

St. Lucie Public Schools

# Rivers Edge Elementary School



## 2019-20 School 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>5</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>12</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>17</b> |

# Rivers Edge Elementary School

5600 NE SAINT JAMES DR, Port St Lucie, FL 34983

<http://www.stlucie.k12.fl.us/ree/>

## Demographics

**Principal: Walukiewicz Kerri**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/17/2019

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2018-19 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2018-19 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 66%  |
| <b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold) | Black/African American Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students<br>English Language Learners<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>Students With Disabilities<br>White Students |
| <b>School Grade</b>  | 2018-19: B   |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2017-18: B<br>2016-17: B<br>2015-16: C<br>2014-15: A<br>2013-14: D   |
| <b>2018-19 Differentiated Accountability (DA) Information*</b>   |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Diane Leinenbach</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N  |
| <b>Year</b>  | A  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | TS&I   |

\* 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 St. Lucie 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](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.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

#### Provide the school's mission statement

At Rivers Edge Elementary, all students will be provided challenging, engaging and satisfying work, which meets their individual differences and abilities ensuring their success each and every day.

#### Provide the school's vision statement

Through the caring, cooperative efforts of parents, staff and community, all students at Rivers Edge Elementary will be successful. They will be challenged, engaged, and satisfied with the learning opportunities provided to them.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

| Name  | Title               |
|---|---------------------|
| Ingersoll, Jennifer<br>Principal              | Principal           |
| Forman, Valerie<br>Assistant Principal        | Assistant Principal |
| Doole, Gail<br>Teacher, K-12                  | Teacher, K-12       |
| Hyde, Bridgette<br>Teacher, K-12              | Teacher, K-12       |
| Jaramillo, Elena<br>Teacher, K-12             | Teacher, K-12       |
| Slappey, Christine<br>Teacher, K-12           | Teacher, K-12       |
| Romano, Nicole<br>Guidance Counselor          | Guidance Counselor  |
| King, Melissa<br>Other                        | Other               |
| Fawcett, Allison<br>Teacher, K-12             | Teacher, K-12       |
| Slappey, Artis<br>Teacher, K-12               | Teacher, K-12       |
| Mardis-Romano, Natasha<br>Instructional Coach | Instructional Coach |

## Early Warning Systems

### Current Year

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     | 85          | 102 | 104 | 115 | 111 | 133 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 650   |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 15  | 9   | 9   | 8   | 7   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 48    |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0   | 1   | 6   | 3   | 6   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 16    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0   | 0   | 4   | 26  | 20  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 50    |

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 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8     |

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

42

Date this data was collected or last updated

Saturday 8/17/2019

### Prior Year - 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 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 1           | 10 | 12 | 15 | 10 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 61    |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 3  | 3  | 4  | 2  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 16    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 5  | 17 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 55    |

**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 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 8  |

**Prior Year - 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 |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 1           | 10 | 12 | 15 | 10 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 61 |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 3  | 3  | 4  | 2  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 16 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     |    |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 5  | 17 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 55 |

**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 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 8  |

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data**

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      | 2019   |          |       | 2018   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 57%    | 50%      | 57%   | 56%    | 50%      | 56%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 60%    | 55%      | 58%   | 61%    | 54%      | 55%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 57%    | 54%      | 53%   | 51%    | 55%      | 48%   |
| Math Achievement            | 62%    | 53%      | 63%   | 66%    | 56%      | 62%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 63%    | 50%      | 62%   | 59%    | 56%      | 59%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 35%    | 42%      | 51%   | 44%    | 46%      | 47%   |
| Science Achievement         | 49%    | 46%      | 53%   | 58%    | 51%      | 55%   |

**EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey**

| Indicator                   | Grade Level (prior year reported) |         |         |         |         |         | Total   |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
|                             | K                                 | 1       | 2       | 3       | 4       | 5       |         |
| Number of students enrolled | 85 (0)                            | 102 (0) | 104 (0) | 115 (0) | 111 (0) | 133 (0) | 650 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 (1)                             | 15 (10) | 9 (12)  | 9 (15)  | 8 (10)  | 7 (13)  | 48 (61) |
| One or more suspensions     | 0 (0)                             | 0 (3)   | 1 (3)   | 6 (4)   | 3 (2)   | 6 (4)   | 16 (16) |

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator                       | Grade Level (prior year reported) |       |       |       |         |         | Total   |
|---------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-------|-------|-------|---------|---------|---------|
|                                 | K                                 | 1     | 2     | 3     | 4       | 5       |         |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0 (0)                             | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)   |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0)                             | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 4 (5) | 26 (17) | 20 (33) | 50 (55) |

#### Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (\*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

| ELA                   |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                    | 2019 | 57%    | 50%      | 7%                         | 58%   | -1%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 48%    | 46%      | 2%                         | 57%   | -9%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 9%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 47%    | 51%      | -4%                        | 58%   | -11%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 57%    | 50%      | 7%                         | 56%   | 1%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -10%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -1%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 59%    | 48%      | 11%                        | 56%   | 3%                      |
|                       | 2018 | 56%    | 49%      | 7%                         | 55%   | 1%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 3%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 2%     |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                    | 2019 | 59%    | 55%      | 4%                         | 62%   | -3%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 67%    | 54%      | 13%                        | 62%   | 5%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -8%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 70%    | 54%      | 16%                        | 64%   | 6%                      |
|                       | 2018 | 62%    | 57%      | 5%                         | 62%   | 0%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 8%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 3%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 55%    | 47%      | 8%                         | 60%   | -5%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 63%    | 55%      | 8%                         | 61%   | 2%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -8%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -7%    |          |                            |       |                         |



| SCIENCE               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                    | 2019 | 46%    | 46%      | 0%                         | 53%   | -7%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 54%    | 50%      | 4%                         | 55%   | -1%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -8%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

**Subgroup Data**

| 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 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD                                       | 24       | 62     | 57          | 36        | 46      | 29           | 26       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 33       | 40     |             | 56        | 73      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 50       | 45     |             | 61        | 72      | 47           | 44       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 55       | 59     | 85          | 65        | 61      | 31           | 44       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 57       |        |             | 57        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 60       | 64     | 49          | 62        | 60      | 33           | 52       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 50       | 55     | 55          | 58        | 59      | 29           | 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 2015-16 | C & C Accel 2015-16 |
| SWD                                       | 27       | 48     | 42          | 42        | 56      | 58           | 15       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 32       | 58     | 54          | 59        | 58      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 57       | 54     | 19          | 71        | 65      | 43           | 52       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 46       | 54     | 56          | 67        | 63      | 58           | 52       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 45       |        |             | 55        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 60       | 64     | 62          | 64        | 54      | 40           | 63       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 50       | 57     | 44          | 63        | 58      | 45           | 58       |         |           |                   |                     |

**ESSA Data**

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

| ESSA Federal Index  |      |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  | TS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index - All Students  | 58   |
| 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 | 77   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 460  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8    |

| <b>ESSA Federal Index</b>  |      |
|--|------|
| Percent Tested   | 100% |
| <b>Subgroup Data</b>   |      |
| <b>Students With Disabilities</b>  |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                     | 40   |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?             | YES  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%      | 0    |
| <b>English Language Learners</b>   |      |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                      | 56   |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | NO   |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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                                | 53   |
| 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  | 60   |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                      | NO   |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%               | 0    |
| <b>Multiracial Students</b>  |      |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   | 57   |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | NO   |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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    |

| 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%           | 0   |
| 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%                      | 0   |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 53  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

#### **Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends**

Our lowest area of performance was in Math L25%. This year, we were 7% below district and 16% below the state. This cell has been trending as our lowest performing since 2015-16. Contributing factors are multiple teachers with < 5 years experience teaching content, inconsistent implementation of small group- differentiated instruction, and limited remedial instructional material.

#### **Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline**

Both Math L25% and Science Achievement showed a drop of 9% percentage points from 2017-2018. The primary factors related to this decline was inexperienced teachers in 5th grade. Of the three 5th grade teachers, one had a single year of experience teaching 5th grade math/science, but the teacher was also a first time 5th grade ELA teacher. Also, one of the teachers was out for maternity in the middle of the school-year. In addition, our math coach was promoted to Assistant Principal in September, and she was unable to be replaced by another math coach. Without consistent, rigorous support, the teachers were unable to bridge the experience gap.

#### **Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends**

Our lowest area of performance was in Math L25%. This year, we were 7% below district and 16% below the state. This cell has been trending as our lowest performing since

2015-16. Contributing factors are multiple teachers with < 5 years experience teaching content, inconsistent implementation of small group- differentiated instruction, and limited remedial instructional material.

**Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?**

Our ELA L25% showed the greatest gains from the previous year. The school was able to secure and experienced ESE teacher to coteach in ELA classes with SWD. In addition, we continued our departmentalized structure in 4th and 5th grade, which allowed our teachers to continue to build the experience and effective cooperative learning structures.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)**

Or area of concern is SWD. While our ELA LG and ELA L25% showed strong improvement, our achievement in ELA was only 24%. In Math, all three sections in math declined, with almost a 30% drop in Math L25%.

**Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year**

1. Math L25%
2. Science
3. SWD
- 4.
- 5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>#1</b>  |  |
| <b>Title</b>   | Math L25%  |
| <b>Rationale</b>   | This area has demonstrated lowest performance since 2015-16. In additional, there was a 9% drop from the previous school year.   |
| <b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | Our goal in 2019-2020 would be to achieve a minimum of 50% in 2019-2020.   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                 | Jennifer Ingersoll (jennifer.ingersoll@stlucieschools.org)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                   | Teachers will receive ongoing instructional support with differentiated instruction. collaborative planning, and student engagement.   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                     | If all teachers use data to drive instruction, and work collaboratively to plan and implement, highly engaging, differentiated instruction, then all stakeholders will increase individual ownership; therefore, students will leave their grade level demonstrating at least a year's worth of growth.  |
| <b>Action Step</b>   |  |
| <b>Description</b>   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Monitor implementation and effectiveness of standards based instruction</li> <li>2. Provide school-based coaching support in collaborative planning</li> <li>3. Monitor implementation of daily small group, differentiated instruction practices.</li> <li>4. Monitor use of SEL and Kagan Strategies to increase student engagement</li> <li>5. Students will demonstrate increased student achievement</li> </ol> |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>  | Valerie Forman (valerie.forman@stlucieschools.org)   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>#2</b>  |  |
| <b>Title</b>   | Science  |
| <b>Rationale</b>   | Rivers Edge had a 9% drop in Science Achievement scores from the previous school year. Our Science proficiency scores should be commensurate with our ELA proficiency scores.  |
| <b>State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | Rivers Edge will demonstrate a Science Achievement proficiency score of 52%.   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                 | Jennifer Ingersoll (jennifer.ingersoll@stlucieschools.org)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                   | Teachers will receive ongoing instructional support with differentiated instruction, collaborative planning, and student engagement.   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                     | If all teachers use data to drive instruction, and work collaboratively to plan and implement, highly engaging, on grade-level instruction, then all stakeholders will increase individual ownership; therefore, students will leave 5th grade meeting or exceeding grade level expectations.  |
| <b>Action Step</b>   |  |
| <b>Description</b>   | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Monitor implementation and effectiveness of standards based instruction</li> <li>2. Monitor the use of the Collaborative Planning Protocol</li> <li>3. Receive on-going support from district science personnel with lesson planning documents.</li> <li>4. Incorporate routine use of hands-on science demonstrations and experiments</li> <li>5. Monitor student engagement through the use of SEL and Kagan strategies</li> <li>6. Students will demonstrate increased student achievement on Unit and class assessments</li> </ol> |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>  | Jennifer Ingersoll (jennifer.ingersoll@stlucieschools.org)   |

**#3**

**Title** SWD ELA proficiency and Math proficiency, Math LG, and Math L25%  
**Rationale** SWD consistency underperform as compared to other subgroups and Gen Ed population.

**State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve** SWD will demonstrate a 10% increase in each underperforming area.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome** Jennifer Ingersoll (jennifer.ingersoll@stlucieschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy** Teachers will receive ongoing instructional support with differentiated instruction, collaborative planning, and student engagement.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** If all teachers use data to drive instruction, and work collaboratively to plan and implement, highly engaging, differentiated instruction, then SWD stakeholders will increase individual ownership; therefore, all SWD will leave their grade level demonstrating either meeting grade level expectations or 1 year's worth of growth.

**Action Step**

**Description**

1. Monitor implementation and effectiveness of standards based differentiated instruction
2. Monitor the use of the Collaborative Planning Protocol
3. Coaches and ESE Specialist will provide ongoing support for planning, data analysis, and problem solving
4. Monitor student engagement through the use of SEL and Kagan strategies
5. Students will demonstrate increased student achievement

**Person Responsible** Melissa King (melissa.king@stlucieschools.org)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)**

**After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)**

Our remaining schoolwide improvement priorities will focus on the following priorities:  
 Attendance - At least monthly meeting focused on identifying students with high absenteeism and problem solving to reduce further absences.  
 Disproportionate discipline - Monthly monitoring of discipline referrals to insure racial equity and alternatives to OSS.  
 Academic proficiency achievement and growth - We will continue to school and district based coaching support to improve on standards based planning and teaching practices. We will monitor student achievement and growth using iReady diagnostic testing and district created Unit assessments.

**Part IV: Title I Requirements**

### **Additional Title I Requirements**

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Pilot SIP to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

#### **Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students**

Rivers Edge has had a strong support from our parents and community business partners. In addition, to several PTO grade performances, we have several major family events that encourages parents and families to participate with the school:

- Dad Take Your Child to School
- Student Led Conference Night
- Science Night
- Family Camp Night
- Donuts with Grandparents
- Spring Fling
- Bingo for Books
- Publix Math Night
- Kids Musical

#### **PFEP Link**

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

#### **Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services**

REE utilizes MTSS for students to receive multi-tiered support. Support groups are organized by the classroom teachers, guidance counselor, district personnel and the interventionist on an as-needed basis for students. We have an active Functional Assessment Safety Team (FAST). A formalized process is in place to assist students in need of additional behavior interventions and supports. We also have designated staff trained to respond during a crisis and a disruption. The district has several mental health partnerships with outside agencies that are utilized to provide services for students on an as-needed basis. Tier 1: Sanford Harmony FLIP Project Ride Safer Smarter Too Good for Drugs Bullying Lessons Tier 2: Second Step Mentoring Check-in/Check-out Tier 3: Check-in/Check-out PTR BIP Social Stories

#### **Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another**

For our incoming kindergarten students, we provide a welcome orientation for parents prior to the first day of school. Our Kindergarten students participate in KinderCamp the first day of school, so kindergarten teachers can assess individual student's skill levels. For all grade levels, we provide curriculum nights to build parents understanding of grade level expectations. We also use the district scope and sequence to provide standards based instruction, which will support children in transition from one school to another and from one grade level to another.



**Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact**

Through the problem solving process, areas of support were identified and an action plan was developed and implemented. We have a walk to intervention block at the same time for all students in grades 1-5 and we have departmentalized grades 4 and 5. We have an SFA facilitator on staff to support with the implementation of Success for All in grade K & 1, and coaches that support standards based instruction in ELA and Math. We have an interventionist to provide tiered academic support to all students.

\*We have purchased SFA consumables, personnel and technology.

**Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations**

- Kids at Hope School
- community members participate in our Tunnel of Hope
- students "time travel" and set goals for college, career, family, and community service
- Giving Tree: students learn about different community organizations and donate items
- BUG: Bringing Up Grades is a partnership with Kiwanis
- REE Clubs: Environmental Club, Student Council, Safety Patrol, STEAM Rollers

| <b>Part V: Budget</b> |              |   |               |
|-----------------------|--------------|---|---------------|
| <b>1</b>              | <b>III.A</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Math L25%</b>  | <b>\$0.00</b> |
| <b>2</b>              | <b>III.A</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: Science</b>  | <b>\$0.00</b> |
| <b>3</b>              | <b>III.A</b> | <b>Areas of Focus: SWD ELA proficiency and Math proficiency, Math LG, and Math L25%</b> | <b>\$0.00</b> |
| <b>Total:</b>         |              |   | <b>\$0.00</b> |