their instructional momentum towards improved proficiency.

#### Action Step

- 1. Disaggregate and analyze student data to determine curricular and instructional needs.
- 2. Provide small group guided reading professional development during planning week.

#### Description

- 3. Provide ongoing support and feedback to teachers on the implementation of small group guided reading.
- 4. Provide opportunities for teachers, via small group guided reading professional learning communities, to reflect and discuss best practices.

#### Person Responsible

Leonora Ahkin Chin Tai (leonora.ahkin-chin-tai@browardschools.com)

#### 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).

#### 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, § 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.

Riverland Elementary School builds positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students through effective communication, advocating for the involvement of all stakeholders in school events and shared decision making. Our school communicates via the school website, parent links, newsletters and conferences. We advocate for involvement in school events such as meet and greet, open house and family nights.

#### **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.

Riverland Elementary ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met through various services which include character education, counseling groups, peer mentoring and programs such as Just Say Hello and Sanford Harmony.

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

Riverland Elementary proudly supports incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another. To support incoming kindergarteners, the school conducts a kindergarten roundup. Additionally, all students participate in meet and greeet at the beginning of the school year. Moreover to support our fifth grade students transitioning to middle school, a variety of information and orientation sessions with the boundaried middle school as well as district magnet schools are held.

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.

The Riverland Leadership Team meets weekly to ensure that all resources are aligned in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired outcomes. The school principal facilitates the weekly meetings which include data analysis, alignment of resources and personnel to 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.

Riverland Elementary engages students in units of study encompassing a variety of college and career opportunities. After a series of lessons, fifth graders attend the JA Biz Town where they participate in a simulated economy and run businesses. Additionally, all students participate in Career Day where business partners, industry and community organizations

## Part V: Budget

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

| 1 | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: Increasing t<br>gains in English Language A | earning  | \$0.00                         |             |                |  |  |  |  |
|---|--|---|--|--------------------------------|-------------|----------------|--|--|--|--|
| 2 | III.A.   |   | Areas of Focus: Increasing the percentage of students in our lowest quartile who lemonstrate learning gains in English Language Arts |                                |             |                |  |  |  |  |
|   | Function   | Object  | Budget Focus   | Funding Source                 | FTE         | 2019-20        |  |  |  |  |
|   | 2110   | 100-Salaries  | 0151 - Riverland Elementary<br>School  | Title, I Part A                |             | \$12,427.00    |  |  |  |  |
|   |  |   | Notes: Title I funds have been allocate  | ed to conduct Extended         | Learning (  | Opportunities. |  |  |  |  |
|   | 1380 690-Computer Software 0151 - Riverland Elementary School Title, I Part A                    |   |  |                                |             |                |  |  |  |  |
|   |  |   | Notes: Title I funds have been allocate differentiation of instruction.  | ed to purchase i-Ready         | licenses in | support of     |  |  |  |  |
|   | 3610   | 500-Materials and Supplies                                  | 0151 - Riverland Elementary<br>School  | School<br>Improvement<br>Funds |             | \$1,365.00     |  |  |  |  |
|   |  |   | Notes: The Guided Reading book by Fountas and Pinnell will be utilized in our Professional Learning Communities.                     |                                |             |                |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: Increase stu                                | udent attendance   |                                |             | \$500.00       |  |  |  |  |
|   | Function   | Object  | Budget Focus   | Funding Source                 | FTE         | 2019-20        |  |  |  |  |
|   | 3610   | 510-Supplies  | 0151 - Riverland Elementary<br>School  | General Fund                   |             | \$500.00       |  |  |  |  |
|   | _  |   | Notes: Supplies to create perfect atter  | ndance certificates will       | be purchas  | ed.            |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | III.A.   | Areas of Focus: Students wi                                 | th Disabilities  |                                |             | \$1,596.00     |  |  |  |  |
|   | Function   | Object  | Budget Focus   | Funding Source                 | FTE         | 2019-20        |  |  |  |  |
|   | 3336   |   | 0151 - Riverland Elementary<br>School  | General Fund                   |             | \$1,596.00     |  |  |  |  |
|   | Notes: Accountability Funds to Purchase Fountas & Pinnell phonics spelling and word Study System |   |  |                                |             |                |  |  |  |  |
|   | Total: \$29,888.00   |   |  |                                |             |                |  |  |  |  |