Treasure Coast Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Treasure Coast Elementary School

8955 85TH ST, Sebastian, FL 32958

www.indianriverschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Scott Simpson

Start Date for this Principal: 7/21/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	48%
2019-20 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 (51%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	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 Indian River 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Treasure Coast Elementary is committed to empowering each and every student to reach his/her highest potential both socially and academically through the creation of a school wide culture where all key stakeholders are rooted in a continuous commitment to deepen our knowledge, strengthen our skills and honor our core values.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Treasure Coast Elementary, we envision a school where student potential is boundless, differences are celebrated and all key stakeholders work hand in hand to create a risk free learning environment that nurtures the soul and fosters social and academic development.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Simpson, Scott	Principal	The school based leadership team members work collaboratively with teachers, staff and families to collect and analyze student data in a continuous cycle in order to reduce barriers, establish goals and improve student achievement. We will maintain a safe, positive school climate for all students. The administrators are responsible for identifying and aligning all available resources (personnel and curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes, including, methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. The administrators are responsible for scheduling and facilitating Leadership Meetings, implementing the continuous improvement model to reduce barriers and support collective agency that will lead to improved student achievement.
Stanfield, Walter	Guidance Counselor	Guidance Counselor responsible for providing social/emotional support for students, training teachers to deliver SEL instruction, work with students to support social/emotional needs, provide ongoing support for parents/families to implement strategies/plans at home.
Bagley, Felice	Assistant Principal	The school based leadership team members work collaboratively with teachers, staff and families to collect and analyze student data in a continuous cycle in order to reduce barriers, establish goals and improve student achievement. We will maintain a safe, positive school climate for all students. The administrators are responsible for identifying and aligning all available resources (personnel and curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes, including, methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. The administrators are responsible for scheduling and facilitating Leadership Meetings, implementing the continuous improvement model to reduce barriers and support collective agency that will lead to improved student achievement.
Castillo, Chelsea	Instructional Coach	Our instructional coaches are responsible for providing collaborative support to all key stakeholders that includes, coaching, professional development, identification of current research based instructional strategies/materials, problem solving to reduce barriers to student achievement, and management of instructional materials.
De La Cruz, Heidi	Instructional Coach	Our instructional coaches are responsible for providing collaborative support to all key stakeholders that includes, coaching, professional development, identification of current research based instructional strategies/materials, problem solving to reduce barriers to student achievement, and management of instructional materials.
Rollins, Theresa	Instructional Coach	Our instructional coaches are responsible for providing collaborative support to all key stakeholders that includes, coaching, professional development,

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		identification of current research based instructional strategies/materials, problem solving to reduce barriers to student achievement, and management of instructional materials.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/21/2020, Scott Simpson

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

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	48%
2019-20 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 (51%) 2017-18: B (57%) 2016-17: B (61%)

	2015-16: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

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	113	97	118	138	139	111	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	716
Attendance below 90 percent	22	22	19	17	28	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	7	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in Math	0	0	12	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	7	4	14	8	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

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	2	3	9	9	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
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

Tuesday 7/21/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	100	91	115	131	134	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	677
Attendance below 90 percent	0	19	22	14	18	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	6	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	8	13	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	11	17	31	31	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	142

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	9	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	
Number of students enrolled	100	91	115	131	134	106	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	677
Attendance below 90 percent	0	19	22	14	18	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	6	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	8	13	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	11	17	31	31	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	142

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	9	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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

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	58%	58%	57%	63%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	57%	58%	57%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	54%	53%	46%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	66%	63%	63%	72%	60%	61%
Math Learning Gains	44%	60%	62%	67%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	48%	51%	67%	51%	51%
Science Achievement	45%	54%	53%	57%	48%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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	2019	67%	60%	7%	58%	9%
	2018	57%	56%	1%	57%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	54%	61%	-7%	58%	-4%
	2018	52%	56%	-4%	56%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	50%	54%	-4%	56%	-6%
	2018	60%	52%	8%	55%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	83%	64%	19%	62%	21%
	2018	75%	60%	15%	62%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	64%	64%	0%	64%	0%
	2018	72%	63%	9%	62%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
05	2019	49%	57%	-8%	60%	-11%
	2018	73%	58%	15%	61%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-24%				
Cohort Comparison		-23%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	43%	53%	-10%	53%	-10%
	2018	63%	54%	9%	55%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	34	33	32	49	42	48	24				
ELL	33	46	50	47	42		19				
BLK	39	50	40	53	48	40	47				
HSP	46	48	59	65	36		37				
MUL	40	36		40	45						
WHT	66	55	53	69	44	39	48				
FRL	51	53	56	60	43	39	40				
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	32	40	43	54	44	35	24				

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
ELL	11	39	62	64	70	64					
BLK	45	48	40	66	59	36	62				
HSP	45	52	67	80	75	60	70				
MUL	53			80							
WHT	64	51	31	72	66	48	58				
FRL	51	47	41	70	65	48	58				
2017 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	43	42	36	50	45		20				
ELL	38	33		55	56						
BLK	52	54		60	71		42				
HSP	57	47	36	68	72	64	33				
MUL	77			85							
WHT	67	61	53	75	65	66	65				
FRL	58	55	46	69	65	67	52				

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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	63
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	417
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	43

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	45
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	51
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	40
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	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	53
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	51
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.

The component with the lowest performance was Math Lowest 25th Percentile. There was a 12% decrease from 49% in 2018 to 37% in 2019. The contributing factors to last year's low performance were 8 out of 12 teachers were new to 4th and 5th grade and restructuring of grade level teams.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline was Math Learning Gains which decreased 24 points from 68% in 2018 to 44% in 2019. The contributing factors to last year's low performance were 8 out of 12 teachers were new to 4th and 5th grade and restructuring of grade level teams.

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.

The data component that showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average was Math Learning Gains with a gap of 18%. The school average was 44%, while the state average was 62%. The contributing factors to the gap in performance were 8 out of 12 teachers were new to 4th and 5th grade and restructuring of grade level teams.

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

The data component with the most improvement was ELA bottom quartile, which increased by 9% from 42% in 2018 to 51% in 2019. The new actions implemented were the use of Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI), as a Tier 2 support. Additionally, teachers monitored student progress through Fountas & Pinnell Benchmark Assessment System (BAS).

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Potential areas of concern are 10 course failures in ELA and 18 course failures in Math.

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

1. Students with Disabilities
2. Math bottom quartile
3. Math learning gains
4. Science Achievement
5. ELA Achievement Gap

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teachers will deliver high-complexity instruction to the full extent of the standard, through collaborative planning and delivering standards-based instruction in a Gradual Release of Responsibility Model. This area was identified as a critical need due to the decrease in Math Learning Gains by 24%, from 68% in 2018 to 44% in 2019. The trend in ELA achievement does not show an increase from 2016 - 2019. (2016 - 58%, 2017 - 63%, 2018 - 57%, 2019 - 58%). Additionally, the ESSA Federal Index recognized that only 37% of Students with Disabilities and only 40% of Multiracial students were proficient in Reading.
Measurable Outcome:	Student achievement in ELA will increase 7 percentage points, from 58% to 65%. SWD proficiency, using the ESS Federal Index, will increase 13 percentage points, from 37% to 50%. Multiracial student proficiency, using the ESS Federal Index, will increase 10 percentage points, from 40% to 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Theresa Rollins (theresa.rollins@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Coaching cycle - According to Jim Knight, Instructional coaching involves goal setting, questioning, and data gathering typical of one-to-one coaching which is integrated with explanation, modeling, and feedback (Knight, 2007).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The coaching cycle allows Instructional Coaches to partner with teachers in conversation so they can choose and implement research-based practices that will help students learn more effectively in order to increase achievement in ELA and Learning Gains in Math.

Action Steps to Implement

Implement district-wide initiative of the coaching cycle and how it will support teachers.

Person Responsible	Chelsea Castillo (chelsea.castillo@indianriverschools.org)

Provide professional development on high-complexity instruction.

Person Responsible	Theresa Rollins (theresa.rollins@indianriverschools.org)

Schedule Planning/Collaborating to select high complexity resources, including text and curriculum.

Person Responsible	Heidi De La Cruz (heidi.delacruz@indianriverschools.org)

Monitor implementation of equitable, high-complexity instruction for all subgroups

Person Responsible	Felice Bagley (felice.bagley@indianriverschools.org)

Provide support/feedback on the implementation of school-wide high complexity instruction.

Person Responsible	Scott Simpson (scott.simpson@indianriverschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teachers will increase student voice and student responsibility through explicit monitoring of learning in a Gradual Release of Responsibility Model. This area was identified as a critical need due to the decrease in Math Learning Gains by 24%, from 68% in 2018 to 44%; and the Science proficiency of ELL students at 19%. According to research (Fischer & Frey, 2008), when students take responsibility for their learning, the outcomes of learning gains are increased.
Measurable Outcome:	Math LQ student achievement will increase 10 percentage points, from 37% to 47%. Student achievement in Math learning gains will increase 11 percentage points, from 44% to 55%. ELL student proficiency in Science will increase 21 percentage points, from 19% to 40%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Chelsea Castillo (chelsea.castillo@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Gradual Release of Responsibility Model suggests that cognitive work should shift slowly and intentionally from teacher modeling, to joint responsibility between teachers and students to independent practice and application by the learner (Pierson & Gallagher, 1983).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When teachers deliver explicit whole group instruction that is focused on standards, along with differentiated guided and independent practice, all students will develop connections to the concepts, procedures and deepen their understanding. Delivering instruction through the Gradual Release of Responsiblity Model provides support for all subgroups to receive a consistent instruction delivered across a continuum that supports students to make connections to the concepts and procedures that deepen understanding.

Action Steps to Implement

Implement and monitor teacher weekly planning with instructional coaches and administration using standards, curriculum maps and test item specifications.

Person Responsible	Felice Bagley (felice.bagley@indianriverschools.org)

Provide teachers with ongoing training to implement instruction in the Gradual Release of Responsibility Model.

Person Responsible	Chelsea Castillo (chelsea.castillo@indianriverschools.org)

Conduct classroom observations to identify trends and needs, sharing data with teachers.

Person Responsible	Heidi De La Cruz (heidi.delacruz@indianriverschools.org)

Provide teachers with support/feedback based upon on classroom observations, student voice and responsibility.

Person Responsible	Felice Bagley (felice.bagley@indianriverschools.org)

Conduct ongoing data analysis with instructional coaches and administration to monitor student progress and adjust instruction, including differentiation for individual student needs.

Person Responsible	Scott Simpson (scott.simpson@indianriverschools.org)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	With new policies and procedures during COVID-19, students will continue to feel safe and accepted during the school day. Approximately 30% of school-wide students will be learning virtually (not in person) due to safety concerns as a result of COVID-19. Additionally, during a district-wide survey, approximately 75% of parents who are choosing to send their child back to school (traditional) have concerns with student safety.
Measurable Outcome:	Students will report at the same or higher percentage positively during the 2020-2021 school year, as reported during the most recent student survey, that they feel safe and accepted while at school. On the most recent student survey (prior to COVID-19), 84% of students reported feeling safe and accepted at school.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Walter Stanfield (walter.stanfield@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Sanford Harmony is a social emotional learning program for PreK - 6 students designed to foster inter-gender communication and understanding, connection, and community both in and outside classroom and develop boys and girls into compassionate and caring adults.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Sanford Harmony promotes an inclusive environment in the classroom, and students are provided with opportunities to practice effective ways of engaging with others.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide professional development of Sanford Harmony

Person Responsible	Walter Stanfield (walter.stanfield@indianriverschools.org)

Monitor implementation of Sanford Harmony in classrooms

Person Responsible	Felice Bagley (felice.bagley@indianriverschools.org)

Provide support and feedback to teachers and staff regarding the components of Sanford Harmony

Person Responsible	Scott Simpson (scott.simpson@indianriverschools.org)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Treasure Coast Elementary will implement a new focus, Marine Science, and a STEAM-based enrichment block. Science achievement decreased from 62% to 45%. Additionally, student proficiency for ELL was 19%, African-American was 47%, Hispanic was 37%, and Students With Disabilities 24%.
Measurable Outcome:	Science achievement will increase 15 percentage points, from 45% to 60%. Science achievement for ELL students will increase 22 percentage points, from 19% to 41%. Science achievement for Students with Disabilities will increase 17 percentage points, from 24% to 41%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Felice Bagley (felice.bagley@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implement STEAM instruction (Science, Technology, Education, Arts, Mathematics) during the Tier 1 and enrichment block to increase student achievement by focusing on vocabulary integration and high-complexity instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	According to the U.S. Department of Education, "In an ever-changing, increasingly complex world, it's more important than ever that our nation's youth are prepared to bring knowledge and skills to solve problems, make sense of information, and know how to gather and evaluate evidence to make decisions. These are the kinds of skills that students develop in science, technology, engineering, and math—disciplines collectively known as STE[A]M." Research has proven that students' experiences with STEAM were effective in both cognitive and affective learning. By implementing Marine Science through a STEAM-based block, student achievement in Science will increase.

Action Steps to Implement

Update the master schedule to include a STEAM-based enrichment block, separate from the regular Science instructional time, incorporating Marine Science when applicable.

Person Responsible	Scott Simpson (scott.simpson@indianriverschools.org)

Develop a vertical and horizontal plan to incorporate Marine Science instruction into the STEAM enrichment and other instructional blocks.

Person Responsible	Felice Bagley (felice.bagley@indianriverschools.org)

Provide professional development to develop and implement STEAM-based instruction.

Person Responsible	Scott Simpson (scott.simpson@indianriverschools.org)

Monitor STEAM-based instruction and Marine Science through quarterly walkthroughs, as measured by vocabulary integration and high-complexity instruction aligned to the standards.

Person Responsible	Felice Bagley (felice.bagley@indianriverschools.org)

Analyze Science unit assessment scores and walkthrough data, providing feedback to grade levels regarding STEAM and Marine Science implementation.

| **Person Responsible** | Scott Simpson (scott.simpson@indianriverschools.org) |

Implement additional after-school and Saturday tutoring with a Science, focused on ELL students, Students with Disabilities, and students scoring in the lowest quartile in ELA or Math.

| **Person Responsible** | Felice Bagley (felice.bagley@indianriverschools.org) |

Increase opportunities for students to connect with Marine Science by forming community partnerships.

| **Person Responsible** | Scott Simpson (scott.simpson@indianriverschools.org) |

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

The school leadership team will address the remaining school-wide improvement priorities by analyzing student data to identify barriers, monitoring student data and progress, provide teachers with instructional support including resources and professional development, and ensure teachers are provided the time to collaborate with each other in order to implement instructional strategies and interventions that will increase student academic achievement.

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 ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

A positive school culture and environment is specifically embedded into School Improvement Goal #3. Facilitating an environment in which every student feels loved and accepted every day is foundational to our core mission of teaching and learning.

In addition to School Improvement Goal #3, Treasure Coast Elementary is a PBIS model school. Teachers and staff demonstrate respectful behavior and teach students effective ways to share their thoughts, ideas and concerns. We monitor the culture of the school through surveys and use this data to implement plans to address concerns.

Classroom and school wide rules are designed to foster leadership among all key stakeholders. We use Positive Behavior Supports to reward and shape positive behaviors. Students and staff refer to the acronym "GRIT" that stands for:

G - Give your very best.
R - Respect yourself and others.
I - Use integrity (doing the right thing even when no one is looking).
T - Teamwork

We continue to provide ongoing professional development training to support teachers who need help in creating evidence based methods and structures for expanding positive interpersonal interaction in classroom settings.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

		Part V: Budget				
1	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction**				**$10,250.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		120-Classroom Teachers	0341 - Treasure Coast Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$10,250.00
			Notes: These funds will be used for teacher professional development, specifically high-complexity instruction delivered equitably to all subgroups.			
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction**				**$8,400.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		120-Classroom Teachers	0341 - Treasure Coast Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$8,400.00
			Notes: After-school tutoring and buses will be offered to students based upon reading, math and science deficiencies. Additionally, students from our African-American subgroup and ELL subgroup will be specifically selected for after-school tutoring opportunities.			
3	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning**				**$0.00**
4	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement**				**$0.00**
					Total:	**$18,650.00**