New River Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

New River Elementary School

4710 RIVER GLEN BLVD, Wesley Chapel, FL 33545

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

Demographics

Principal: Colleen Wilkinson

Start Date for this Principal: 6/17/2020

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	58%
2020-21 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* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (52%) 2016-17: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

> * 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 Pasco County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

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

New River Elementary School

4710 RIVER GLEN BLVD, Wesley Chapel, FL 33545

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	55%

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

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	C

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Basinger, Sonya	Assistant Principal	Facilitator of the School Leadership Team
Wilkinson, Colleen	Principal	Facilitator of the School Leadership Team
Furman, Jolene	Teacher, K-12	This member will collaborate in the school decision making process as a member of the School Leadership Team.
Johnson, Kari	Teacher, K-12	This member will collaborate in the school decision making process as a member of the School Leadership Team.
Robb, Sara	Teacher, K-12	This member will collaborate in the school decision making process as a member of the School Leadership Team.
Jenkins, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12	This member will collaborate in the school decision making process as a member of the School Leadership Team.
Jones, Dianna	Teacher, K-12	This member will collaborate in the school decision making process as a member of the School Leadership Team.
Romano, Stella	Teacher, ESE	This member will collaborate in the school decision making process as a member of the School Leadership Team.
Martin, Ellen	Instructional Coach	This member will collaborate in the school decision making process as a member of the School Leadership Team.
Leidy, Jon	Behavior Specialist	This member will collaborate in the school decision making process as a member of the School Leadership Team.
Lydon, Jamie	Teacher, K-12	This member will collaborate in the school decision making process as a member of the School Leadership Team.
Wohl, Rich	Other	This member will collaborate in the school decision making process as a member of the School Leadership Team.
Miltenberger, Kristen	Instructional Coach	This member will collaborate in the school decision making process as a member of the School Leadership Team.
Raines, Nicole	Teacher, K-12	This member will collaborate in the school decision making process as a member of the School Leadership Team.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Carlson, Laura	Teacher, K-12	This member will collaborate in the school decision making process as a member of the School Leadership Team.
	Instructional Coach	This member will collaborate in the school decision making process as a member of the School Leadership Team.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 6/17/2020, Colleen Wilkinson

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.*
1

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.*
7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
35

Total number of students enrolled at the school
613

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
8

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
9

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	88	92	109	117	115	117	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	638
Attendance below 90 percent	19	13	26	14	25	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	114
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failures	1	2	2	8	5	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 of 2019 Statewide FSA	0	0	0	0	9	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	2	6	11	4	5	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/29/2021

2020-21 - 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	78	89	104	114	121	103	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	609
Attendance below 90 percent	3	15	15	9	13	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
One or more suspensions	0	1	4	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	10	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Courses Failures ELA or Math	0	2	5	8	14	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

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	6	11	8	13	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

2020-21 - 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	78	89	104	114	121	103	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	609
Attendance below 90 percent	3	15	15	9	13	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
One or more suspensions	0	1	4	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	10	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Courses Failures ELA or Math	0	2	5	8	14	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

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	6	11	8	13	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				55%	58%	57%	58%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				51%	56%	58%	53%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42%	54%	53%	45%	45%	48%
Math Achievement				52%	60%	63%	60%	59%	62%
Math Learning Gains				50%	61%	62%	57%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				40%	50%	51%	32%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				50%	53%	53%	59%	56%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	56%	60%	-4%	58%	-2%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	53%	59%	-6%	58%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
05	2021					
	2019	49%	55%	-6%	56%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	50%	59%	-9%	62%	-12%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	46%	62%	-16%	64%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
05	2021					
	2019	53%	57%	-4%	60%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	49%	53%	-4%	53%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	15	15	13	16	35		19				
ELL	9	10		27	30		20				
ASN	42			50							
BLK	51	32		32	28		33				
HSP	36	22	15	25	39		36				
MUL	38			38			50				
WHT	43	41		45	46		50				
FRL	32	22	13	31	36	43	28				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	17	40	47	24	45	48	43				
ELL	71	64		46	57						
BLK	53	53	50	54	43	38	48				
HSP	46	49	48	40	46	30	34				
MUL	39	29		39	47		33				
WHT	63	54	35	59	54	52	63				
FRL	44	49	46	45	53	43	37				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	25	53	45	28	48	47	40				
ELL	29			29							
BLK	54	49	36	54	49	45	55				
HSP	48	57	50	49	44	20	45				
MUL	55	63		30	38						
WHT	64	52	41	68	68	38	62				
FRL	50	45	42	50	53	27	48				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	35
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	247
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	19
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	19
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	46
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	35
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	29
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	42
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	45
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	29
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

The subgroups that were below 41% include Hispanic students, multi-racial students, and students with disabilities. We have a decline in both ELA and Math achievement.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Our students with disabilities and students in our lowest quartile continue to show low proficiency data on FSA in 2019 as well as our NWEA MAPs data.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

This year was difficult to pull groups from different classrooms where students had similar needs. Students were separated into cohorts. Since support facilitators were not able to cross over groups, more individualized groups has to be pulled and support facilitators weren't able to spend as much time meet all their needs.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Math learning gains had the most improvement.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Our teachers have been using the resources for several years. This allowed them to have a deeper understanding of the resources and standards. Our teachers used Eureka equip assessments that determined foundational math gaps that students had. They were able to provide small group or whole group lessons to teach those missing skills to allow students to be ready to learn the new standard.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Our instructional staff will need to determine our students foundational gaps and fill those gaps in to allow students to access the standard being taught at the grade level.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Our support facilitators and teachers will be trained in station based teaching to provide an additional layer of support in either a foundational skill, preview, or reteach of the grade level standards. Professional development will also be done in the new BEST Standards.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Professional development around the core instruction to ensure that we are closing gaps for students. Ensure we are targeting specific foundational needs. Staff will also engage in professional development around the new standards, curriculum, supplemental resources and assessments. Monitoring around tier I outcome will continue to drive professional development needs.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Hispanic

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Only 40% of the Hispanic subgroup are meeting proficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	In the 2021-2022 school year 50% of Hispanic students will be meeting proficiency.
Monitoring:	Our Hispanic students will be identified and data from NWEA Maps assessments will be collected in the Fall, Winter, and Spring.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Colleen Wilkinson (cgwilkin@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	For ELA and Math essential standards are chosen, taught, and assessed. Targeted interventions are developed, implemented, and monitored.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This strategy was selected because it aligned with our District Key priorities of high impact instruction and data driven decisions.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Essential Standards are determined for ELA and Math by PLCs
2. PLCs will determine how they will assess the essential standard
3. PLCs will choose a date to analyze the data and develop tier II interventions
4. PLCs will monitor the targeted interventions
5. PLCs will monitor unit assessment to determine how students are transferring the knowledge to summative assessments.

Person Responsible	Colleen Wilkinson (cgwilkin@pasco.k12.fl.us)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Multi-Racial	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Only 37% of the Multi-Racial subgroup are meeting proficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	In the 2021-2022 school year 47% of Multi-Racial students will be meeting proficiency.
Monitoring:	Our Multi-racial students will be identified and data from NWEA Maps assessments will be collected in the Fall, Winter, and Spring.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Colleen Wilkinson (cgwilkin@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	For ELA and Math essential standards are chosen, taught, and assessed. Targeted interventions are developed, implemented, and monitored.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Strategy was selected because it aligned with our District Key priorities of high impact instruction and data driven decisions.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Essential Standards are determined for ELA and Math by PLCs
2. PLCs will determine how they will assess the essential standard
3. PLCs will choose a date to analyze the data and develop tier II interventions
4. PLCs will monitor the targeted interventions
5. PLCs will monitor unit assessment to determine how students are transferring the knowledge to summative assessments.

Person Responsible	Colleen Wilkinson (cgwilkin@pasco.k12.fl.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Only 38% of the SWD subgroup are meeting proficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	In the 2021-2022 school year 48% of Multi-Racial students will be meeting proficiency.
Monitoring:	Our Multi-racial students will be identified and data from NWEA Maps assessments will be collected in the Fall, Winter, and Spring.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Colleen Wilkinson (cgwilkin@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	For ELA and Math essential standards are chosen, taught, and assessed. Targeted interventions are developed, implemented, and monitored.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Strategy was selected because it aligned with our District Key priorities of high impact instruction and data driven decisions.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Essential Standards are determined for ELA and Math by PLCs
2. PLCs will determine how they will assess the essential standard
3. PLCs will choose a date to analyze the data and develop tier II interventions
4. PLCs will monitor the targeted interventions
5. PLCs will monitor unit assessment to determine how students are transferring the knowledge to summative assessments.

Person Responsible	Colleen Wilkinson (cgwilkin@pasco.k12.fl.us)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Only 43% of our student are meeting ELA proficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	In the 2021-2022 school year 55% of our students will be meeting proficiency.
Monitoring:	Our students not meeting proficiency in the area of ELA will be identified and data from NWEA Maps assessments will be collected in the Fall, Winter, and Spring.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Colleen Wilkinson (cgwilkin@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	In the area of ELA essential standards are chosen, taught, and assessed. Targeted interventions are developed, implemented, and monitored. PALS, Heggerty, SIPPS, HMH comprehension and fluency will be used for interventions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Strategy was selected because it aligned with our District Key priorities of high impact instruction and data driven decisions.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Essential Standards are determined for ELA and Math by PLCs
2. PLCs will determine how they will assess the essential standard
3. PLCs will choose a date to analyze the data and develop tier II interventions
4. PLCs will monitor the targeted interventions
5. PLCs will monitor unit assessment to determine how students are transferring the knowledge to summative assessments.

Person Responsible	Colleen Wilkinson (cgwilkin@pasco.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

When compared to all schools in the state, we ranked #360 our of 1,395 elementary schools. In our district we ranked #15 out of 41 elementary schools. Our school reported .2 incidents per 100 students. When compared to all the elementary schools statewide will fell into the low risk category. The only area that we ranked high was drug/public order incidents. We had a students bring tobacco product to school. Our suspension rate was #1 in the state and county. Suspension per 100 students was 0.0. Our school works hard to identify why students are engaging in the behavior and then teach students a replacement behavior.

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.

As a school teams will develop and sustain a culture of collective responsibility evident through the SuP, mission, vision, core values, goals, and intentional PD. Our goal is to build relationships with our students and families. Throughout the year we will hold several family events for parents and families to become a part of the Reptile family.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Leadership Teams will:
- Establish a School Leadership Team (SLT) that acts as the guiding coalition and distributes leadership for sustained school success.
- Form collaborative teacher teams (PLCs) and create time for PLCs to collaborate and commit to team norms that encourage equitable participation in a safe and supportive environment.
- Develop plan to welcome students and staff back to school, address potential trauma, and ensure access to needed mental health supports.
- Use of SAC and PTA feedback to improve communication and connection with students, families, and communities.
- Create systems to ensure students are engaged in planning and setting goals for the future. Use MAPS assessments and Great Minds math assessments to have students set and monitor goals to create opportunities for student and staff celebrations.
- Develop a deep understanding of individual and team strengths

PLC/Teacher will:
- Utilize the CHAMPS routines to welcome students back
- Utilize morning meetings to check-in on students