

Pasco County Schools

Richey 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	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	16
Budget to Support Goals	0

Richey Elementary School

6850 ADAMS ST, New Port Richey, FL 34652

<https://res.pasco.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Amy Denney Haskedakes

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2020

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)	89%
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: C (49%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
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 Pasco 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	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Richey Elementary School

6850 ADAMS ST, New Port Richey, FL 34652

<https://res.pasco.k12.fl.us>

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	88%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	41%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pasco 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 Richey elementary staff accepts the responsibility to be exemplary in every way and to provide educational opportunities to help each child reach their highest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To accomplish this mission, Richey Elementary's success plan has three priorities that closely align with the district priorities: High Impact Instruction, Data-Driven Decisions, and Collaborative Culture.

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
Haskedakes, Amy	Principal	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/1/2020, Amy Denney Haskedakes

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

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

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

27

Total number of students enrolled at the school

600

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

6

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

16

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	75	110	96	105	104	114	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	604
Attendance below 90 percent	28	44	29	33	35	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	211
One or more suspensions	4	9	8	8	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Course failure in ELA	0	13	41	15	36	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	12	34	35	17	23	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	146

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 7/30/2021

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	78	107	97	94	116	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	601
Attendance below 90 percent	14	29	20	16	23	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127
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	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

2020-21 - Updated**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	78	107	97	94	116	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	601
Attendance below 90 percent	14	29	20	16	23	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	127
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	0	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**School Data Review**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				45%	58%	57%	43%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				51%	56%	58%	36%	51%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56%	54%	53%	33%	45%	48%
Math Achievement				44%	60%	63%	44%	59%	62%
Math Learning Gains				51%	61%	62%	46%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58%	50%	51%	31%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				40%	53%	53%	47%	56%	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 Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	40%	59%	-19%	58%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
05	2021					
	2019	38%	55%	-17%	56%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	41%	59%	-18%	62%	-21%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	45%	62%	-17%	64%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
05	2021					
	2019	31%	57%	-26%	60%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	35%	53%	-18%	53%	-18%
Cohort Comparison						

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	45	24	18	41	25	55	27				
ELL	23	31		27	42						
BLK	27	15		27	31		15				
HSP	33	24	30	25	21		15				
MUL	35			32							
WHT	43	21		40	35		34				
FRL	39	20	17	33	32	63	27				
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	34	52	53	37	53	55	30				
ELL	29	50		30	57	67	8				
BLK	29	47		33	27						
HSP	40	49	56	36	52	62	28				
MUL	52	75		52	46						
WHT	49	49	50	49	55	57	47				
FRL	45	50	57	44	51	58	41				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	21	29	40	29	35	32	42				
ELL	28	47		26	29						
BLK	29	42		33	46						
HSP	33	45	50	37	40	25	50				
MUL	45	33		39	38						
WHT	49	30	19	48	50	48	48				
FRL	42	36	34	41	45	30	46				

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	36
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	7
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	52
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	290

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	96%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
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	35
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	23
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	29
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	34
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	35
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	35
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?

Challenges:

Maintaining consistent staff from year to year

Student behavior due to outside influences

Attendance of students due to MSOL and COVID

Strengths:

Significant improvement in staff engagement (+0.36)

Strength in Core Action 1

Increased in Core Action 2 overall

Grade levels are providing Math interventions with specific action plans and increased focus on the grade level standards.

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

SWD: Areas to address are ELA (34%) and Math (37%) Achievement.

FRL: areas to address are Science (41%) Achievement.

BLACK: areas to address are Math Learning Gains (27%), ELA (29%) and Math (33%) Achievement.

Hispanic: areas to address are Math (36%) and Science (28%) Achievement.

ELL: areas to address are ELA (29%), Math (30%), and Science (8%) Achievement.

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 strategies and PD we will facilitate include:

- o Kagan Cooperative Learning Day 1 & 2 (July 12th and 13th)
- o Kagan Coaching Sessions
- o PLC Trainings (PLC structures will change due to IB focused work)
- o IB PYP Program of Inquiry PD & creation
- o IB PYP Unit of Study PD (Summer PD)
- o IB PYP learning & PD ongoing development through year
- o Develop and implement opportunities for staff to gain a deep understanding of the B.E.S.T. standards

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

SWD: Math Learning Gains (53%) and ELA Learning Gains (52%)

FRL: Math Learning Gains (51%) and ELA Learning Gains (50%)

BLACK: ELA Learning Gains is a strength (47%)

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

- Significant improvement in staff engagement (+0.36)
- Strength in Core Action 1
- Increased in Core Action 2 overall
- Grade levels are providing Math interventions with specific action plans and increased focus on the grade level standards.

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

- o PLC Facilitator Training
- o Strengthen PLCs MTSS knowledge and application of interventions
- o Monthly SIT meetings to monitor Lowest 35%
- o Develop IB PYP Assessment Policy

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.

Staff will be provided 2 days of Kagan Cooperative Structures professional development, 2 days of Conscious Discipline learning, on-going IB Primary Years Program learning, on-going content coaching, along with CD & Kagan coaching throughout the year.

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

B.E.S.T standards ELA PD, continued math intervention supports and on-going support from district content specialists, while developing our IB learning and focus.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	High Impact Instruction: Design Units of Study to clearly identify what we expect all students to learn, through a student inquiry model using a transdisciplinary approach.
Measurable Outcome:	We will see an overall increase in student engagement using our walk-through data. In addition, we will see an increase in student proficiency on EOY exams by 8%.
Monitoring:	Engagement will be monitored via school-based walk-throughs, as well as, NWEA Maps assessment data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amy Haskedakes (adenneyh@pasco.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Collaboratively planning while engaging in transdisciplinary approaches with an inquiry based framework.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If our students are not receiving instruction that is aligned with grade level standards, an opportunity to apply those standards, and instructors who are deeply engaged, they will struggle to see growth within each content area.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Measurable Outcome:

Monitoring:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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.

We are ranked 739 out of 1395 elementary schools statewide. We are ranked 25 out of the 41 in the county. We had a reported 0.6 incidents occur per 100 students. Our violent incidents we ranked 1 per 699 students. We had 1 property incident. We had 2 public order incidents. In the area of suspensions, we rank 1338 out of 1395. We are ranked 40th in the county out of 126. Total reported suspensions was 113. (In school 48, out of school 65).

When compared to other Pasco County elementary schools directly in our surrounding region, we were the 2nd to lowest for fighting incidents. In the area of bullying, the range is from 0-40 incidents, Richey Elementary had 4.

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.

Goal: Collaborative Culture:

Develop and maintain the school family that can self-manage, have good relationships, promote growth, and share a collective responsibility, while increasing our sense of community with all stakeholders.

- o Continue Conscious Discipline continued learning & implementation
- o Conscious Discipline Summer PD Day 3 & 4 (July 14th and 15th)
- o Strengthen Schoolwide Behavior Response/Support using Conscious Discipline to prevent vs. react and repair
- o Develop IB PYP Language Policy schoolwide
- o Continue mentor/mentee partners program to model appropriate relationships and provide a safe, trusted adult connection
- o Recreate our mission statement and purpose with all staff, to align with the IB focus

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

Our Conscious Discipline Action Team (CDAT) will provide continued learning opportunities, coaching, and implementation support throughout the year. Administration will provide 2 days of Conscious Discipline training during the school retreat, in addition to 4 coaching days throughout the school year. All staff will recreate our mission statement and purpose to align with our school family why. Student Services Team will

continue our mentee/mentor program to model appropriate relationships, and to provide a safe, trusted, adult connection.