

Wakulla County Schools

# Riversink Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Riversink Elementary School

530 LONNIE RAKER LN, Crawfordville, FL 32327

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Catherine Cutchen**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/12/2021

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	68%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: A (69%) 2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: A (63%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northwest
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Rachel Heide</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A

\* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Wakulla County School Board on 11/14/2022.

## 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>13</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Riversink Elementary School

530 LONNIE RAKER LN, Crawfordville, FL 32327

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

## School Demographics

<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	68%
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	<b>Charter School</b>	<b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	17%

## School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A		B	B

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Wakulla County School Board on 11/14/2022.

## 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

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hatfield, Heather	Instructional Coach	
Cutchen, Catherine	Principal	
Vernon, James	Assistant Principal	
Dotson-Scarry, Bobbie	SAC Member	
Salib, Bonita	School Counselor	

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Thursday 8/12/2021, Catherine Cutchen

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

1

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

8

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

36

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

502

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

1

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

1

**Demographic Data**

**Early Warning Systems**

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	83	98	86	65	67	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	492
Attendance below 90 percent	25	30	21	9	17	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121
One or more suspensions	6	2	3	4	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Course failure in ELA	0	6	4	2	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in Math	0	1	2	2	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	7	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	11	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	2	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	3	7	6	10	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	45

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	13	13	3	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**

Friday 9/9/2022

**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	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

**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	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

**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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	75%	63%	56%				69%	68%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	68%						55%	59%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	58%						46%	47%	53%
Math Achievement	74%	47%	50%				67%	68%	63%
Math Learning Gains	71%						63%	69%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	68%						50%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	71%	68%	59%				54%	56%	53%

**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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	72%	67%	5%	58%	14%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	73%	66%	7%	58%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	53%	61%	-8%	56%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	61%	64%	-3%	62%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	83%	71%	12%	64%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
05	2022					
	2019	48%	60%	-12%	60%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	55%	53%	2%	53%	2%
Cohort Comparison						

**Subgroup Data Review**

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	32	38	33	35	58	61	29				
BLK	58	54		63	69		50				
WHT	78	69	59	77	73	69	74				
FRL	66	67	63	62	67	53	52				

  

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				

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
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				

**ESSA Data Review**

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	485
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

**Subgroup Data**

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0

<b>Native American Students</b>	
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%	0
<b>Asian Students</b>	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	59
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Pacific Islander Students</b>	
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%	0
<b>White Students</b>	
Federal Index - White Students	71
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Economically Disadvantaged Students</b>	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	61
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### 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?**

Based on our testing data 5th grade science (67%) was one of the lowest areas of achievement, as well as 5th grade math (71%). This is a consistent trend over the last 3 years of data compilation for there to be a decrease from 3rd to 4th grades and 4th to 5th grades for competency in math and science.

#### **What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?**

5th grade science at 67% and 5th grade math at 71% were our two lowest testing categories.

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

Attendance issues and improvement in behavior and school culture in this particular grade level. Action steps being implemented are focusing on attendance and adherence to the district truancy plan, as well as the institution of a new positive behavior system focused on character development.

#### **What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?**

RES's achievement levels in math went from 67% in 2021 to 74% in 2022. Our science achievement levels went from 50% in 2021 to 71% in 2022.

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

Continued teacher continuity with a continued focus on content imbedded lessons implemented over a multi-year basis structured around the retention and support of a core teacher base.

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

Kagan-based strategies for the lower grade levels. The use of instructional resources such as I-Ready Math and Mystery Science for the upper grade levels. Focused learning strategies administered by Title 1 teachers, K-3 tutors and resource paraprofessionals.

#### **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.**

Continuing of teacher demonstrations of programs such as Lalilo and Kagan. Grade level cohort walkthroughs to show best practices and classroom implementation. The continuation of higher order questioning training through teacher led professional development at staff meetings.

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

Increase professional development opportunities to promote teacher retention. Focusing on improvement in attendance and tracking of truancy issues to support students being on campus for

teachers to be able to expose them to the new BEST Standards and FAST testing protocols to ensure student success in the third reported testing window.

**Areas of Focus**

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

**Area of Focus**

**Description and**

**Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Based on 2022 testing data, 5th grade math will increase in proficiency from 71% to 76% for an increase of 5%. 5th grade Math was identified as one of two lowest tested categories at RES at 71% proficient. Based on data the cohort traditionally decreases by an average of 7%.

**Measurable**

**Outcome:**

**State the specific measurable**

**outcome the school plans to achieve.**

**This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

5th grade math will maintain 71% proficiency.

**Monitoring:**

**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

The use of FAST data collected through 3 testing windows and disaggregated by district personnel to identify subgroups within this testing category for the purpose of meeting state proficiency requirements of a level 3 or above.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Catherine Cutchen (catherine.cutchen@wcsb.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Collaborative planning with Instructional Coaches.  
 Professional Development of standards-based instruction.  
 Professional development of FAST testing procedures.  
 I-Ready Math for students identified in the subgroup for being near the proficiency standard.  
 Math-backed incentives school-wide.  
 Intensive math instruction for students identified at or near the proficiency threshold.  
 Use of high yield math routines.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.**  
**Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

The continued development of best practices through the support of district level Instructional Coaches. Providing data analysis and subgroup identification from Administrator of Instructional Data. Continued implementation of high yield routines school wide for the support of student achievement. The continued use of RTI identification and monitorization for students in need of additional support based on quantifiable data collected through the RTI process.  
 All strategies are district approved/adopted as evidenced-based through current research and effectiveness in target populations.

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Use of instructional coaches for professional development.  
 Monthly grade level meeting for professional development by instructional coaches (Heather Hatfield)

2. Use of teacher coaches for professional development.

Bi-weekly professional development by teacher coaches during faculty meetings. (Ashley Guess)

3. Use of Administrator of Instructional Data for data analysis.

Monthly grade level meetings with administration to analyze data. (James Vernon)

4. Use of PLC and DCT teams.

Pre-planning curriculum development and identification of professional development needs by PLC and DCT teams. (Beverly Sanders)

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



**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**

**Area of Focus**

**Description and**

**Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Based on 2022 testing data, the area of 5th grade science was one of the lowest tested categories at RES at 67% proficient.

**Measurable**

**Outcome:**

**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

RES plans to improve from a 67% proficiency to 70% proficiency which will show a 3% improvement in achievement to level 3 or above on the statewide Science assessment.

**Monitoring:**

**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

The use of data collected through the administration of DSBA's, as well as, data collected through the use of Study Island.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Catherine Cutchen (catherine.cutchen@wcsb.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Collaborative planning with instructional coaches.  
 Professional Development in standards-based instruction.  
 Use of Mystery Science for students identified in the subgroup for being near the proficiency standard.  
 Intensive science instruction for students identified at or near the proficiency threshold.  
 Use of DSBA's for data collection and progress monitoring.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

The continued development best practices through the support of district level instructional coaches. Providing data analysis and subgroup identification from Administrator of Instructional Data. Continued implementation of DSBA's school wide for the support of student achievement and progress monitoring. The continued use of RTI identification and monitorization for students in need of additional support based on quantifiable data collected through the RTI process. All strategies are district approved/adopted as evidenced-based through current research and effectiveness in target populations.

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Use of instructional coaches for professional development.  
 Monthly grade level meeting for professional development by instructional coaches (Heather Hatfield)

2. Use of teacher coaches for professional development.

Bi-weekly professional development by teacher coaches during faculty meetings. (Ashley Guess)

3. Use of Administrator of Instructional Data for data analysis.

Monthly grade level meetings with administration to analyze data. (James Vernon)

4. Use of DSBA's for progress monitoring.

Quarterly grade level meetings with teams to analyze data. (Bobbie Scarry)

5. Use of PLC and DCT teams.

Pre-planning curriculum development and identification of professional development needs by PLC and DCT teams. (Beverly Sanders)

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

**#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to character development through positive behavior system**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** Based on behavioral data collected in the 2022 school year, a need for redevelopment of the positive behavior system was identified as an area of importance to support academic achievement through improved school culture.

**Measurable Outcome:**

**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** The school looks to reduce disciplinary actions that result in ISS or OSS by 10% to promote students being in the learning atmosphere of the classroom as much as possible.

**Monitoring:**

**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** Documentation through FOCUS with referral tracking and the number of days assigned for discipline being tracked and recorded through administration. Data tracking through the RTI process. Collaboration with district RTI administrator to track data.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Catherine Cutchen (catherine.cutchen@wcsb.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.** The use of the House System to promote positive school behavior, individualized character development and improved attendance/school activity participation.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.** Data showed that the previous PBS system had become ineffective in promoting character development and positive behavior. A year long study was launched to vet the adoption of the House System for the 2022 school year. An overview committee was developed for the implementation and sustainability of this system at RES.

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Monthly House meetings.  
School-wide house meetings scheduled monthly (James Vernon)
2. Focusing on character development through the use of the House point system.  
Introducing of a new character focus during the monthly meetings. (Sarah Watters)
3. Positive identification of "Housemates" through use of team colors and house meetings.  
Monthly team unity challenges. (Imani George)
4. Opportunities for community service and educational enrichment through House team events.  
Monthly community outreach (Bonita Salib)
5. Education of community stakeholders of the House system to promote buy-in to the program for sustainability.  
Quarterly SAC meetings with stakeholders to update on progress. (Bobbie Scarry)

**Person Responsible**

Catherine Cutchen (catherine.cutchen@wcsb.us)

## 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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

### **Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.**

Offering parent volunteer trainings quarterly to promote as many community stakeholders access to the campus as part of community involvement. Developing and distributing the school year at a glance calendar to keep parents abreast of all important school dates to promote parental involvement. Offering enrichment opportunities such as Odyssey of the Mind, school field trips, the Fun Run and Spring Festival to promote a positive and inclusive atmosphere.

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

The use of local business owners for donations that assist in minimizing cost to the school to offer as many enrichment opportunities as possible. The identification of volunteer guest speakers to provide areas of expertise for events like SAVE and Title 1 College and Career Night. The use of parent volunteers in the classroom setting to assist in reducing teacher workload that allows teachers to focus on instruction.

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.