

St. Lucie Public Schools

Rivers Edge Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	24

Rivers Edge Elementary School

5600 NE SAINT JAMES DR, Port St Lucie, FL 34983

<http://www.stlucie.k12.fl.us/ree/>

Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Ingersoll

Start Date for this Principal: 8/16/2021

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)	76%
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* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: B (57%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
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 was approved by the St. Lucie County School Board on 10/12/2021.

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	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	24

Rivers Edge Elementary School

5600 NE SAINT JAMES DR, Port St Lucie, FL 34983

<http://www.stlucie.k12.fl.us/ree/>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>65%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>60%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the St. Lucie County School Board on 10/12/2021.

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.

At Rivers Edge Elementary, all students will be provided challenging, engaging and satisfying work, which meets their individual differences and abilities ensuring their success each and every day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Through the caring, cooperative efforts of parents, staff and community, all students at Rivers Edge Elementary will be successful. They will be challenged, engaged, and satisfied with the learning opportunities provided to them.

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
Ingersoll, Jennifer	Principal	
Forman, Valerie	Assistant Principal	
Mardis-Romano, Natasha	Instructional Coach	
Tiegs, Bridgette	Teacher, K-12	
Jaramillo, Elena	Teacher, K-12	
Zaragoza, Alexis	Teacher, K-12	
Hodgson, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Rocco, Kerri	Teacher, K-12	
Owens, Pamela	Teacher, K-12	
Schroeder, Samantha	Teacher, K-12	
Johnson, Kelly	Instructional Coach	
Cannon, Heather	School Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/16/2021, Jennifer Ingersoll

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.*

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.*

18

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

30

Total number of students enrolled at the school

650

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

9

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

8

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	102	97	105	127	127	120	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	678
Attendance below 90 percent	13	17	22	16	15	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106
One or more suspensions	1	2	0	3	10	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	6	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	5	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	26	24	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	25	23	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	5	6	11	2	5	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	1	6	4	23	21	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78

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	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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

Monday 8/16/2021

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	94	85	92	109	110	112	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	602
Attendance below 90 percent	4	16	14	13	16	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	3	1	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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	94	85	92	109	110	112	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	602
Attendance below 90 percent	4	16	14	13	16	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	3	1	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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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				57%	50%	57%	56%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				60%	55%	58%	61%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				57%	54%	53%	51%	55%	48%
Math Achievement				62%	53%	63%	66%	56%	62%
Math Learning Gains				63%	50%	62%	59%	56%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				35%	42%	51%	44%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				49%	46%	53%	58%	51%	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	57%	50%	7%	58%	-1%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	47%	51%	-4%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						
05	2021					
	2019	59%	48%	11%	56%	3%
Cohort Comparison						
		-57%				
		-47%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	59%	55%	4%	62%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	70%	54%	16%	64%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
05	2021					
	2019	55%	47%	8%	60%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	46%	46%	0%	53%	-7%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

iReady Diagnostic data was used to determine below information. For Science 5th grade, no data available.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	32	33	40
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	30	10
	Students With Disabilities	18	17	27
	English Language Learners	30	9	23
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	20	22	48
	Economically Disadvantaged	18	18	45
	Students With Disabilities	27	27	58
	English Language Learners	20	0	31

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	31	33	40
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	34	41
	Students With Disabilities	13	13	27
	English Language Learners	15	15	23
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	18	21	30
	Economically Disadvantaged	17	23	25
	Students With Disabilities	13	13	13
	English Language Learners	23	17	15

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	73	79	88
	Economically Disadvantaged	69	75	88
	Students With Disabilities	25	29	50
	English Language Learners	55	55	77
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	75	87	97
	Economically Disadvantaged	68	87	97
	Students With Disabilities	39	58	82
	English Language Learners	55	75	100

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	78	79	85
	Economically Disadvantaged	75	75	86
	Students With Disabilities	27	40	56
	English Language Learners	63	50	58
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	77	78	34
	Economically Disadvantaged	75	74	27
	Students With Disabilities	65	58	30
	English Language Learners	38	36	17
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	72	74	74
	Economically Disadvantaged	67	73	73
	Students With Disabilities	43	33	71
	English Language Learners	50	50	57
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	86	55	92
	Economically Disadvantaged	86	58	92
	Students With Disabilities	86	18	80
	English Language Learners	63	54	88
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	69	69	73
	Economically Disadvantaged	61	66	73
	Students With Disabilities	43	43	40
	English Language Learners	13	25	38

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	18	44	36	39	38		25				
ELL	37	43		40	57		57				
BLK	42	50		48	44		67				
HSP	48	48		52	58	36	59				
MUL	53			57							
WHT	67	57	46	68	62	64	67				
FRL	48	51	40	53	55	45	61				
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	62	57	36	46	29	26				
ELL	33	40		56	73						
BLK	50	45		61	72	47	44				
HSP	55	59	85	65	61	31	44				
MUL	57			57							
WHT	60	64	49	62	60	33	52				
FRL	50	55	55	58	59	29	41				
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	27	48	42	42	56	58	15				
ELL	32	58	54	59	58						
BLK	57	54	19	71	65	43	52				
HSP	46	54	56	67	63	58	52				
MUL	45			55							
WHT	60	64	62	64	54	40	63				
FRL	50	57	44	63	58	45	58				

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	54
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	56
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	433

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%
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%	
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%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	50
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	51
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	55
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	62
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	51
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

Our bottom quartile in Reading and Math did not reach 50% learning gains on FSA in the 2020-2021 school year. Per our iReady progress monitoring, our ELL and ESE student are underperforming when compared to unidentified students.

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

Math L25% has been consistently below 50% learning gains. This cell has been trending as our lowest performing since 2015-16. Our ESE subgroup has been identified in ESSR as underperforming.

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

Contributing factors are multiple teachers with < 5 years experience teaching content, inconsistent implementation of small group- differentiated instruction, and limited remedial instructional material.

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

Our ELA L25% showed the greatest gains from the previous year.

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

The school was able to secure and experienced ESE teacher to coteach in ELA classes with SWD. In addition, we continued our departmentalized structure in 4th and 5th grade, which allowed our teachers to continue to build the experience and effective cooperative learning structures.

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

Implementation of new Benchmark curriculum to support needed growth in ELA for L25 and demographic subgroups across all grade levels. Coaching support for implementations of rigorous standards based instruction in reading and math. Intervention to provided support for tiered interventions and progress monitoring. LLI and Benchmark Advanced intervention will be used to provide tiered instruction. Teacher will provide after school tutoring for ESE students.

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.

Teachers at all grade levels will receive PD on the new Benchmark Advanced textbook/curriculum. PD will be provided for LLI intervention and BAS progress monitoring. Differentiated in-class coaching support will be provided for teachers.

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

The staff will implement the SEL curriculum Sanford Harmony across all grade levels. PBIS will be implemented schoolwide and at the classroom level for all students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale: Our ELA bottom quartile performed at 40% making learning gains.

Measurable Outcome: Our goal would be to achieve a minimum of 50% in 2021-2022.

Monitoring: This area of focus will be monitored using Unit assessment, iReady diagnostic, and Tiered intervention progress monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jennifer Ingersoll (jennifer.ingersoll@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: We will be using Benchmark Advanced System for whole group, differentiated small group instruction and Tiered intervention. Also, we will use LLI intervention for tiered intervention. We will utilize school-based coaching support in collaborative planning and classroom implementation of curriculum. We also have a school-based interventionist to assist in providing tiered intervention to student and monitor student progress.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Benchmark Advanced is our peer-reviewed adopted text materials for elementary ELA instruction. LLI is a researched based intervention designed to provide targeted, differentiated small group instruction. Coaching support for collaborative planning and classroom feedback is part of our district literacy plan. our interventionist position is a Reading endorsed teacher with experience in providing tiered intervention and tracking student progress.

Action Steps to Implement

Monitor implementation and effectiveness of standards based instruction for whole group, and small group

Person Responsible Jennifer Ingersoll (jennifer.ingersoll@stlucieschools.org)

Provide school-based coaching support in collaborative planning and classroom feedback

Person Responsible Natasha Mardis-Romano (natasha.mardis@stlucieschools.org)

Monitor implementation and effectiveness of standards based instruction for Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention

Person Responsible Bridgette Tiegs (bridgette.hyde@stlucieschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale: Our math bottom quartile demonstrated learning gains at 46% per FSA.

Measurable Outcome: Our goal would be to achieve a minimum of 50% in 2021-2022.

Monitoring: This area of focus will be monitored using Unit assessment and iReady diagnostic.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Valerie Forman (valerie.forman@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will receive ongoing instructional support with differentiated instruction, collaborative planning, and student engagement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If all teachers use data to drive instruction, and work collaboratively to plan and implement, highly engaging, differentiated instruction, then all stakeholders will increase individual ownership; therefore, students will leave their grade level demonstrating at least a year's worth of growth.

Action Steps to Implement

Monitor implementation and effectiveness of standards based instruction.

Person Responsible Valerie Forman (valerie.forman@stlucieschools.org)

Provide school-based coaching support in collaborative planning and classroom implementation feedback.

Person Responsible Kelly Johnson (kelly.johnson@stlucieschools.org)

Monitor implementation of daily small group, differentiated instruction practices.

Person Responsible Valerie Forman (valerie.forman@stlucieschools.org)

Monitor data of unit assessments and iReady diagnostic data.

Person Responsible Kelly Johnson (kelly.johnson@stlucieschools.org)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: SWD consistency underperform in the areas of ELA proficiency, ELA LG, ELA L25% and Math proficiency, Math LG, and Math L25% as compared to other subgroups and Gen Ed population.

Measurable Outcome: SWD will demonstrate a 10% increase in each underperforming area.

Monitoring: This area of focus will be monitored using Unit assessment, iReady diagnostic, and Tiered intervention progress monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jennifer Ingersoll (jennifer.ingersoll@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will receive ongoing instructional support and implement with fidelity differentiated small group instruction, Tiered intervention, collaborative planning, and student engagement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If all teachers use data to drive instruction, and work collaboratively to plan and implement, highly engaging, differentiated instruction, then SWD stakeholders will increase individual ownership; therefore, all SWD will leave their grade level demonstrating either meeting grade level expectations or 1 year's worth of growth.

Action Steps to Implement

Monitor implementation and effectiveness of standards based differentiated small group instruction

Person Responsible Jennifert Moler (jennifer.moler@stlucieschools.org)

Monitor the use of the Collaborative Planning Protocol

Person Responsible Natasha Mardis-Romano (natasha.mardis@stlucieschools.org)

Coaches and ESE Specialist will provide ongoing support for planning, data analysis, and problem solving

Person Responsible Natasha Mardis-Romano (natasha.mardis@stlucieschools.org)

Students will demonstrate increased student achievement

Person Responsible Jennifer Ingersoll (jennifer.ingersoll@stlucieschools.org)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Social and emotional learning (SEL) is the process through which children and adults acquire and effectively apply the knowledge, attitudes, and skills necessary to understand and manage emotions, set and achieve positive goals, feel and show empathy for others, establish and maintain positive relationships, and make responsible decisions. Research demonstrates that SEL programs promote academic success and increase positive behavior, while reducing misconduct, substance abuse, and emotional distress for elementary school students. Given the impact of the COVID-19 outbreak on school routines and access, family norms and dynamics, and social interactions among peers and the community, it is critical that school address the possible SEL needs of their students.

Measurable Outcome: Students will demonstrate a 10% increase of positive responses from the Spring 2021 SEL student survey to the Spring 2022 SEL student survey.

Monitoring: Area of focus will be monitored using classroom walkthrough data on Sanford Harmony implementation and Panorama student data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Valerie Forman (valerie.forman@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers and staff will implement the Sanford Harmony curriculum across all grade levels and classroom settings.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Studies suggest that students participating in both the relationship building activities and everyday activities of Sanford Harmony benefit both socially and academically. The studies reveal promising gains in both social emotional development and academic performance over those in control groups.

Action Steps to Implement

PD to teachers during preservice week on SEL/Sanford Harmony purpose and implementation process

Person Responsible Valerie Forman (valerie.forman@stlucieschools.org)

Monitor implementation and effectiveness of Sanford Harmony lesson plans

Person Responsible Valerie Forman (valerie.forman@stlucieschools.org)

Monitor implementation of Meet-up/Buddy-up and Community Circles in each classroom

Person Responsible Valerie Forman (valerie.forman@stlucieschools.org)

SEL/Sanford Harmony refreshers at each faculty meeting

Person Responsible Valerie Forman (valerie.forman@stlucieschools.org)

Implement school-based SEL committee to monitor implementation and advise school

Person Responsible Jennifer Ingersoll (jennifer.ingersoll@stlucieschools.org)

Designation of SEL coordinator to attend district PD's throughout the school year

Person Responsible Valerie Forman (valerie.forman@stlucieschools.org)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale: One or more grades (3,4,5) are below 50% for proficiency in ELA. 4th grade is at 48%.

Measurable Outcome: By the end of 2022, 51% students in grade (identify grade 3,4,5) will show proficiency in ELA.

Monitoring: This area of focus will be monitored using Unit assessment, iReady diagnostic and Growth Monitoring, K-2 Monitoring Assessments and tiered intervention progress monitoring.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jennifer Ingersoll (jennifer.ingersoll@stlucieschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: - Tier 2 interventions with fidelity in all grades (K -5) with special attention paid to our K – 2 classes (refer to Reading Matrix found in the approved SLPS Reading Plan) - Use Benchmark Advanced System for whole group, differentiated small group instruction and tiered intervention and use LLI intervention for tiered intervention. - Utilize school-based coaching support in collaborative planning and classroom implementation of curriculum. - Focus on strong CLPs creating standards-based lessons

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Benchmark Advanced is our peer-reviewed adopted text materials for elementary ELA instruction. LLI is a researched based intervention designed to provide targeted, differentiated small group instruction. Coaching support for collaborative planning and classroom feedback is part of our district literacy plan. our interventionist position is a Reading endorsed teacher with experience in providing tiered intervention and tracking student progress.

Action Steps to Implement

Monitor implementation and effectiveness of standards-based instruction for whole group, and small group – using monitoring schools (Unit Assessments, K-2 assessments).

Person Responsible Jennifer Ingersoll (jennifer.ingersoll@stlucieschools.org)

Monitor implementation and effectiveness of standards-based instruction for Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention

Person Responsible Jennifer Ingersoll (jennifer.ingersoll@stlucieschools.org)

Provide school-based coaching support in collaborative planning and classroom feedback

Person Responsible Jennifer Ingersoll (jennifer.ingersoll@stlucieschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

Per the SafeSchoolsforAlex website, Rivers Edge Elementary has a low school incident ranking. In analyzing our school data, it is noted that our ESE students account for a disproportionate percentage (45%) of our L2 and L3 infractions. This will be addressed through our SEL plan and MTSS. All students will receive Sanford Harmony instruction 1 time per week and follow classroom protocols of greeting, class meet-up circles, and brain breaks. We will also utilize a 2x10 strategy with ESE students who demonstrate more frequent behavioral infractions. Students with high frequency behaviors will also receive tiered behavioral intervention as a part of our MTSS structures..

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.

Rivers Edge has had a strong support from our parents and community business partners. With the onset of COVID, our opportunities to host family and community events has been limited to after school activities or online until it is safe to have events on campus during school hours. In response to these restrictions, we have increased our digital outreach through posting of school events on Facebook.

In addition, we are increasing our communication through sending monthly school newsletters via email to families. Fortunately, we were able to have an in-person Open House, which was attend by around 70% of our families. This year, we are planning on the following after school activities:

In addition, to primary grade level, Rivers Edge choral, and school-wide musical performance, we have several major family events that encourages parents and families to participate with the school:

- Family Read Aloud Nights (digital)
- SEL Night
- ESOL Night
- Student Led Conference Night (combination digital and in-person)
- Science Night
- Spring Fling
- Publix Math Night

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

Jennifer Ingersoll, principal, monitor for implementation of SEL and SAC chairperson. Valerie Forman, assistant principal, monitor implementation of SEL and PBIS team member. Classroom teachers will implement SEL and participate in Parent and Family Involvement Committee. SAC committee will provide feedback and suggestions to SEL implementation based on implementation and student survey data. PTO members will plan PTO after school activities and provide feedback to school through SAC involvement. Community members will support after school programs through donations and participation in events, like Publix Math Night.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00