Broward County Public Schools

Riverland Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| School Demographics | 3 |
|--------------------------------|----|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 6 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 19 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 25 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 25 |

Riverland Elementary School

2600 SW 11TH CT, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33312

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Oslay Gil Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2011

| | • | | | | | | | |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 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* Economically Disadvantaged Students* | | | | | | | |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (49%) | | | | | | | |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Infe | ormation* | | | | | | | |
| 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. F | or more information, click here. | | | | | | | |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Broward 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:

- 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 | 6 |
| | |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| | |
| Planning for Improvement | 19 |
| | |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| - | |
| Budget to Support Goals | 25 |
| | |

Last Modified: 4/17/2024 https://www.floridacims.org Page 4 of 26

Riverland Elementary School

2600 SW 11TH CT, Fort Lauderdale, FL 33312

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

| School Type and Gr (per MSID I | | 2020-21 Title I School | Disadvant | Economically taged (FRL) Rate ted on Survey 3) | | | | | | |
|-----------------------------------|----------|------------------------|-----------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Elementary S PK-5 | School | Yes | 87% | | | | | | | |
| Primary Servio (per MSID I | • • | Charter School | (Reporte | Minority Rate ed as Non-white Survey 2) | | | | | | |
| K-12 General E | ducation | No | | 96% | | | | | | |
| School Grades Histo | ory | | | | | | | | | |
| Year | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | | | | | | |
| Grade | | С | С | С | | | | | | |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Broward 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.

The mission of Riverland Elementary School is that all students will be instructed by a highly qualified teacher, who will meet the present needs of the students and work collaboratively with parents/guardians so that students become college and career ready. All students will demonstrate at least one year's worth of growth. Program offerings such as the World Languages program are directly aligned to the school's vision statement. Additionally, high expectations in all classrooms and content areas are held by administration and teachers to meet the needs of all students through individualized, quarterly achievement goals, and individualized instruction through

innovative programs such as the Digital 5 Initiative, the balanced literacy model for literacy instruction, and a 90-minute block of math instruction infused with individualized center-based performance tasks to build automaticity, fluency, and critical thinking skills. Further evidence of the school's program offerings alignment to the vision and mission statements include Riverland Elementary School's magnet program not only being recognized as the second highest rated elementary school magnet program in the district, but also students' abilities showcased at an exemplary level by taking home gold medals in nearly all categories at the annual World Languages Competition held by the Innovative Programs Department.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Riverland Elementary School is to provide a world-class education to all students, preparing them to live, work, and compete in a global economy.

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 |
|--------------------|------------------------|---|
| Gil, Oslay | Principal | The duties and responsibilities of the principal include supervising the daily operations of the school ensuring compliance with all local, state and federal guidelines. Additionally, Mr. Gil implements instructional curricular programs to meet the individual needs of students at Riverland Elementary. Moreover, he is charged with recruiting, hiring and retaining highly qualified teachers and providing the appropriate professional development to further develop the staff. |
| Familia, Katherine | Assistant Principal | As assistant principal, Mrs. Familia's duties and responsibilities include supporting Mr. Gil in the daily operations of the school ensuring compliance with all local, state and federal guidelines. Additionally, she will support the implementation of instructional curricular programs to meet the individual needs of students at Riverland Elementary. Moreover, she is charged with supporting Mr. Gil's efforts in the recruitment, hiring and retention of highly qualified teachers and providing the appropriate professional development to further develop the staff. |
| Montiel, Peggy | Other | The role of the ESE Specialist is to provide information and support to students, families, and professionals about local resources and support groups. The ESE Specialist works with general education teachers regarding their role and responsibility to students with disabilities (SWD) and the gifted. The ESE Specialist maintains all records, test data, Educational Plans (EP), for gifted students, and Individual Education Plans (IEP) for the students with disabilities at the school. |
| Galloway, Ashley | Magnet Coordinator | The responsibilities of Ashley Galloway as curriculum facilitator and magnet coordinator are to collaborate with teachers |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|----------------------------|------------------------|--|
| | | and provide support with planning, implementing lessons, and providing resources. Moreover, I am responsible for coordinating and planning our magnet open house to provide parents with information regarding our magnet program. |
| | School Counselor | As the school counselor, Ms. Doering, aligns her Annual School Counseling Plan (ASCP) with the American School Counselor Association (ASCA) Model and the School Principal's vision. She continues to build relationships with her staff and school community to maximize her ability to serve students. She is responsible for the utilization of BASIS to review academic, behavioral, and attendance data to identify students in need of school counseling services in addition to supporting the needs of our most fragile students. Based on data, Ms. Doering conducts small group counseling sessions and conducts classroom school counseling lessons to each class. Ms. Doering serves as the Rtl Manager and the Testing Coordinator. |
| Ahkin Chin Tai, Leonora | Reading Coach | As the literacy coach, Ms. Chin Tai is responsible for working collaboratively with both the leadership team and teachers. Her responsibilities include classroom-based modeling, one-on-one support, observing instructional delivery and providing feedback to enhance instruction, facilitating teachers' requests for professional development as well as monitoring students' progress based on Florida's state standards. |
| Smith, Quana | Instructional Coach | As the curriculum facilitator, Ms. Smith collaborates with the leadership team as well as team leaders to provide a comprehensive approach to implementing curriculum and instruction. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2011, Oslay Gil

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.

6

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

24

Total number of students enrolled at the school

483

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

7

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 | | | | | Gra | ide | Le | vel | | | | | | Total |
|--|----|----|-----|----|-----|-----|----|-----|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled | 48 | 63 | 102 | 73 | 84 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 447 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 4 | 7 | 16 | 6 | 6 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 29 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 |
| | 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOLAT |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 6 | 18 | 17 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | | | | | | Gr | ade | e Le | vel | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/20/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

| Indicator | | | | | Gr | ade | Le | ve | | | | | | Total |
|---|----|----|----|----|----|-----|----|----|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled | 60 | 97 | 85 | 98 | 78 | 81 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 499 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 31 | 47 | 40 | 26 | 35 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 198 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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

| Indicator | | | | | | Gr | ade | e Le | evel | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|------|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | |
| 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 | | | | | Gra | de | Le | vel | | | | | | Total |
|---|----|----|----|-----|-----|----|----|-----|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| mulcator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOtal |
| Number of students enrolled | 63 | 94 | 88 | 101 | 83 | 82 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 511 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 25 | 38 | 35 | 37 | 41 | 26 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 202 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | Total | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|-------|-------|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | | 0 | 6 | 18 | 17 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 4 | 1 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| Students retained two or more times | | 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 Grade Component | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State | |
| ELA Achievement | | | | 46% | 59% | 57% | 48% | 56% | 56% | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 45% | 60% | 58% | 49% | 57% | 55% | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 46% | 54% | 53% | 50% | 51% | 48% | |
| Math Achievement | | | | 62% | 65% | 63% | 56% | 62% | 62% | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 61% | 66% | 62% | 50% | 60% | 59% | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 41% | 53% | 51% | 41% | 47% | 47% | |
| Science Achievement | | | | 39% | 46% | 53% | 35% | 49% | 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% | 60% | -13% | 58% | -11% |
| Cohort Com | nparison | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 54% | 62% | -8% | 58% | -4% |
| Cohort Com | nparison | -47% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 31% | 59% | -28% | 56% | -25% |
| Cohort Com | nparison | -54% | | | • | |

| | | | MATH | | | |
|-----------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 58% | 65% | -7% | 62% | -4% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 65% | 67% | -2% | 64% | 1% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -58% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 50% | 64% | -14% | 60% | -10% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -65% | | | | |

| | SCIENCE | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison | | | | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 34% | 49% | -15% | 53% | -19% | | | | | | | |
| Cohort Cor | nparison | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The ELA and Mathematics data below was compiled as a result of the administration of the i-Ready Diagnostic. The Diagnostic was administered in the Fall, Winder and Spring. The Science data includes standards based district assessments and the Statewide Science Assessment.

| | | Grade 1 | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------|--|-------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring | | | | | |
| | All Students | 66 | 55 | 42 | | | | | |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 63 | 56 | 39 | | | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 40 | 20 | 2 | | | | | |
| | English Language Learners | 54 | 36 | 13 | | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring | | | | | |
| | All Students | 51 | 52 | 52 | | | | | |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 50 | 53 | 53 | | | | | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 20 | 40 | 40 | | | | | |
| | English Language Learners | 32 | 28 | 44 | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Grade 2 | | | | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Grade 2 Fall | Winter | Spring | | | | | |
| | Proficiency All Students | | Winter 28 | Spring 35 | | | | | |
| English Language Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | Fall | | | | | | | |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities | Fall 28 | 28 | 35 | | | | | |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | Fall 28 27 | 28 28 | 35 34 | | | | | |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language | Fall 28 27 0 15 Fall | 28 28 0 | 35 34 20 14 Spring | | | | | |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students | Fall 28 27 0 15 | 28 28 0 7 | 35 34 20 14 | | | | | |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | Fall 28 27 0 15 Fall | 28 28 0 7 Winter | 35 34 20 14 Spring | | | | | |
| Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically | Fall 28 27 0 15 Fall 21 | 28 28 0 7 Winter 16 | 35 34 20 14 Spring 14 | | | | | |

| | | Grade 3 | | |
|--------------------------|---|------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 34 | 34 | 51 |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 31 | 34 | 51 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 9 | 14 | 32 |
| | English Language Learners | 15 | 14 | 26 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 9 | 16 | 27 |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 6 | 13 | 23 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 5 | 14 | 14 |
| | English Language Learners | 8 | 3 | 0 |
| | | Grade 4 | | |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | Proficiency All Students | | Winter 17 | Spring 16 |
| English Language Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | Fall | | |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities | Fall 21 | 17 | 16 |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | Fall 21 21 | 17 16 | 16 17 |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency | Fall 21 21 0 5 Fall | 17 16 6 0 Winter | 16 17 6 12 Spring |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students | Fall 21 21 0 5 | 17 16 6 0 | 16 17 6 12 |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | Fall 21 21 0 5 Fall | 17 16 6 0 Winter | 16 17 6 12 Spring |
| Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically | Fall 21 21 0 5 Fall 11 | 17 16 6 0 Winter | 16 17 6 12 Spring 20 |

| | | Grade 5 | | |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|---------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 24 | 29 | 29 |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 27 | 34 | 39 |
| 7 | Students With Disabilities | 12 | 6 | 18 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 13 | 31 | 52 |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 16 | 34 | 58 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 18 | 25 |
| | English Language Learners | 8 | 8 | 17 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 19 | 26 | 24 |
| Science | Economically Disadvantaged | 21 | 28 | 28 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 8 | 12 | 7 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 6 | 0 |

Subgroup Data Review

| | | 2021 | SCHOO | DL GRAD | E COMF | PONENT | S BY SU | JBGRO | UPS | | |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 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 | 19 | 27 | | 19 | 21 | | 8 | | | | |
| ELL | 24 | 37 | | 31 | 26 | 36 | 17 | | | | |
| BLK | 26 | 25 | | 24 | 41 | 20 | 16 | | | | |
| HSP | 37 | 50 | 45 | 35 | 34 | | 31 | | | | |
| FRL | 28 | 34 | 36 | 26 | 37 | 38 | 26 | | | | |
| | | 2019 | SCHO | OL GRAD | E COMF | ONENT | S BY SU | JBGRO | UPS | | |
| 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 | 20 | 39 | 43 | 21 | 42 | 25 | 20 | | | | |
| ELL | 45 | 43 | 45 | 60 | 62 | 53 | 38 | | | | |
| BLK | 46 | 49 | 64 | 60 | 60 | 38 | 30 | | | | |
| HSP | 46 | 40 | 32 | 66 | 63 | 50 | 43 | | | | |
| FRL | 45 | 44 | 47 | 61 | 61 | 41 | 36 | | | | |

| | | 2018 | SCHO | OL GRAD | E COMP | PONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 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 | 11 | 26 | 24 | 13 | 25 | 25 | 8 | | | | |
| ELL | 45 | 48 | 59 | 51 | 39 | 46 | 6 | | | | |
| BLK | 41 | 39 | 38 | 48 | 43 | 25 | 24 | | | | |
| HSP | 56 | 61 | 61 | 68 | 59 | 60 | 45 | | | | |
| WHT | 40 | 29 | | 43 | 33 | | | | | | |
| FRL | 47 | 50 | 50 | 55 | 48 | 41 | 33 | | | | |

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 | 34 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | YES |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 4 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 46 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 269 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 94% |

Subgroup Data

| 21 |
|-----|
| YES |
| |
| |

| English Language Learners | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 31 |
| 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 | |
| | N/A |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | IN/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 24 |
| 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 | 41 |
| 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 | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| 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 | |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 34 |
| 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?

Riverland Elementary demonstrated a 2% decrease in the overall proficiency in ELA from 2018 to 2019, 48 to 46. Moreover, there was a 4% decrease in the percentage of students demonstrating overall learning gains and lowest quartile learning gains, 49 to 45 and 50 to 46 respectively. Furthermore, the Diagnostic 2 i-Ready Data demonstrated a decrease in predicted proficiency of 10% in third grade, 11% in fourth grade and 6% in fifth grade. Additionally, 57% of our Students

with Disabilities were considered at risk, 36% placed in Tier 2, and 7% placed in Tier 1. Furthermore, 82% of our Students with Disabilities were off track, 15% borderline, and 3% on track as demonstrated through the Benchmark Assessment System. The COVID-19 pandemic has contributed significantly to the current educational gaps. Thus, we are currently mitigating significant learning gaps in both ELA and Mathematics. Our progress monitoring tools, to include i-Ready, indicate a decline in student proficiency and learning gains across subgroups.

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

Based on our data, the greatest decline was evident in the overall learning gains, lowest quartile learning gains as well the predicted proficiency and the learning gains of our students with disabilities. The COVID-19 pandemic has contributed significantly to the current educational gaps .

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 greatest gap when compared to the state average for 2019 was evident in English Language Arts learning gains with a gap of 13%. In addition to chronic absenteeism, our leadership team and teachers identified teacher expertise and comfort in the content area as contributions to this gap. The COVID-19 pandemic has contributed significantly to the current educational gaps .

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

The most significant improvement was noted in a 6% increase in Mathematics achievement when compared to 2018.

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

Our greatest area of concern is chronic absenteeism followed by the percentage of students scoring an achievement level 1 in English Language Arts and Mathematics. As per our data these

areas have a direct correlation.

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

- 1. Increasing the percentage of students who demonstrate learning gains in English Language Arts
- 2. Increasing the percentage of students in our lowest quartile who demonstrate learning gains in English

Language Arts

- 3. Increasing the percentage of students who demonstrate learning gains in English Language Arts
- 4. Increase student attendance

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.

Riverland Elementary School will continue to support the development and growth of teachers' instructional practice with the provision of professional development as it relates to the differentiation of instruction, the provision of strategic small group instruction and the implementation of appropriate interventions.

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

Teachers will participate in lesson studies, professional learning communities and continued professional development opportunities. Students will be provided with additional support via extended learning opportunities. Students will continue to receive the opportunity to participate in extended learning opportunities after school.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Riverland Elementary had a 4% decrease in English Language Arts learning gains from 2018 to 2019, also demonstrating a 13% gap between our school and the state. Moreover, 2021 FSA and current diagnostic results reveall a significant decrease in student reading proficiency and learning gains.

Measurable Outcome:

Monitoring:

By June 2022 Riverland Elementary will increase the English Language Arts learning gains from 45% to 55%.

The area of focus will be monitored through progress monitoring assessments. Riverland

Elementary School will participate in six week instructional cycles followed by Collaborative Progress Monitoring Conversations.

Person responsible for

Oslay Gil (oslay.gil@browardschools.com)

monitoring outcome:

Riverland Elementary will continue to implement the four literacy instructional contexts within balanced literacy during the 120 minute English Language Arts block. This school year we will continue to give special attention to and designating specific times to small group guided reading where teachers will differentiate instruction to meet the individual needs of students. Accordingly, we have also planned and begun to deliver professional

Evidencebased Strategy: needs of students. Accordingly, we have also planned and begun to deliver professional development centered around the successful implementation of small group guided reading. We will be engaging in a Guided Reading professional learning community book study. Additional instructional materials will be purchased to support the instructional program. Moreover, ESSER funding sources will be utilized to create two teaching positions. These teachers will provide intensive small group instruction to students not meeting adequate yearly progress.

Rationale for Evidencebased Strategy: Although we were able to maintain our overall proficiency in English Language Arts, there was a significant decrease in learning gains. Our data reflects the need to provide strategic instructional supports during small group guided reading instruction to address the academic deficiencies of students in order to maintain their instructional momentum towards proficiency. Moreover, our current data, post virtual learning, indicates a significant decrease in student reading proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

Disaggregate and analyze student data to determine curricular and instructional needs

Person Responsible

Oslay Gil (oslay.gil@browardschools.com)

Establish meeting dates for quarterly data chats

Person Responsible

Katherine Familia (katherine.familia@browardschools.com)

Provide professional development relevant to balanced literacy to include the interactive read aloud, shared reading and small group guided reading

Person Responsible

Leonora Ahkin Chin Tai (leonora.ahkin-chin-tai@browardschools.com)

Provide ongoing support and feedback to teachers on the implementation of the literacy block.

Person

Responsible Oslay Gil (oslay.gil@browardschools.com)

Last Modified: 4/17/2024 https://www.floridacims.org Page 20 of 26

Provide opportunities for teachers, via a small group guided reading professional learning communities, to reflect and discuss best practices

Person

Responsible

Katherine Familia (katherine.familia@browardschools.com)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance

Area of Focus

Chronic absenteeism prevents students from receiving the full benefits of our instructional program. For the 2019-2020 school year, 24.18% of our students were chronically absent. Moreover, 15% of the students chronically absent are students with disabilities, who only

Description and

met 32% of our Federal

Rationale:

Index

Measurable

By June 2022, Riverland Elementary overall chronically absent percentage

Outcome:

will decrease from 24.18% to 15%.

Student attendance will be monitored by teachers, the Leadership Team and the

Monitoring:

Collaborative Problem Solving Team. Should concerns arise, interventions will be provided

as needed.

Person responsible

for

Leonora Ahkin Chin Tai (leonora.ahkin-chin-tai@browardschools.com)

monitoring outcome:

Evidencebased

Strategy:

Furthermore, we will ensure that these students are in the Response to Intervention process and are receiving emotional, behavioral and academic supports. We will hold

quarterly data chats to monitor student progress

Rationale for

Evidence-

The students who are identified as chronically absent make up 15% of our

based

students with disabilities.

Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

Identify students chronically absent

Person

Responsible

Peggy Montiel (tonya.montiel@browardschools.com)

Review students presently in Rtl and ensure that all students have been referred

Person

Responsible

Peggy Montiel (tonya.montiel@browardschools.com)

Ensure the provision of emotional, behavioral and academic supports and interventions as needed

Person

Responsible

Peggy Montiel (tonya.montiel@browardschools.com)

Provide quarterly incentives for students with perfect attendance

Person

Quana Smith (quana.smith@browardschools.com) Responsible

Last Modified: 4/17/2024

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

During the 2018-2019 our Students with Disabilities were rated at 32% FPPI. According to our 2019-2020 i-Ready Data 57% of our Students with Disabilities were considered at risk, 36% Tier 2, and 7% tier 1. Furthermore, 82% of our Students with Disabilities were off track, 15% borderline, and 3% on track. The Spring 2021 i-Ready Diagnostic revealed that 17% of our Students with Disabilities in third through fifth grade, were proficient. This data supports the critical need for continuous improvement in the instruction of our Students with Disabilities.

Measurable Outcome:

By June of 2022, our Students with Disabilities will be rated at or about 41% FPPI.

Monitoring:

Student progress will be monitored via the i-Ready Diagnostic assessments, and Go Math progress monitoring assessments. Moreover, Riverland Elementary School will participate in six week instructional cycles followed by Collaborative Progress Monitoring

Conversations.

Person responsible for

Peggy Montiel (tonya.montiel@browardschools.com)

monitoring outcome:

> Riverland Elementary will continue to implement the four literacy instructional contexts within balanced literacy during the 120 minute English Language Arts block. This school year we will be giving special attention to

Evidencebased Strategy:

and designating specific times to small group guided reading where teachers will

differentiate instruction to meet the individual needs of students. Accordingly, we have also

planned and begun to deliver professional

development centered around the successful implementation of small group guided reading. Subsequently, we will be engaging in a Guided Reading professional learning

community book study.

Rationale for Evidencebased

Strategy:

Although there was an overall increase of 11 points in the English Language Arts proficiency rate for the subgroup of Students with Disabilities, our data reflects the need to provide strategic instructional supports during small group guided reading instruction to address the academic deficiencies of students in order to continue building on the foundational skills. Moreover, we have identified the need to address unfinished learning in

the area of math. Thus, students will require remediation relevant to necessary

mathematical prerequisite skills.

Action Steps to Implement

Disaggregate and analyze student data to determine curricular and instructional needs

Person Responsible

Oslay Gil (oslay.gil@browardschools.com)

Provide professional development relevant to the implementation of an effective Mathematics block. This will include the provision of whole group and small group instruction with opportunities for remediation, reteaching, guided and independent practice.

Person Responsible

Leonora Ahkin Chin Tai (leonora.ahkin-chin-tai@browardschools.com)

Provide professional development relevant to small group instruction, differentiation of instruction and centers

Person

Quana Smith (quana.smith@browardschools.com) Responsible

Provide ongoing support and feedback to teachers on the implementation of small group guided reading and math remediation and reteach

Person Responsible Leonora Ahkin Chin Tai (leonora.ahkin-chin-tai@browardschools.com)

Provide opportunities for teachers, via small group guided reading professional learning communities, to reflect and discuss best practices

Responsible

Leonora Ahkin Chin Tai (leonora.ahkin-chin-tai@browardschools.com)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of

and

Focus
Description

The 2021 Mathematics FSA and 2021 diagnostic results revealed a significant decline in projected proficiency rates in third through fifth grades.

Rationale:

Measurable Outcome:

By the end May 2021, the Mathematics proficiency rate will increase from 19% to 30%.

Student progress will be monitored via the i-Ready Diagnostic assessments, and Go Math progress monitoring assessments. Moreover, Riverland Elementary School will participate

in six week instructional cycles followed by Collaborative Progress Monitoring

Conversations.

Person responsible

Monitoring:

for monitoring outcome:

Oslay Gil (oslay.gil@browardschools.com)

Evidencebased Strategy: A designated 60 minute Math block will continue to be implemented. The Math block will facilitated the strategic provision of instruction through the implementation of whole group instruction, independent practice, small group instruction and math centers. Moreover, ESSER funding sources will be utilized to create two teaching positions. These teachers will provide intensive small group instruction to students not meeting adequate yearly

progress.

Rationale

for Evidencebased Strategy: We have identified the need to address unfinished learning in the area of math. The implementation of the Math block will facilitate the provision of strategic instruction, providing opportunities for guided practice, independent practice, remediation, reteaching and enrichment through the differentiation of instruction. This will facilitate the remediation

relevant to necessary mathematical prerequisite skills.

Action Steps to Implement

Disaggregate and analyze student data to determine curricular and instructional needs

Person Responsible

Oslay Gil (oslay.gil@browardschools.com)

Provide professional development relevant to small group instruction, differentiation of instruction and centers

Person

Responsible

Quana Smith (quana.smith@browardschools.com)

Provide ongoing support and feedback to teachers on the implementation of small group guided reading and math remediation and reteach

Person

Responsible

Katherine Familia (katherine.familia@browardschools.com)

Provide opportunities for teachers, via small group guided reading professional learning communities, to reflect and discuss best practices

Person Responsible

Leonora Ahkin Chin Tai (leonora.ahkin-chin-tai@browardschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the <u>SafeSchoolsforAlex.org</u>, 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.

Riverland Elementary is considered very low risk. Our discipline data indicates a majority of local events with the highest number of referrals for disobedience/insubordination. We are implementing Zones of Regulation school wide. Additionally, we will continue to implement ten minutes of mindfulness followed by sustained silent reading. It is our goal to set the expectations for academic success and the development of a safe culture and environment conducive to academic excellence.

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.

Riverland Elementary School builds positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students through effective communication, advocating for the involvement of all stakeholders in school events and shared decision making. Our school communicates via the school website, parent links, newsletters, Canvas, Virtual Counselor and conferences. We advocate for involvement in school events such as meet and greet, open house, literacy night, and family nights.

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

We will continue to collaborate with all stakeholders to ensure the provision of a positive culture and environment for all students and staff. The leadership team including, the principal, assistant principal, instructional coaches, ESE specialist, school counselor, social worker and team leaders will continue to positively engage students in positive school events to include counseling, mindfulness and culturally relevant activities. We will partner with our parents and community stakeholders to ensure that we continue to meet the needs of all families and students.

Part V: Budget

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

| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | | | | \$20,367.00 |
|--|---|---|---|--------------------------------|------------------------|---|
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2021-22 |
| | 2110 | | 0151 - Riverland Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | \$2,500.00 |
| | Notes: Title I funds have been allocated to conduct Extended Learning C | | | | Opportunities. | |
| | 3336 | | 0151 - Riverland Elementary School | Title, I Part A | | \$17,867.00 |
| Notes: Title I funds have been allocated to purchase instructional materials to supple literacy program. | | | | | ials to supplement the | |
| | | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance | | | | |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & E | nvironment: Student Attenda | nce | | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | | nvironment: Student Attendar | | | \$0.00 \$0.00 |
| _ | | | roup: Students with Disabiliti | | | · |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subg | roup: Students with Disabiliti | | FTE | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subg | roup: Students with Disabilition | es | FTE | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. III.A. Function | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subg | roup: Students with Disabilities Il Practice: Math Budget Focus 0151 - Riverland Elementary | Funding Source Title, I Part A | | \$0.00 \$2,500.00 2021-22 \$2,500.00 |