

Wakulla County Schools

Riversink Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 6 |
| Needs Assessment | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 22 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Riversink Elementary School

530 LONNIE RAKER LN, Crawfordville, FL 32327

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

Demographics

Principal: Catherine Cutchen

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

| | |
|--|--|
| 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 |
| 2019-20 Title I School | Yes |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 68% |
| 2019-20 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%) |
| 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 is pending approval by the Wakulla County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the “Date Modified” listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 6 |
| Needs Assessment | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Riversink Elementary School

530 LONNIE RAKER LN, Crawfordville, FL 32327

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

School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2019-20 Title I School | 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School KG-5 | Yes | 63% |
| 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 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | B | B | A | B |

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The 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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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 | |
| Hofheinz, Amanda | Teacher, ESE | |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2016, Catherine Cutchen

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

32

Demographic Data

| | |
|--|--|
| 2020-21 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 |
| 2019-20 Title I School | Yes |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 68% |
| 2019-20 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%) |
| 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 . | |

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 | 91 | 90 | 75 | 79 | 81 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 478 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 24 | 15 | 32 | 18 | 10 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 135 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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

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

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 | 9 | 7 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/10/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 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 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 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 |

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 | |
| | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | 0 (0) |

Grade Level Data

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

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 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% |
| 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% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 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 |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|------|
| 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% | 0 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| 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% | 0 |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 55 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| 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% | 0 |

| Multiracial Students | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Pacific Islander Students | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 59 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| 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% | 0 |

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 learning gains 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 1 teacher and ESE Resource teacher.

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 learning gains. Factors contributing include a significant drop in 5th grade student proficiency and lack of direction with the Title 1 teacher and ESE resource teacher.

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

Grade 4 math achievement levels improved 25% 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?

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. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus | Increased Achievement of Students with Disabilities. Riversink's Federal Percentage of Points Index for students with disabilities is 39% which is 2% lower than the state's threshold of 41%. |
| Description and Rationale: | |
| Measurable Outcome: | To increase the Federal Percentage of Points Index of Students with Disabilities from 39% to 41%. |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | Catherine Cutchen (catherine.cutchen@wcsb.us) |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | <p>Collaborative planning with instructional coach.</p> <p>Training by Teacher Coaches in standards-based instruction and test specs understanding.</p> <p>Leveled remediation at every grade level.</p> <p>Implementation of an Inclusion Model.</p> <p>Use of iReady with all students with disabilities.</p> <p>Additional training for teachers in Kagan strategies.</p> <p>Training and continued implementation of high-yield routines in Math.</p> <p>Teacher coaches meet weekly with teachers for collaborative planning.</p> <p>Title 1 teacher provides supplemental, differentiated instruction to students performing below grade level expectations.</p> |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | <p>Implementation of BPIE to increase achievement for students with disabilities. Research shows that students with disabilities perform best when in inclusive environments. Kagan use in the classroom provides cooperative learning structures to support inclusive practices and complement academic and social skill developments. High yield routines offer students access to big ideas of mathematics and allow deeper understanding of concepts.</p> <p>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.</p> |

Action Steps to Implement

1. Catherine Cutchen placed students in testing grades with Highly Effective teachers.
2. Professional development in Kagan strategies provided by Kagan Coach, high yield routines and standards-based instruction by instructional coaches and teacher coaches, meetings monthly.
3. Meetings with instructional coach monthly to support instruction and review data.
4. Meetings with teacher coaches weekly for instructional planning.
5. Progress monitoring by teacher coaches through weekly meetings and maintaining an on-going progress monitoring spreadsheet.
6. Faculty meetings to cover 504's and ESE procedures and documentation. ESE staff will attend quality IEP training and Matrix training offered throughout the year. A school "how to" shared video has been created for all ESE staff to support training and documentation.
7. Implementation of iReady computerized instruction and teacher small group intervention for students with disabilities grades 2-5, on a weekly basis by classroom teachers.
8. Implementation of high yield routines in grades K-5 school-wide on a weekly basis by classroom teachers.
9. Hearbuilder reading program (computerized instruction and teacher small group intervention) for students with disabilities in grades 1-2 on a weekly basis by classroom teachers.
10. IEP progress reports sent home every 9 weeks with noted progress by ESE Resource Teachers.
11. Distance learning plans for students with disabilities who are distance learners.

12. iReady computerized instruction for students with disabilities (access for distance learners).
13. Use of Canvas learning management system for students with disabilities for distance learners.

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

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | Increase Math Learning Gains in Grades 3-5. Riversink was below the district average in Math proficiency and Math learning gains on the 2018-2019 FSA Mathematics assessment. |
| Measurable Outcome: | In 2019-2020, 65% 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.</p> <p>Collaborative planning with instructional coach and teacher coaches.</p> <p>Training in standards-based instruction and test specs understanding.</p> <p>Use of iReady in grades 3-5 with all students.</p> <p>Moved students with disabilities to inclusion setting.</p> <p>Additional training in Kagan structures.</p> <p>Math Fact incentives school-wide.</p> |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | <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 students with disabilities perform better in inclusion settings.</p> <p>Collaborative planning with instructional coaches for standards-based teaching enhances student achievement. Training in standards-based instruction and test specs understanding allows teachers to have a deeper understanding of what the instruction should look like.</p> <p>Leveled remediation at every level is provided to address individual academic student needs. Use of iReady, a research based computerized program, allows additional support for students with disabilities and lower quartile students. Additional training in Kagan structures as cooperative learning provides support for inclusion practices and complement academic and social skills development. Training and implementation of high yield routines in math supports students school-wide with math strategies. Teacher coaches meet with teachers for collaborative instructional planning. Title 1 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 (RTI) process which will provide supports as determined by the district's RTI process.</p> |

Action Steps to Implement

1. Training of teacher coaches by district on best practices (trainings offered quarterly).
2. Targeted and systematic interventions as outlined in the district's RTI Handbook (provided weekly by highly effective teachers) Evidence of implementation is RTI logs submitted quarterly.
3. Meetings with instructional coaches bi-weekly regarding best practices and standards based instruction. Evidenced by meeting agendas and minutes.
4. Implementation of iReady Math school-wide with data day training on iReady best practices, monitored by instructional coach and used during bi-weekly meetings and data day.
5. Training in high yield routines and implementation in grades k-5 provided by teacher coaches monthly, as evidenced by walk-throughs and observations.

6. RTI semester meetings to review iReady data, STAR and FSA assessments with assistant principal and parents of students via telephone. 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, on a daily basis across grade levels.
8. Training on Kagan and implementation of Kagan structures would include Round Robin, Rally Table, Think-Pair-Share, Quiz-Quiz Trade, etc. for grades k-5, as well as, a strategy of the month provided by the Kagan Coach, as evidenced by lesson plans, walk-throughs, and observations.
9. Teachers will be trained in Canvas Learning Management System for basic understanding and functionality.
10. Collaboration between distance learning teachers and brick-and-mortar teachers on a monthly basis, as evidenced by meeting agendas and minutes.

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

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

| | |
|---|--|
| Area of Focus | Increase in ELA learning gains for the lowest quartile. Riversink's lowest quartile learning gains in ELA continues to be below 50%. This subgroup is not making the necessary growth to be proficient. |
| Description and Rationale: | |
| Measurable Outcome: | During the 2020-2021 school year, 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>Collaborative planning with instructional coach.</p> <p>Use of iReady for the lowest quartile.</p> <p>Support from Title 1 Resource Teacher.</p> <p>Implementation of the Inclusion Model.</p> <p>Kagan strategies and structures.</p> <p>Implementation of video best practices.</p> <p>Progress monitoring of lowest quartile by teacher coaches.</p> <p>Worked with district instructional coaches and leaders to identify best practices. Walk-throughs and observations have identified areas needing improvement. Video best practices will allow teachers to observe best practices. Information from FIN guided our practice of inclusion as it has been shown to improve performance of students with disabilities. 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 provides teachers with a deeper understanding of how instruction should look. Remediation at every grade level is provided to address individual student academic needs. Implementation of an inclusion model supports students with disabilities, as research shows that students with disabilities perform better in inclusion settings. Use of iReady, a research based computerized program, allows additional support for students with disabilities and lower quartile students. Additional training in Kagan structures as cooperative learning provides support for inclusion practices and complement academic and social skills development. Teacher coaches meet with teachers for collaborative instructional planning. Title 1 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 (RTI) process which will provide supports as determined by the district's RTI process.</p> |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | |

Action Steps to Implement

1. Training of teacher coaches by district on best practices (trainings offered quarterly).
2. Targeted and systematic interventions as outlined in the district's RTI Handbook (provided weekly by highly effective teachers) Evidence of implementation is RTI logs submitted quarterly.
3. Meetings with instructional coaches bi-weekly regarding best practices and standards based instruction. Evidenced by meeting agendas and minutes.
4. RTI semester meetings to review iReady data, STAR and FSA assessments with assistant principal and parents of students via telephone. Development of interventions based on that data and RTI meetings.
5. 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, on a daily basis across

grade levels.

6. Training on Kagan and implementation of Kagan structures would include Round Robin, Rally Table, Think-Pair-Share, Quiz-Quiz Trade, etc. for grades k-5, as well as, a strategy of the month provided by the Kagan Coach, as evidenced by lesson plans, walk-throughs, and observations.

7. Teachers will be trained in Canvas Learning Management System for basic understanding and functionality.

8. Collaboration between distance learning teachers and brick-and-mortar teachers on a monthly basis, as evidenced by meeting agendas and minutes.

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

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of****Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

Increase proficiency of Grade 5 students on Science FCAT 2.0. Grade 5 students decreased in FCAT 2.0 Science proficiency by 24%.

Measurable Outcome:

60% of Grade 5 students taking Science FCAT 2.0 or FSAA will be proficient (level 3 or higher) for the 2020-2021 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 Study Island, a research based computerized learning program, for progress monitoring of student progress.

Implementation of inclusion model for students with disabilities as research shows that students with disabilities perform best when in inclusive environments.

Increased usage of STEM activities for hands-on 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 the inclusion model, and students with disabilities.

Collaborative planning with instructional coach assists in reviewing of standards taught and best practices. Training in standards-based instruction and test specs understanding allows teachers to better deliver standardized instruction. Additional training in Kagan structures which uses cooperative learning strategies supports inclusive practices and complements academic and skill development. Teacher coaches meet with teachers for collaborative instructional planning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implementation and training for Study Island for grade 5 teachers, monitored by instructional coach.
2. Training with instructional coach for teachers, provided monthly, as evidenced by meeting agendas and logs.
3. Virtual STEM night for parents and students school-wide, as evidenced by school website.
4. On-going Kagan training for teachers via Kagan coach, monthly, as evidenced by walk-throughs and observations by administration.
5. Implementation of Kagan structures school-wide, as evidenced by walk-throughs and observations by administration.
6. Vertical planning for science teachers in grades 4-5 once per semester, as evidenced by meeting agendas and minutes.
7. Progress monitoring through Study Island for grade 5 students with pre-test, mid-year review, and post-test, monitored by instructional coach.
8. Implementation of Canvas for distance learners.
9. Teacher training in Canvas Learning Management System annually.

Person**Responsible**

Catherine Cutchen (catherine.cutchen@wcsb.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

In accordance with the needs assessment, Riversink Elementary would like to place priority on social-emotional learning within the school environment. Riversink is implementing Sanford-Harmony program school-wide to provide supports and instruction in social-emotional learning.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Parents are invited and encouraged to attend regularly scheduled School Advisory Council meetings, as well as, Parent-Teacher Organization (PTO) meetings. Both meetings occur virtually approximately four times per year at varied times to accommodate parent work schedules, as well as, provide pandemic precautions. 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 planning, review, and evaluation of the parent and family engagement plans, including the school improvement plan, and parent and family engagement project application. Parent input is sought, recognized, valued, and strongly considered in the decision-making process, including decisions involving Title 1 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, including virtual activities.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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