

The School District of Lee County

River Hall Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	13
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	0

River Hall Elementary School

2800 RIVER HALL PKWY, Alva, FL 33920

<http://rhe.leeschools.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Jody Poulakis

Start Date for this Principal: 4/8/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 Lee County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	13
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

River Hall Elementary School

2800 RIVER HALL PKWY, Alva, FL 33920

<http://rhe.leeschools.net/>

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 PK-5	Yes	88%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	56%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee 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.

To provide a safe, secure environment that ensures the development of the whole child. Through successful experiences, all children will grow academically, socially, emotionally, physically and creatively.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To educate all students to their fullest potential so they may become productive members of society.

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
Poulakis, Jody	Principal	<p>The team is responsible for ensuring that all stakeholders are informed and have an understanding of the SiP. All members are responsible for the following:</p> <p>Providing professional development opportunities throughout the year Monitoring the progress for academic and behavior and providing interventions to targeted subgroups</p> <p>Principal: Conducts classroom walk throughs and provides immediate feedback Communicates openly with all stakeholders, including parents Provides opportunities throughout the year for parents and students to immerse themselves in the school environment in order to improve community and parental involvement Interacts with parents and community groups to address concerns with leadership Provide or coordinate continuous professional development Monitor Student achievement data Share recent research, district, and state initiatives Plan for implementation of curricular and extra curricular activities to support the needs of students</p>
Mell, Michelle	Assistant Principal	<p>Interact with parent and community groups sharing concerns with leadership Provide or coordinate continuous professional development Monitor student achievement data Share recent research, state and district initiatives Plan for implementation of curricular and extracurricular activities to support the needs of students Shares information on interventions for students (special needs and concerns-academic and behavior) Support staff training and school-wide initiatives Share with leadership status of at risk students and needs for student success</p>
Herndon, Robert	Dean	<p>Implement school-wide discipline procedures and district Code of Conduct Support teachers with classroom management Contact parents to discuss student behavior and how to improve Works to improve student conduct throughout the school Plans and implements safety procedures throughout the school Provide Professional Development, modeling, and support for Restorative Practices</p>
Boils, Ronald	Dean	<p>Implement school-wide discipline procedures and district Code of Conduct Support teachers with classroom management Contact parents to discuss student behavior and how to improve Works to improve student conduct throughout the school Plans and implements safety procedures throughout the school</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<p>Provide Professional Development, modeling, and support for Restorative Practices</p>
Boils, Rhonda	Other	<p>Intervention Specialist</p> <p>Plan for academic and behavior interventions for students Train teachers in interventions, progress monitoring, and differentiated instruction Implement Tier 3 supplemental and intensive interventions Keep progress monitoring notes and anecdotal(s) of interventions implemented Training for staff on monitoring, grading, communication and other requirements for students Monitor and share new research, initiatives, and regulations Provide Professional Development, modeling, and support for Restorative Practices</p>
Remy, Lacie	Instructional Coach	<p>Peer Collaborative Teacher (PCT)</p> <p>Instruct students approximately 50% of the day Fulfill instructional coaching duties 50% of the day Design and deliver professional development (PD) opportunities for teachers and staff Provide one-on-one and group mentoring to apprentice and mentor teachers Model, observe, and provide feedback to teachers through the utilization of the instructional coaching cycle Lead and guide professional learning communities through data analysis Provide a schedule of activities including lesson plans as well as a PD calendar to be shared</p>
Rodriguez, Jane	Instructional Coach	<p>Work one-on-one with teachers to ensure that scientifically-based literacy - researched programs are implemented with fidelity. Provide direct, classroom-based, PD through regular modeling. Work with all teachers, prioritize coaching and mentoring to maximize impact on instruction and learning. Mentor teachers in providing appropriate intensive reading intervention. Model lessons in effective reading instruction, including differentiated instruction. Facilitate teacher study groups in the area of preventing & remediating reading problems. . Organize and lead professional development which are needs-based and focused on the accomplishments of the established reading benchmarks. Coordinate and schedule ongoing professional development of teachers such as coaching grade level meetings and study groups. Provide instructional support in content areas by demonstrating effective strategies.</p>

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 4/8/2020, Jody Poulakis

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.*

3

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

49

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (44%) 2015-16: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	

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	135	150	147	145	172	167	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	916
Attendance below 90 percent	10	45	18	30	18	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	155
One or more suspensions	0	2	4	1	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA	0	12	14	17	18	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
Course failure in Math	0	8	8	12	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	15	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	12	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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	9	11	14	21	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Saturday 10/24/2020

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	157	174	149	194	175	155	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1004
Attendance below 90 percent	45	30	18	19	25	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	151
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	2	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	15	29	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68

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	121	79	49	72	79	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	449

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year		3	4	2	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	157	174	149	194	175	155	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1004
Attendance below 90 percent	45	30	18	19	25	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	151
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	2	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	15	29	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68

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	121	79	49	72	79	49	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	449

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year		3	4	2	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	52%	57%	57%	51%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	56%	58%	46%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	50%	53%	34%	49%	52%
Math Achievement	59%	62%	63%	49%	60%	61%
Math Learning Gains	69%	65%	62%	46%	60%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	62%	54%	51%	39%	50%	51%
Science Achievement	41%	52%	53%	45%	51%	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	47%	58%	-11%	58%	-11%
	2018	52%	55%	-3%	57%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	51%	55%	-4%	58%	-7%
	2018	47%	53%	-6%	56%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	49%	54%	-5%	56%	-7%
	2018	41%	52%	-11%	55%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	46%	61%	-15%	62%	-16%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	54%	58%	-4%	62%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	65%	62%	3%	64%	1%
	2018	55%	58%	-3%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				
05	2019	58%	58%	0%	60%	-2%
	2018	44%	57%	-13%	61%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	39%	50%	-11%	53%	-14%
	2018	36%	52%	-16%	55%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
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	24	32	25	39	62	55	19				
ELL	26	47	48	49	74	67	13				
BLK	30	43	27	41	61	55	27				
HSP	47	56	59	54	68	64	31				
MUL	50			71	80						
WHT	63	57	33	68	71	62	54				
FRL	43	56	48	52	69	66	36				

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	14	34	34	16	25	32					
ELL	14	31	38	29	29	25	7				
BLK	35	39	31	40	38	35	13				
HSP	38	39	39	44	44	29	28				
MUL	42			42							
WHT	58	49	58	63	60	53	49				
FRL	42	43	46	46	47	41	26				

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	13	12	9	15	33	23	20				
ELL	18	19	13	21	29	12	8				
BLK	39	50	47	26	39	42	28				
HSP	42	39	26	43	46	21	32				
MUL	50			50							
WHT	60	51	44	58	49	55	58				
FRL	41	45	37	39	42	35	35				

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	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	58
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	440
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
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	48
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	41
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	55
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	67
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	58
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.

2019-20 Q3 QDC data indicate 4th grade ELA is the lowest performance area. (Overall proficiency 42%, overall learning gains 38% and L25 learning gains 7%). ELA learning gains of the lowest 25% dropped 12 percentage points from last year. The students in the lowest quartile and those with learning disabilities were grouped in 3 classrooms. These classrooms showed 0% LG in room #1 and room #2 and 20%LG in room #3 (as compared to room #4 with 55% LG, room #5 with 46% LG , and room #6 with 38% LG) These students had 4 different classroom teachers over the course of the first 3 quarters. These students will need daily, intensive support to close the learning gaps. We have hired a Peer Collaborative Teacher (PCT) that can model best practices, work with small groups of kids in the lowest quartile and provide professional development to teachers.

Math learning gains of the same group of students were also significantly lower (31%) compared to the overall grade level's learning gain of 46%. This group of students is going to need significant, daily support from highly qualified resource teachers (in addition to core instruction) during the 2020-21 school-year.

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

Math LG were 19% lower in Q3 of the 2019-20 year than last year's FSA LG percentage. As mentioned above, the students in this sub group had 4 different teachers over the first semester. The teachers did not deliver targeted instruction driven by progress monitoring data. They did not utilize WIN time nor did they group students for small group instruction of any kind, using PM data. This group of students also had the largest number of discipline referrals and out of school suspensions in the entire school. Lost instructional time contributed to the lack of learning in 4th grade.

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.

Q3 progress monitoring data with the greatest gap to the state was math proficiency (-14) and math learning gains (-19). PLC conversations revolved around the lack of consistent teachers (several subs in and out for the L25/good cause classrooms. Teachers responsible for this group struggled to provide intensive intervention using Progress monitoring data resulting in a lack of differentiation in math.

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

Greatest gains were in 5th grade science proficiency. Q1 (16%) Q2 (46%) Q3 (49%) Q3 performance was 3% higher this year than last year. Our SIP goal was to increase science proficiency by 3% from 41% in FY19 to 44% in FY20. Q3 proficiency on the district assessment was 49%, surpassing our SIP goal. The first 2 quarters, students were provided with a science special for 5th graders. The teacher targeted the 3rd and 4th grade standards the students needed to master (determined by district science assessment data). 5th Grade teachers delivered 5th grade standards to students during the regular science block (extra 30 minutes of science added). Unfortunately, the science special was consistently staffed following winter break. Students did not get additional science support in Q3 but the team utilized the WIN model for science instruction with lessons planned by the Learning and Leading teacher for 5th grade. Adding a science resource teacher for grades 3-5 will maintain our forward momentum and significantly increase students' mastery of standards.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

EWS data indicate a very high out of school suspension rate (as well as overall rate of discipline referrals) Our school leads the district in OSS for Q3. We had 37 students with at least 1 day of OSS, and a total of 116 days of suspension.

4th grade had the most discipline referrals of any grade level (216 through the end of February) and data indicate our students with disabilities are written more referrals and suspended out of school more that their non-disabled peers. We have hired a resource teacher with ESE certification and strong behavioral background to help increase time on task in the classroom as well as overall instructional time. We have also hired a Behavior Specialist to help train teacher/staff in verbal de-escalation, re-launch PBIS, and model best practices for engaging students with disabilities in the classroom.

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

1. 5th grade ELA Proficiency and Learning Gains (last year's 4th grade)
2. 4th Grade Math Proficiency and Learning Gains (last year's 3rd grade)
3. 4th Grade ELA Proficiency (last year's 3rd grade)
4. Decreasing discipline referrals and out of school suspensions
5. 5th grade Science Proficiency

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Students are still performing well below the state average in Science. The state has outperformed us by 11% and 18% over the last two years. SWD subgroup data indicate a 19% proficiency rate.

Measurable Outcome: The school will increase science achievement to 52% as measured by the 5th grade Science FSA during the 2020-2021 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jody Poulakis (jodyp@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Each grade level will increase the number of minutes spent on science instruction in grades K-5. The additional Science Resource teacher will work with 3rd through 5th grade provide strategic science instruction, as well as the scientific method. (We also have a science resource teacher for Kindergarten through 2nd grade.)

We will use science formative assessments to drive instruction and make instructional decisions. We will also utilize the district Science Leading and Learning representatives to bring back district data and professional development to the staff each quarter.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Due to the focus on reading and math, science can be overlooked. The students should receive instruction in science according to the Florida State Standards for Science, at all grade levels.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Hire an additional Science Resource teacher
2. ESE Resource teacher will provide reading support in the science block for SWD
3. Provide Science as a rotation in the specials wheel to all grade levels
4. Assess student outcomes quarterly (District OPM)
5. Formative assessments for third, fourth, and fifth grades

Person Responsible Jody Poulakis (jodyp@leeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Q3 QDC data indicate 4th grade ELA is the lowest performance area. (Overall proficiency 42%, overall learning gains 38% and L25 learning gains 7%). ELA learning gains of the lowest 25% dropped 12 percentage points from last year. A lack of differentiated instruction combined with a high absentee and suspension rate impacted learning gains.
 Subgroup Data indicate a continued need to increase proficiency and learning gains in ELA although we are on an upward trend (2019 school grade data for SWD show 10% increase ELA proficiency, 14% increase in L25 ELA LG)

Measurable Outcome: We will increase proficiency on the 4th grade FSA from 42% to 50% for the 2020-2021 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Master schedule provides an uninterrupted 90 minute Reading Block and at least 45 minutes of iii time for grades 3-5. An additional ESE Resource teacher has been hired to support SWD in the gen-ed classroom. We also hired a PCT to work with the 4th grade inclusion classroom and support our SWD sub group.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: SRA instruction has been proven to show a rapid improvement in reading instruction for students who are performing below grade level. We have chose this instructional program for the lowest performing students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: By putting a paraprofessional in the classroom, we will be able to provide instruction to smaller groups of students.

Action Steps to Implement

- 1. Provide reading tutoring during specials
- 2. Provide after school tutoring beginning in January

Person Responsible Jody Poulakis (jodyp@leeschools.net)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our goal is to increase on-task learning time by reducing disruptive behaviors and Out of School Suspensions. 2020-21 data reflect 73 discipline referrals (16 SWD) and 48 Out of School Suspensions (16 SWD).

Measurable Outcome: We will reduce the number of out of school suspensions from 48 to 24 (50% reduction) as measured by the Early Warning System.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jody Poulakis (jodyp@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The school will implement Restorative Practices as a means for behavior modification, as well as focusing on relationships and providing mentors for students who are at risk for multiple offenses that could be deemed severe enough for suspension

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: According to the What Works Clearinghouse, the most effective strategy to increase student compliance is building meaningful relationships with students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify students who are at risk of being suspended
2. Provide a mentor for these students who will check in with them and provide support and trust
3. Monitor student behavior and provide interventions in restorative practices and PBS
4. Implement a hierarchy of steps for teachers to utilize before looking at suspension as an option
5. Dean of Discipline will communicate with teachers methods for classroom management and steps to take before suspension becomes an option
6. Hire Behavior Specialist to model best practices, train in verbal de-escalation, and support student behavior plans.

Person Responsible Jody Poulakis (jodyp@leeschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Math LG were 19% lower in Q3 of this year than last year's FSA LG percentage. Q3 progress monitoring data with the greatest gap to the state was math proficiency (-14) and math learning gains (-19).

Measurable Outcome: We will increase overall math proficiency to 54% (from 50%), increase learning gains in math 66%, and increase learning gains of the L25 to 43% as measured by FSA at the end of the 2020-21 school-year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jody Poulakis (jodyp@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will use iReady instructional grouping profile lessons and teacher toolbox lessons during small group math time and during math intervention to reinforce grade level standards practice as well as district provided spiral math "Take Ten" each morning. Math tutoring will take place during specials time (given parent permission.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Math proficiency and learning gains dropped from the previous year (19%)

Action Steps to Implement

1. Small group math lessons during the math block using iReady MAFS and teacher toolbox lessons
2. Math intervention groups using the iReady instructional grouping profile lessons
3. Tutoring during breakfast groups and specials in specific standards (using formative and exemplar data)
4. After school tutoring beginning in January 2021.
5. Additional teacher support provided by PCT
6. Additional ESE Resource teacher to support SWD

Person Responsible: Jody Poulakis (jodyp@leeschools.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The areas of focus address the priorities in 2.E. of the Needs Assessment/Analysis.

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.

River Hall Elementary will involve parents in an organized and timely manner with regards to the planning, review and improvement of the Title I programs. All parents will be invited through the school newsletter, invitations, parentlink, and personal phone calls to attend the SAC/Title I meetings. The procedures for selecting this group will include the input of parents, staff members and the SAC committee. Input from parents will be collected through surveys and quality tools like parking lots, affinity surveys and open discussions. These communications will be flexible in format such as online, in person or on paper; allowing for all parents to give input. Formats will be in different languages and simple terms that parents can easily understand. Information gathered from this data will be used to create a plan. The plan will be created and reviewed during SAC/Title I quarterly meetings. During a scheduled SAC meeting, the committee will hold an open discussion and will decide, with input from parents, how the 1% set aside for Parent Involvement will be used. Ideas and input from parents will be documented in the SAC Meeting Minutes. In order to provide additional support for parental involvement transportation or flexible meeting times will be available. Documentation for all SAC and parent meetings to include: flyers, agendas, handouts, minutes, sign-in sheets and workshop comments will be maintained in the Title I CRATE. The SIP will be approved in the November 2020 SAC meeting.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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