

The School District of Lee County

River Hall 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	18
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	23

River Hall Elementary School

2800 RIVER HALL PKWY, Alva, FL 33920

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

Demographics

Principal: Jody Poulakis

Start Date for this Principal: 9/20/2021

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)	100%
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: C (45%) 2016-17: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 Lee County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

River Hall Elementary School

2800 RIVER HALL PKWY, Alva, FL 33920

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	92%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	55%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Poulakis, Jody	Principal	
Tweet, Adam	Assistant Principal	
Remy, Lacie	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Provides coaching and mentoring support to teachers, monitors achievement data, and works with groups of students.
Rodriguez, Jane	Reading Coach	Provides coaching and mentoring support to teachers, monitors achievement data, and works with groups of students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 9/20/2021, Jody Poulakis

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

4

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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,015

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

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

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	171	194	152	164	154	180	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1015
Attendance below 90 percent	14	36	44	35	26	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	193
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	5	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	3	19	10	19	16	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
Course failure in Math	3	8	4	20	21	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	25	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	106
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	5	35	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	3	12	9	20	33	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	5	1	7	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/21/2021

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	9	11	14	21	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	9	11	14	21	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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				52%	57%	57%	48%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				54%	56%	58%	44%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				45%	50%	53%	44%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				59%	62%	63%	52%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				69%	65%	62%	52%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				62%	54%	51%	39%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				41%	52%	53%	37%	54%	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	47%	58%	-11%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	51%	55%	-4%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
05	2021					
	2019	49%	54%	-5%	56%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	46%	61%	-15%	62%	-16%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	65%	62%	3%	64%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
05	2021					
	2019	58%	58%	0%	60%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	39%	50%	-11%	53%	-14%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Data was collected through a quarterly progress monitoring cycle, which included instruments such as STAR, iReady, and district-created progress monitoring assessments.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	10/8.2	32/25	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/12.5	0/0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6/5	32/25.4	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	2/28.6	1/14.3	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/5.9	0/0

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	22/15.8	52/3.7	1/20
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	4/21.1	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	5/20.8	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	5/3.7	21/14.3	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	28/24.6	40/33.3	47/38.8
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/11.1	1/10	2/20
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	10/8.8	25/21.5	45/37.2
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/11.1	0/0	1/9.1
	English Language Learners	1/5.3	0/0	0/0

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	31/27	33/28.2	41/34.5
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	2/1.9	31/26.3	35/30.2
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	1/7.7
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	1/5.3
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	34/22.8	53/31.7	58/33.1
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	2/10	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/3.8	1/3.6
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	12/8.6	43/25.7	51/29.7
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	2/10	2/9.5
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/3.8	2/7.4
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	36/24.2	52/32.5	64/39.8
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	3/17.6	1/5.9	5/27.8
	English Language Learners	2/9.1	1/4	3/11.1

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	10	28	38	14	44	62	5				
ELL	12	30	29	14	37	44	12				
BLK	17	14		25	23		10				
HSP	35	38	38	35	41	38	26				
MUL	17			38							
WHT	50	45		55	45		52				
FRL	27	28	50	32	33	50	21				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	24	32	25	39	62	55	19				
ELL	26	47	48	49	74	67	13				
BLK	30	43	27	41	61	55	27				
HSP	47	56	59	54	68	64	31				
MUL	50			71	80						
WHT	63	57	33	68	71	62	54				
FRL	43	56	48	52	69	66	36				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	14	34	34	16	25	32					
ELL	14	31	38	29	29	25	7				
BLK	35	39	31	40	38	35	13				
HSP	38	39	39	44	44	29	28				
MUL	42			42							
WHT	58	49	58	63	60	53	49				
FRL	42	43	46	46	47	41	26				

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	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	45
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	322

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
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	28
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	
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	18
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	37
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	28
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

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	49
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	37
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?

2020-21 Q3 Progress Monitoring Data:

ELA Proficiency 35%, Learning Gain 43%, Learning Gains for the L25 group was 42.5%. Math 31%, Learning Gain 27.5%, 19% Learning Gain of L25.

FSA Achievement Data:

ELA Proficiency 39%, 37% Learning Gain, 39% Learning Gain of L25. Math 43% Proficient, 41% Learning Gain, 42% Learning Gain of L25. Science 36% proficient.

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

ELA proficiency and learning gains are in need of greatest improvement when compared to Q3 progress monitoring and 2019 FSA test data. Students with disabilities (SWD) are not making enough learning gains. ELA 2019: 24% Proficient, 32% Learning Gains, 25% Learning Gains in L25.

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

The 2020-21 school year found many of our students changing instructional models from face to face to Home Connect or hybrid. The majority of our 4th grade L25 students learned in the Home Connect or Hybrid model the entire year. Students with disabilities did not benefit from hybrid instruction nor

did they make learning gains in this model of instruction. Because they took most of their progress monitoring assessments and received intervention via Home Connect, little learning gain was made. Our 5th grade L25 and SWD students also struggled with learning from home. During the 2019-20 school year, this group of students had little to no intervention and had no less than 3 different teachers for ELA and Math due to difficulty maintaining staffing in that grade level. The face to face students did not walk to reading intervention due to COVID. Teachers that had been departmentalized for math for years, found themselves teaching reading for the first time in their career.

Actions needed to address this need for improvement include targeted intervention for this group of students and increased instructional time. The WIN model for intervention is targeting gaps in foundational skills needed to improve overall reading for this group of students. Students are walking to reading with specific intervention plans and curriculum. Small group intervention during the 90 minute reading block is targeted grade level standards and skills at a lower reading level (material) to allow kids to practice fluent reading and build comprehension at the same time.

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

2019 Science was 39% (-14 from state average of 53)

2021 Science was 34% (-13 from state average of 47)

This is a 1% increase from state average

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

We added science to the specials wheel for 3-5. The science resource teacher taught 34rd and 4th grade standards on the wheel (for 5th graders) and the teachers taught 5th grade standards in the block. The science resource teacher also supported instruction in the classroom. She met with teachers in PLC to review progress monitoring data and ensure alignment of priority science standards to instruction.

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

We have put WIN back in the master schedule with walk to read. 4th and 5th grade is departmentalized again allowing teachers to maximize their strengths and provide targeted reading instruction.

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.

Professional development plan includes PLC work around the exemplars and backwards planning for targeted instruction, using progress monitoring data to drive small group instruction and intervention supported by District Level Curriculum Leaders. Teachers are participating in iReady Data Chats and receiving mini-PD based on individual need. We have also scheduled monthly PD for high-yield instructional strategies including topics such as numbered heads together, distributive summarizing, text dependent questioning, and writing to raise achievement. Intermediate grade levels are receiving extensive PD in Top Score Writing in an effort to increase overall ELA performance. Primary grade levels are receiving PD in foundational skill instruction that build decoding and fluency skills as well as the other high yield strategy PD.

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

Additional services and supports are being provided by the K-2 Literacy Coach and Peer Collaborative Teacher. They support via the coaching model, in classroom co-teaching and modeling as needed and they also support/co-facilitate weekly PLCs.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: SWD subgroup data from 2019 indicate this group must be a priority for intervention and instruction again this year. 24% of SWD in 4th and 5th grade demonstrated proficiency, 32% demonstrated a learning gain, and 25% of the L25 students made a learning gain on FSA ELA in 2019. Only 19% of SWD demonstrated proficiency in Science due to their inability to read proficiently at grade level.

Measurable Outcome: 2021-22 achievement goal for SWD is 34% proficient with a 50% learning gain overall and a 55% learning gain for those students in the L25 as measured by the FSA ELA assessment in the Spring of 2022.

Monitoring: Progress monitoring using exemplars, pre and post tests for intervention block, iReady diagnostic monitoring (weekly instructional path time on task and percent of lessons passed in the path).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lacie Remy (lacierr@leeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Evidence based strategies include iReady and walk to read using Really Great Reading (Phonics)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Students are assigned lessons in iReady directly aligned to the standards and skills they need based on the diagnostic given in September and December. Teacher assigned lessons are aligned to performance on exemplars and classroom progress monitoring assessments. Really Great Reading instruction fills in the phonics gaps students need to be proficient readers.

Action Steps to Implement

Weekly monitoring of performance in the iReady Instructional Path for minutes on task (strive for 45) and percent lessons passed. Teachers have Monitoring Monday Data Chats with students every week in which they look at minutes in the path as well as percent of lessons passed and set weekly goals. They also have What's Up Wednesday check-ins to be sure students are making progress toward that goal for the week. Teachers submit the data chat form each week to the admin team.

Person Responsible Lacie Remy (lacierr@leeschools.net)

Teachers meet weekly in PLC to review progress monitoring data from ELA exemplars and WIN assessments. Much time and effort is spent backwards planning from exemplars to ensure instruction meets the rigor of the assessments and focuses on priority standards.

Person Responsible Jody Poulakis (jodyp@leeschools.net)

Teachers adjust student assignments to WIN groups based on progress monitoring data in PLC. Intervention specialist and resource teachers, coaches, etc attend PLC to support intervention planning and delivery.

Person Responsible Lacie Remy (lacierr@leeschools.net)

Monthly Professional Development is provided based on teacher survey data and student progress monitoring data.

Person Responsible Jody Poulakis (jodyp@leeschools.net)

ESE Resource Teachers are assigned to serve students in small group and intervention groups. They participate in PLC weekly to provide further support to teachers.

Person
Responsible Jody Poulakis (jodyp@leeschools.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students in this subgroup demonstrated 30% ELA Proficiency, 43% Learning Gain, and 27% Learning Gain for those in the L25. They were 27% proficient on the NGSS Science assessment (impacted by lack of reading proficiency)
Measurable Outcome:	2021-22 achievement goal for this subgroup is 40% proficient with a 53% learning gain overall and a 50% learning gain for those students in the L25 as measured by the FSA ELA assessment in the Spring of 2022.
Monitoring:	Progress monitoring using exemplars, pre and post tests for intervention block, iReady diagnostic monitoring (weekly instructional path time on task and percent of lessons passed in the path).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidence based strategies include iReady and walk to read using Really Great Reading (Phonics)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students are assigned lessons in iReady directly aligned to the standards and skills they need based on the diagnostic given in September and December. Teacher assigned lessons are aligned to performance on exemplars and classroom progress monitoring assessments. Really Great Reading instruction fills in the phonics gaps students need to be proficient readers.

Action Steps to Implement

Weekly monitoring of performance in the iReady Instructional Path for minutes on task (strive for 45) and percent lessons passed. Teachers have Monitoring Monday Data Chats with students every week in which they look at minutes in the path as well as percent of lessons passed and set weekly goals. They also have What's Up Wednesday check-ins to be sure students are making progress toward that goal for the week. Teachers submit the data chat form each week to the admin team.

Person Responsible Lacie Remy (lacierr@leeschools.net)

Teachers meet weekly in PLC to review progress monitoring data from ELA exemplars and WIN assessments. Much time and effort is spent backwards planning from exemplars to ensure instruction meets the rigor of the assessments and focuses on priority standards.

Person Responsible Lacie Remy (lacierr@leeschools.net)

Monthly Professional Development is provided based on teacher survey data and student progress monitoring data.

Person Responsible Jody Poulakis (jodyp@leeschools.net)

Individual data chats with this subgroup combined with check in and check out with leadership team.

Person Responsible Adam Tweet (adamct@leeschools.net)

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.

2019-20 discipline data on the SafeSchoolsforAlex website indicates a violent incident rate of 1.79 for every 100 students at RHES. Property Incidents and Drug Incidents were 0. Total reported suspensions resulted in RHE ranking #848/#1359 in the state and #25/#126 in the county, with a total of 37 out of school suspensions (3.7 per 100 students).

Primary areas of concern are the overall referral rate and the resulting suspension rate. We implemented various restorative practices for the 2020-21 school year and it had a positive impact. We used more positive incentives with our PBIS program. School-wide expectations were shared with students and reviewed with any student seen in the office for a discipline concern. Restorative practices were implemented including student conferences, time-outs in other classrooms where students completed a written reflection, and students were supported in efforts to apologize for the disruptive behaviors. Repairing relationships was a focus last year and continues to be moving into the 2021-22 school year.

The focus for the 2021-22 school year is to be more proactive with the PBS program and increase parent-teacher communication early and often. We have implemented "Bobcat Blue Cards" which are a more progressive approach to shaping behaviors. The cards require teachers to contact parents with each discipline issue and work with the school Behavior Team (Deans, Intervention Specialist, School Counselor and Social Worker, Assistant Principal, and Principal) closely to create interventions and supports for each child. Monthly incentives and recognition are in place to increase positive behaviors and recognize students working hard to follow school-wide expectations for behavior. Monthly PLC conversation takes place in week #3 of the PLC cycle. Students at risk for behavioral/discipline referrals are discussed and interventions are put in place by the team. Monitoring of those interventions is done by the Deans and Intervention Specialist to ensure they are having the desired outcome. The PBIS team reviews discipline data monthly and shares with teachers and the Behavior Team to celebrate the small wins, identify effective interventions, provide further support for students still struggling, and identify any areas of concern. We continue to use a restorative approach and expect it will continue to decrease the number of minor discipline incidents as well as out of school suspensions.

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.

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00