

Wakulla County Schools

Riversink 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 | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 17 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 23 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Riversink Elementary School

530 LONNIE RAKER LN, Crawfordville, FL 32327

<https://res.wakullaschooldistrict.org/>

Demographics

Principal: Catherine Cutchen

Start Date for this Principal: 8/31/2021

| | |
|--|--|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School KG-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) | 68% |
| 2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: B (61%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Northwest |
| Regional Executive Director | Rachel Heide |
| 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 Wakulla 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 | 6 |
| Needs Assessment | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 17 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Riversink Elementary School

530 LONNIE RAKER LN, Crawfordville, FL 32327

<https://res.wakullaschooldistrict.org/>

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 KG-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 | 16% |

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Wakulla 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 Riversink Elementary School is to facilitate the development of all students to their fullest potential by providing research-based instructional strategies and promoting the love of learning and community pride in a safe, positive environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Every student will reach his or her highest potential in our positive learning environment provided by highly qualified professionals; every child, every chance, every day.

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 |
|-----------------------|---------------------|---|
| Cutchen, Catherine | Principal | Active/ Voting member of SAC Committee, responsible for the planning of professional development for school improvement, monitoring teacher accountability. |
| Vernon, James | Assistant Principal | Sac administrator, assisting in monitoring teacher accountability. |
| Salib, Bonita | School Counselor | Overseeing school culture and environment, monitoring fidelity of ESE compliance. |
| Dotson-Scarry, Bobbie | Teacher, ESE | SAC Chairperson, development of SIP for presentation to SAC committee. |
| Gentry, Angie | Reading Coach | Monitor and support curriculum implementation |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 8/31/2021, Catherine Cutchen

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.*

0

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

36

Total number of students enrolled at the school

493

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

4

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

5

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 | 87 | 96 | 84 | 63 | 75 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 490 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 9 | 18 | 17 | 11 | 18 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 87 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 6 | 5 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 39 | 51 | 27 | 19 | 8 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 153 |

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 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 11 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |

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 | 14 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| 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

Tuesday 8/31/2021

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 | 91 | 90 | 75 | 79 | 81 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 478 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 24 | 15 | 32 | 18 | 10 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 135 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 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 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| | 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |

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 | 9 | 7 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

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 | 91 | 90 | 75 | 79 | 81 | 62 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 478 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 24 | 15 | 32 | 18 | 10 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 135 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 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 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| | 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |

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 | 9 | 7 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

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 | | | | 69% | 68% | 57% | 68% | 64% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 55% | 59% | 58% | 60% | 59% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 46% | 47% | 53% | 47% | 49% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 67% | 68% | 63% | 72% | 64% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 63% | 69% | 62% | 62% | 60% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 50% | 52% | 51% | 56% | 51% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 54% | 56% | 53% | 78% | 64% | 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 | 72% | 67% | 5% | 58% | 14% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 73% | 66% | 7% | 58% | 15% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -72% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 53% | 61% | -8% | 56% | -3% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -73% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 61% | 64% | -3% | 62% | -1% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 83% | 71% | 12% | 64% | 19% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -61% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 48% | 60% | -12% | 60% | -12% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -83% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 55% | 53% | 2% | 53% | 2% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

STAR Reading
 STAR Math
 Science DSBA

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |

| Grade 2 | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |

| Grade 3 | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |

| Grade 4 | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | | | |
| | Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |

| Grade 5 | | | | |
|-----------------------|---|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |

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 | 32 | 54 | | 25 | 42 | | 31 | | | | |
| BLK | 47 | | | 53 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 72 | 49 | 40 | 67 | 54 | 42 | 51 | | | | |
| FRL | 61 | 42 | | 51 | 39 | | 40 | | | | |
| 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 | 45 | 43 | 35 | 50 | 50 | 43 | 8 | | | | |
| BLK | 60 | | | 50 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 50 | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 71 | 58 | 45 | 68 | 65 | 55 | 53 | | | | |
| FRL | 62 | 52 | 42 | 59 | 62 | 46 | 45 | | | | |

| 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 | 39 | 45 | 64 | 56 | 73 | 86 | 55 | | | | |
| BLK | 70 | | | 80 | | | | | | | |
| MUL | 40 | | | 80 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 70 | 61 | 46 | 71 | 61 | 58 | 79 | | | | |
| FRL | 63 | 60 | 45 | 65 | 67 | 57 | 57 | | | | |

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 | 53 |
| 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 | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 374 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 98% |
| 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 | |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| 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 | |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| 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 | 54 |
| 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 | 47 |
| 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?

The Lowest Quartile in Math struggled with only 36% learning gains. In ELA, 46% in the lowest quartile had learning gains but we still saw an overall drop in proficiency in the fifth grade of 12% in math and 12% in ELA.

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

Third and fifth grade lowest quartile learning gains in math is the biggest area of need with an overall gap of 5% required to meet mandated learning gains.

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

Long term teacher retention in the fifth and third grade contributed to the gap based on the data from year to year as well as attendance issues documented in those grade levels.

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

Fourth grade showed 71% proficiency in math and 72% in ELA.

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

Teacher continuity with content embedded lessons developed over multiple years based on the ability to retain and support teachers.

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

An after-school program on Tuesdays and Thursdays to improve math and science scores for students identified on the watchlist for a potential drop in proficiency is being offered school-wide. The implementation of Mystery Science and Pebble Go to provide additional learning platforms for science achievement. I-Ready for grades 3-5 for math supports and Lalilo for grades K-3 will continue to be used to help support struggling students. DSBA's will be developed and used for science in the fifth grade for progress monitoring.

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.

Higher Order Questioning Training and Rural Connect Training have been implemented to provide professional development of teachers in the content areas for each grade level that will be tested this school year. Teacher demonstrations and walkthroughs by grade level cohorts to show best practices in these programs has been developed school-wide for increased understanding of program implementation.

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

Installation and training of the use of E- board technologies in fifth grade math and science classrooms to support learning gains and mitigate attendance issues for these testing groups.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Increase math learning gains in grades 3-5 based on the data that math scores dropped 24% in 3rd, 9% in fourth, 12% in fifth grade for FSA Math in 2020-2021.

Measurable Outcome: In 2021-2022, 62% of all students tested in grades 3-5 in FSA/ FSAA math will make learning gains.

Monitoring: STAR Math
 I-Ready Math
 Afterschool Math Support Program

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Catherine Cutchen (catherine.cutchen@wcsb.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Collaborative planning with instructional and teacher coaches. Professional development in standards-based training for the B.E.S.T. standards implementation. Use of i-Ready for 45 minutes per week for all students. Math backed incentive programs schoolwide. Intensive math instruction for students with disabilities and the use of inclusionary settings when appropriate. Use of High Yield Instructional Routines.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Developed best practices through the support of district-level instructional coaches. Providing data analysis and instruction support to teachers through the use of the teacher and instructional coaches. The identification of areas that need to be improved through the use of walkthroughs and observations. Grade level collaboration with instructional coaches with inclusionary planning for increased student achievement. Remediation practices for students identified as needed additional supports based on individual student needs. Implementation of High Yield Routines schoolwide to support student achievement. The use of RTI identification for monitorization of students who need additional supports based on quantifiable data through the district's RTI process.

Action Steps to Implement

Training of teacher coaches by district on best instructional practices.

Person Responsible Catherine Cutchen (catherine.cutchen@wcsb.us)

Targeted and systematic interventions as outlined in the district's RTI Handbook. Evidence of implementation is RTI logs submitted quarterly.

Person Responsible Angie Gentry (angela.gentry@wcsb.us)

Meetings with instructional coaches monthly regarding best practices and standards-based instruction. Evidenced by meeting agendas and minutes.

Person Responsible Catherine Cutchen (catherine.cutchen@wcsb.us)

Use of i-Ready Math school-wide. Data will be used during monthly meetings to individualize student learning paths.

Person Responsible Angie Gentry (angela.gentry@wcsb.us)

Training in High Yield Routines and implementation in grades K-5, evidenced by walk-throughs and observations.

Person Responsible Catherine Cutchen (catherine.cutchen@wcsb.us)

RTI semester meetings to review i-Ready data, STAR and FSA assessments with assistant principal and parents of students via telephone. Development of interventions based on data and RTI meetings.

Person Responsible James Vernon (james.vernon@wcsb.us)

Title 1 Remediation teacher will work with students performing below grade level, by using differentiated instruction in small groups across grade levels to address learning gaps.

Person Responsible Catherine Cutchen (catherine.cutchen@wcsb.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

The 5th grade science proficiency on FCAT 2.0 was identified as an area of critical need based on the data that only 48% were proficient in 20-21.

Measurable Outcome: RES will improve 5th grade science scores to meet 55% proficiency on the 2022 testing cycle.

Monitoring: Science DSBA
After-school Science Program

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Catherine Cutchen (catherine.cutchen@wcsb.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Identified best practices for science with the assistance of district-level instructional coach. Departmentalization for maximized content area specific achievement. The use of the Mystery Science program for additional science resource and content support. Implementation of inclusionary practices for the 5th grade ESE student population for maximized student achievement. Maintain the use of hands-on STEM activities to promote learning in science.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Conducting walkthroughs and observations to identify areas of need in 5th grade science classroom settings. Grade level collaborative planning with instructional coaches to review and implement best practices and instructional strategies. Teacher coaches meet with teachers to review progress and achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Implementation of Study Island for 5th grade students, monitored by instructional coach.

Person Responsible Angie Gentry (angela.gentry@wcsb.us)

Meetings with instructional coach monthly, as evidenced by agendas and logs.

Person Responsible Catherine Cutchen (catherine.cutchen@wcsb.us)

Virtual STEM night for parents and students school-wide, as evidenced by school website.

Person Responsible James Vernon (james.vernon@wcsb.us)

Implementation of Kagan structures school-wide, as evidenced by walk-throughs and observations by administration.

Person Responsible Catherine Cutchen (catherine.cutchen@wcsb.us)

Progress Monitoring through Study Island for grade 5 students with pre-test, mid-year review, and post-test, monitored by instructional coach.

Person Responsible Angie Gentry (angela.gentry@wcsb.us)

Title 1 Remediation Teacher will work with students performing below grade level, by using differentiated instruction in small groups across grade levels to address learning gaps.

Person Responsible James Vernon (james.vernon@wcsb.us)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Increase the achievement of students with disabilities for the 2022 testing cycle. Riversink's Federal Percent of Points Index for Students with Disabilities was 36% which is 5% below the state required threshold of 41% for SWD achievement in all school grade components.

Measurable Outcome: Riversink will increase 5% on the Federal Percent of Points Index for Students with Disabilities to meet the 41% state threshold for the 2022 testing cycle.

Monitoring: IEP Classroom Accommodation Logs/Progress Reports
 STAR Math
 I- Ready Math
 Progress Monitoring Calendar

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Leveled remediation at every level. Implementation of inclusionary models and practices. The use of I-ready for all students with disabilities. The use of High Yield Routines in inclusionary settings for students with disabilities. Teacher coaches meeting with teachers for collaborative planning and expressed directives for students performing below grade level. IEP accommodations implemented with fidelity to provide students with equal access to learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The implementation of the BPIE for the purpose of improved achievement of students with disabilities. Providing acceptable access to educational setting with nondisabled peers to maximize student achievement. Practicing High Yield Routines for students with disabilities to set foundational understanding of tested content. The use of collaborative planning to maximize students with disabilities to the best practices of educational practices in learning environments with non-disabled peers.

Action Steps to Implement

Students with Disabilities were placed with Highly Effective Teachers.

Person Responsible Catherine Cutchen (catherine.cutchen@wcsb.us)

Meetings with instructional coach monthly to support instruction and review data.

Person Responsible Angie Gentry (angela.gentry@wcsb.us)

Meetings with teacher coaches weekly for instructional planning.

Person Responsible Catherine Cutchen (catherine.cutchen@wcsb.us)

Progress monitoring by teacher coaches through weekly meetings and maintaining and on-going process monitoring spreadsheet.

Person Responsible Angie Gentry (angela.gentry@wcsb.us)

Implementation of iReady computerized instruction and teacher small group intervention for students with disabilities grades 2-5, on a weekly basis by classroom teachers.

Person Responsible Catherine Cutchen (catherine.cutchen@wcsb.us)

Lalilo reading program (computerized instruction and teacher small group intervention) for students with disabilities in grades kg. -1 on a weekly basis by classroom teachers.

Person Responsible Angie Gentry (angela.gentry@wcsb.us)

IEP progress reports sent home every 9 weeks with noted progress by ESE Resource Teachers.

Person Responsible Bonita Salib (bonita.salib@wcsb.us)

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.

Riversink Elementary led the district in 2019 for out-of-school suspensions with 19 total which was an average of 3.9 per 100 students. We will reduce the number of Out of School suspensions by utilizing the In-School Suspension option referred to as PASS. Disciplinary data will be reviewed quarterly and Rtl Behavioral Plans will be implemented, as needed, to provide interventions for at-risk students.

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.

A positive school culture and environment reflects the idea that every student has value and can learn and will offer as much inclusionary practices as possible. Teachers understand their role and work collaboratively with each other and administration. The teachers share information both educational and social emotional with parents and stake holders as much as they can in the current pandemic. Identifying and including stakeholder groups both proximal and distal to the school culture in key to student and school success. Stakeholders help develop the school vision, direction and mission and the implementation of the school improvement strategy. They also have a key developmental factor in school performance and addressing equity and transparency.

Parents are invited and encouraged to attend regularly scheduled School Advisory Council Meetings. Meetings occur approximately four times per year at varied times to accommodate parent work schedules. School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings are the forum for continuous improvement of school operations, programs, events, and meetings. During regularly scheduled SAC Meetings parents and families assist with the planning, review and evaluation of the parent and family engagement plans, including the SIP, PFEP, and parent and family engagement project application.

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

Eric Davis SAC Member
Michael Waters SAC Member
Patti Griffin SAC Member
Channel Prince SAC Member
Vicki Strickland SAC Member

Laci Lloyd Para Professional
Bobbie Dotson-Scarry Teacher ESE
James Vernon SAC Chair
Catherine Cutchen Principal
Dianna Miller Teacher
Shante Grimmett Teacher