

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

| 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 | 65% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 60% |

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.*

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 | |
| 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 | | | | 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 | | -57% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 59% | 48% | 11% | 56% | 3% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -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 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 32 | 33 | 40 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 29 | 30 | 10 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 18 | 17 | 27 |
| | English Language Learners | 30 | 9 | 23 |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | 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 attended 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 |