

School District of Indian River County

Sebastian Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	23

Sebastian Elementary School

400 SEBASTIAN BLVD, Sebastian, FL 32958

www.indianriverschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Letitia Whitfield

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

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)	67%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (50%)
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.

Welcome to the New Sebastian Elementary School of the Arts, where we aim to develop students academically, artistically and socially so that they leave our school as independent, cooperative, responsible and creative young adults with a lifelong interest and ability in learning and the arts.

Provide the school's vision statement.

NEST : Nurturing and Educating Students for Tomorrow through the Arts

Within a nurturing, safe environment, Sebastian Elementary staff members will actively engage all students in the learning process and teach students to become critical thinkers, problem-solvers, and life-long learners.

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
Whitfield, Letitia	Principal	The role of a principal is to provide strategic direction in the school system. The Principal develops standardized curricula, assess teaching methods, monitor student achievement, encourage parent involvement, revise policies and procedures, administer the budget, hire and evaluate staff and oversee facilities.
Hoyt, Cheryl	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Hoyt serves as a K-3 interventionist and coordinates the development and implementation of research-based interventions that ensures students with need are provided additional supports to achieve success.
Kohlstedt, Ashley	Assistant Principal	Deal with the issues of school management, student activities and services, personnel, and curriculum instruction. Coordinate with principal to assist in defining and enforcing school policies and guidelines for students, staff, and faculty. Support the goals of their school and identify objectives for instruction and extracurricular programs. Make suggestions, listen, and share experiences encouraging teacher improvement and motivation within classrooms.
Dunderdale, Michelle	Instructional Coach	The instructional coach brings evidence-based practices into classrooms by working with teachers and other school leaders. The role of the coach is to support the principal's work to align staff development with school goals and improve Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction in every classroom and to Support classroom teachers in long- and short-range planning (co-planning) for increased student achievement.
Klein, Sharon	Instructional Coach	The instructional coach brings evidence-based practices into classrooms by working with teachers and other school leaders. The role of the coach is to support the principal's work to align staff development with school goals and improve Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction in every classroom and to Support classroom teachers in long- and short-range planning (co-planning) for increased student achievement.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Letitia Whitfield

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.*

5

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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

30

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)	67%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (61%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: C (50%)
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	39	55	48	52	79	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	325
Attendance below 90 percent	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	3	4	4	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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

Thursday 9/10/2020

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	60	54	66	79	52	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	400
Attendance below 90 percent	0	12	11	10	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	3	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	11	10	29	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	0	4	3	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	60	54	66	79	52	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	400
Attendance below 90 percent	0	12	11	10	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	3	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	11	10	29	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	0	4	3	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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	53%	58%	57%	48%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	57%	58%	54%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	54%	53%	63%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	58%	63%	63%	49%	60%	61%
Math Learning Gains	55%	60%	62%	52%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	48%	51%	35%	51%	51%
Science Achievement	53%	54%	53%	47%	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	43%	60%	-17%	58%	-15%
	2018	55%	56%	-1%	57%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	53%	61%	-8%	58%	-5%
	2018	69%	56%	13%	56%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	58%	54%	4%	56%	2%
	2018	48%	52%	-4%	55%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	59%	64%	-5%	62%	-3%
	2018	59%	60%	-1%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	46%	64%	-18%	64%	-18%
	2018	58%	63%	-5%	62%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				
05	2019	64%	57%	7%	60%	4%
	2018	51%	58%	-7%	61%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	51%	53%	-2%	53%	-2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	47%	54%	-7%	55%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
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	22	30		33	44	46	29				
BLK	34	46	38	41	46	50	29				
HSP	58	50		63	50						
MUL	38	55		33	45						
WHT	60	61	56	64	59	44	61				
FRL	50	52	35	58	53	44	56				

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	33	57	57	31	57	57	8				
BLK	40	62		47	58						
HSP	48	73		62	64		45				
MUL	56	67		41	73						
WHT	67	66	61	62	63	65	51				
FRL	54	61	59	56	62	75	51				

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	17	54	47	17	29	29	25				
BLK	23	53	67	25	55	50	12				
HSP	46	40		42	40						
MUL	50	62		38	54						
WHT	55	55	63	57	53	21	55				
FRL	46	53	62	47	52	37	38				

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	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	374
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
----------------------	--

Students With Disabilities	
-----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	41
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	55
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	43
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	58
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	50
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.

After analyzing the school-wide data, the subgroup of Students With Disabilities (SWD) showed the lowest performance with only 22% of students achieving proficiency in ELA and 33% achieving proficiency in math in 2019. The 2018 data shows 33% of students with SWD subgroup achieving proficiency in ELA and 31% achieving proficiency in math. The SWD math trend shows increasing performance of 2%, however the ELA trend shows an 11% decrease in reading proficiency. Furthermore, we did not meet the Contributing factors to 2019's low performance within the SWD subgroup include the following: scheduling conflicts often impede tiered supports for our SWD population. Each grade level has a scheduled intervention that is scheduled when students are receiving Exceptional Student Services which causes gaps in tiered instruction. Tiered support should be "in addition" to the layered support. Collaboration between the Exceptional Education teachers and General Education needs to be consistently implemented through structured, scheduled times. This provided time will give teachers across all content areas to share specific strategies and analyze intervention resources that will meet the needs of individual students.

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 from the prior year were learning gains of the lowest 25th percentile in mathematics. Scores decreased from 71% to 49%. The factors that contributed to this decline was coaching roles changes and math interventions were not of quality. Instruction and routines were less focused on standards and learning scales. There were gaps in professional development and knowledge on school based initiatives for new staff to implement.

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.

After analyzing school and grade level data, 4th grade Mathematics proficiency showed the greatest gap when compared to state average. 46% of Sebastian Elementary's students achieved proficiency in mathematics. The state's proficiency average was 64%, making a deficit of 18%. The factors that contributed to this decline was coaching roles changes and math interventions were not of quality.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was science proficiency. In 2018, our science percentage was 53% and in 2019 our percentage increased to 53%. Our school implemented kindergarten through fifth grade vocabulary journals and science was built into the instructional calendar for daily lessons.

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

According to the EWS data, 50 students scored in the Level 1 range on the 2018-2019 FSA. This is an indicator that students are not receiving research-based interventions consistently. It is important that Sebastian Elementary implements strategic intervention schedules that maximizes resources.

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

1. Increasing math learning gains and proficiency
2. Focus on bottom quartile in math and ELA, including SWD and African American subgroups
3. Increase ELA proficiency
4. Social Emotional Learning integration
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: While the percentage of students meeting Mathematics proficiency in grades 3-5 held steady from 2018 to 2019, school-wide learning gains in Mathematics decreased from 63% to 55% and learning gains for students in the Lowest 25th Percentile decreased from 71% to 41%. Additionally, learning gains across subgroups was inconsistent. Inconsistencies in performance points to a need for improved Tier 1 instruction, as well as increased opportunities for review and remediation. At Sebastian Elementary, students have been exposed to an aligned curriculum that provides instruction within the Conceptual Representational Abstract cycle, but have not been given tools to provide connections between the conceptual and abstract concepts. Given the school-wide performance the past two years, teachers will be provided explicit training of the implementation of research based visual representation into the Mathematics instructional block. This strategy will build student problem solving capacity and provide necessary structures to have a positive impact on performance through all student subgroups.

Measurable Outcome: Students will improve from 58% learning achievement to 78% learning achievement measured by FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Ashley Kohlstedt (ashley.kohlstedt@indianriverschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: At Sebastian Elementary, teachers will continue to be supported in improving instruction in mathematics to full alignment, depth, and rigor of the math standards. School leadership will support teachers with the implementation of visual representation within systematic and explicit math instruction. Through professional development, coaching cycles and provided opportunity for feedback, the fidelity of core math instruction will improve.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: According to Vanderbilt University's IRIS center, "Explicit, systematic instruction involves teaching a specific concept/procedure in a highly structured, carefully sequenced manner". Math researcher Asha K. Jitendra's research states both general education and special needs students develop a deeper understanding of math concepts when taught with visual representations. The use of visual representation in the form of tables, graphs number lines, diagrams, percent bars and schematic diagrams within an explicit and systematic math routine bridges concrete and abstract mathematical ideas and increases problem solving skills. When teachers incorporate research based visual representation strategies as part of a rigorous math routine, students:

- visualize ideas,
- make connections within the Concrete, Representational and Abstract Learning Cycle
- receive opportunities to practice within a scaffolded sequence
- links quantities to the mathematical operations needed to solve problems

Action Steps to Implement

The assistant principal and math coach will clearly define the components and expectations of the sixty minute math block that follows a guided math format and a tiered system approach for grades K-5.

Person Responsible Letitia Whitfield (letitia.whitfield@indianriverschools.org)

Sebastian Elementary teachers will participate in ongoing professional development that increases the capacity of effective visual representation implementation within the Concrete Representational Abstract cycle while meeting the criteria of the expectations and components of the 60 minute math block. Teachers will develop thinking maps, think alouds, and discussions that reinforce the use of appropriate

visual representation for Tier 1,2 and 3 students. Teachers will work collectively to develop strategies that convert the visually represented information into mathematical notations.

Person Responsible Michelle Dunderdale (michelle.dunderdale@indianriverschools.org)

Provide all General Education and Exceptional Education teachers with weekly common, collaborative planning time, facilitated by the math coach and supported by administration to build a standards based aligned lesson plan which uses Indian River Public School's Pacing Guide, Curriculum map and Unit Planning Guide. This time will be used to develop and implement an Action Plan that focuses on the purposeful use of visual representation with higher level questioning, formative assessments, tiered instruction and monitoring strategies. This common planning will occur weekly in order to prepare and problem solve for the next instructional cycle.

Person Responsible Michelle Dunderdale (michelle.dunderdale@indianriverschools.org)

Administration and coaches will conduct weekly learning walks to monitor alignment and progress of grade level Math Action Plans. Learning walks will inform evidence of visual representation, student engagement and data for monthly data discussions while guiding decisions for needed coaching cycles and collaborative planning sessions. Feedback and coaching will be provided to grade level teams and individual teachers regarding implementation of action plans and lessons associated with the professional development.

Person Responsible Letitia Whitfield (letitia.whitfield@indianriverschools.org)

Student performance data will be monitored weekly by the leadership team with a focus on student achievement and growth across subgroups. The leadership team will analyze the data from Iready, Unit Assessments and Reflex to determine professional development and coaching needs. Student performance data will be used for monthly data talks and problem solving that will provide opportunity to meet individual instructional needs of all students.

Person Responsible Ashley Kohlstedt (ashley.kohlstedt@indianriverschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: From the 2018 - 2019 school year FSA data, ELA proficiency decreased from 59% to 53 which is 5 percentage points below the district. The percentage of the bottom 25th percentile that made learning gains decreased from 61% down to 49%. Without the opportunity and ability to read complex text and monitor for growth, a student's entire learning path is hindered. We will focus on using complex text and research based monitoring tools during intervention blocks and Tier 1 instruction.

Measurable Outcome: ELA proficiency will increase from 53% to 65% and the lowest 25th percentile will increase from 49% to 62% for the 2020-2021 school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Letitia Whitfield (letitia.whitfield@indianriverschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: In order to increase the proficiency in ELA, will implement the use of rigorous complex texts across all curriculum areas and monitor student understanding through a variety of evidence based formative assessments. Monitoring is defined as the act of checking for evidence of the desired result of a specific strategy while the strategy is being implemented.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If teachers monitor student understanding of standards-based lessons, use continuous formative assessment, incorporate accountable talk, and use fluidity of groups to "teach in the moment", student achievement will improve. Monitoring for learning focuses on student learning targets and goals to drive adaptive instruction and empower students to take control of their learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Coaches and teachers will provide professional development on the benefits of complex texts and effective monitoring strategies which includes student reflection and revision of knowledge, accountable talk, formative assessment and summarizing what they learn. Leadership team will conduct monthly learning walks together to verify monitoring of learning is taking place. Feedback and coaching will be provided to grade level teams and individual teachers regarding implementation of strategies being used for rigorous monitoring.

Person Responsible: Sharon Klein (sharsharklein@gmail.com)

Time will be provided to all General Education and Exceptional Education teachers with common, collaborative planning time, facilitated by the ELA coach and supported by administration to build a standards based aligned lesson plan which uses Indian River Public School's Pacing Guide, Curriculum map and Unit Planning Guide. This time will be used to develop and implement an Action Plan that focuses on the purposeful use of complex text with higher level questioning, formative assessments, tiered instruction and embedded monitoring strategies. This common planning will occur weekly in order to prepare and problem solve for the next instructional cycle.

Person Responsible: Sharon Klein (sharsharklein@gmail.com)

Student performance data will be monitored weekly by the leadership team with a focus on student proficiency and growth across grade levels. The leadership will analyze the data and determine professional development and coaching needs. Student performance data will be used for monthly data talks and problem solving that will provide opportunity to meet individual instructional needs of all students.

Person Responsible Sharon Klein (sharsharklein@gmail.com)

Sebastian Elementary leadership team and teachers will analyze Tier 2 and Tier 3 instructional materials and construct tiered intervention schedules, including Saturday intervention and Rising Kindergarten programs (A2 Interventions), that maximizes resources based on student need and data. We will monitor growth through monthly grade level MTSS meetings and weekly Individual Problem Solving meetings.

Person Responsible Ashley Kohlstedt (ashley.kohlstedt@indianriverschools.org)

Administration and coaches will conduct weekly learning walks to monitor alignment and progress of grade level ELA goals. Learning walks will inform evidence of effective complex text usage across tiers, student monitoring, and student engagement while collecting impact review data which guides decisions for needed coaching cycles and collaborative planning sessions. Feedback and coaching cycles will be provided to grade level teams and individual teachers regarding implementation of action plans and lessons associated with the professional development and student performance.

Person Responsible Letitia Whitfield (letitia.whitfield@indianriverschools.org)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Sebastian Elementary's Early Warning Systems indicate a need for continued integration for social and emotional supports throughout the school day. Covid-19 has caused students and staff to feel anxious about their safety and a feeling of human disconnection within the school community. As students transition from home to a school setting, Sebastian Elementary will implement a school-wide, systematic Social Emotional Learning program for virtual and traditional students/ adults that will help build the necessary mechanisms to build and sustain relationships. This program will create and foster a safe, caring and equitable learning environment within the school building which extends into student homes.

Measurable Outcome: Sebastian Elementary students and staff will show growth with social emotional well being on the computer based climate survey. This includes students and adults who returned from school closures in March and students and teachers transitioning from a virtual learning model to a traditional learning model.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Letitia Whitfield (letitia.whitfield@indianriverschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: According to the CASEL organization, "Social Emotional Learning (SEL) is the process through which children and adults acquire and effectively apply the knowledge, attitudes, and skills necessary to understand and manage emotions, set and achieve positive goals, feel and show empathy for others, establish and maintain positive relationships, and make responsible decisions." Sebastian Elementary will implement a year long Social Emotional program using monthly activities and monitoring resources that include Conscious Discipline strategies, Whole Brain Teaching techniques and planning/monitoring resources from the CASEL organization.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Effective Social Emotional Learning programs can produce positive short and long term outcomes for students. Infusing social emotional learning strategies across content area will actively involve students in their social and emotional growth, which will transfer to academic gains. Research also supports that effective SEL programs increases graduation rates and the home/family connection.

Action Steps to Implement

Administer a computer based climate survey to both staff and students in September, November and March. Use data from the survey to implement and monitor SEL strategies and interventions.

Person Responsible: Ashley Kohlstedt (ashley.kohlstedt@indianriverschools.org)

Instructional coaches will provide Social Emotional professional development, that includes vision and mission of Social Emotional Learning, monthly activities that align with "CASEL", "Whole Brain Teaching" and "Conscious Discipline Brain State Model" . Time will be protected during collaborative planning to construct and implement research-based SEL activities. Activities will reinforce and monitor student management of emotion, conflict resolution and problem solving techniques and protocols that will assist students to build relationships while showing empathy for others.

Person Responsible: Ashley Kohlstedt (ashley.kohlstedt@indianriverschools.org)

Leadership will analyze walk through data, academic performance data, climate surveys, discipline referrals and attendance reports for fidelity and sustainability of Social Emotional Learning protocols. After

data analysis, Mr. Adkins will provide specific interventions to address individual student need and SEL strategies for teachers and support staff.

Person Responsible Ashley Kohlstedt (ashley.kohlstedt@indianriverschools.org)

Sebastian Elementary's faculty and staff will establish high expectations and goal setting strategies with all students. We will develop and implement systems that celebrate academic and social emotional learning successes using: Unify Assessments, Iready, Reflex, Accelerated Reading, and positive behavior initiatives.

Person Responsible Ashley Kohlstedt (ashley.kohlstedt@indianriverschools.org)

#4. Other specifically relating to Development of The Performing Arts Academy

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: In 2018, according to FSA generated School Data, Sebastian Elementary’s ELA, Mathematics and Science achievement scores fell below district and state averages. Only 22 percent of Students with Disabilities (SWD) achieved proficiency in ELA and. 33 percent achieved proficiency in Mathematics. 34 percent of Sebastian Elementary’s African American students achieved proficiency in ELA and 40 percent achieved proficiency in Mathematics. To promote a positive learning environment, increase student engagement and improve student achievement across modalities and content area, Sebastian Elementary will focus on integrating the Performing Arts, specifically music, drama, and dance, into standards-based Tier 1, 2, and 3 instruction.

Measurable Outcome: To ensure continuity and innovation within the performing arts, teachers at Sebastian Elementary will increase instructional practices that incorporate differentiated instruction through the integration of reader's theater, movement, and dance and a subject area (literacy, math, science, social studies). Measurable outcomes will be measured by classroom walk-through data collections and student growth/ proficiency on Iready diagnostics, Unit Assessments, and running records.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Letitia Whitfield (letitia.whitfield@indianriverschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Sebastian Elementary will implement an arts integration approach across all content areas which will:
 1) develop reading, language, mathematics and science skills
 2) build cognitive capacity, specifically inferencing, reasoning and problem solving
 3) promote positive social emotional growth
 4) nurture student motivation and engagement
 5) create a learning environment that fosters student and teacher success

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research has made connections between the arts and academic achievement, particularly when it comes to three areas: listening to music and spatial-temporal reasoning; learning to play music and spatial reasoning; and classroom drama and verbal skills“ (Mason, Steedly, & Thormann, 2005). Based on a broad array of research, an arts-rich curriculum contributes to the academic and social growth of a wide range of learners and will provide opportunity and meet individual instructional needs of Sebastian Elementary’s diverse population. Furthermore, with the identification of a Performing Arts School of Choice, Sebastian Elementary will promote teacher innovation, strengthen collaborative planning structures and improve instructional practices. According to Richard Deasy, editor of Critical Links: Learning in the Arts and Student Achievement and Social Development, “Schools integrating the arts into curriculum as part of a comprehensive reform strategy are documenting positive change in school environment and improved student performance.”

Action Steps to Implement

Update school mission statement to reflect the commitment to Implementing initiatives that foster the transformation to a performing arts academy. Communicate mission statement and rational to all stakeholders including teachers, staff, parents, students and community partners.

Person Responsible Letitia Whitfield (letitia.whitfield@indianriverschools.org)

Collaborate with all stakeholders to develop a three year plan that collectively identifies goals and action steps that will lead to a comprehensive transformation to a Performing Arts School of Choice. Build and

foster relationships with community partners that support Sebastian Elementary's performing arts program.

Person Responsible Letitia Whitfield (letitia.whitfield@indianriverschools.org)

Administrators and teacher leaders will collaborate with the Director of Instructional Innovation to:

- 1) Write grants to fund drums that create a range of percussion opportunities
- 2) Utilize technology and strategies to promote Sebastian Elementary's performing arts initiatives
- 3) Identify resources that will support the growth of an arts program

Person Responsible Ashley Kohlstedt (ashley.kohlstedt@indianriverschools.org)

Coaches, administration and teacher leaders will provide professional development on October 21st on the benefits of integrating reader's theater, movement and music within tiered instruction. Ongoing feedback and coaching will be provided to grade level teams and individual teachers regarding implementation of differentiation strategies being used through art integration.

Person Responsible Ashley Kohlstedt (ashley.kohlstedt@indianriverschools.org)

Administration and coaches will conduct weekly learning walks to monitor implementation and progress of grade level arts integration within Tier 1 instruction. Learning walks will inform evidence of student engagement and data for monthly data discussions while guiding decisions for needed coaching cycles and collaborative planning sessions. Feedback and coaching will be provided to grade level teams and individual teachers regarding implementation of action plans and lessons associated with the professional development.

Person Responsible Letitia Whitfield (letitia.whitfield@indianriverschools.org)

Student performance data will be monitored weekly by the leadership team with a focus on student achievement and growth across subgroups. The leadership team will analyze the data from Iready, Unit Assessments, Dibels, Running Records and Reflex to determine the correlation between differentiating instruction through art integration and student achievement.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

N/A

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.

Sebastian Elementary's instructional staff and leadership team will encourage and support parents and community members to attend school events and actively take part in the decision-making process. The leadership team will collaborate with teachers, staff, parents and community members to coordinate engaging activities, programs, and events that assist families and students with school-related tasks. These events will help families better understand school curriculum, performance expectations and social emotional learning strategies. School leadership will share community resources and materials with families that will help families support their students. Parents and community members will receive communication through a variety of portals such as DOJO, email, newsletters, school website, mass phone calls, and social media.

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: Math				\$100.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	1142	239-Other	0191 - Sebastian Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$100.00
			<i>Notes: Funding needed to buy materials for Visuals and Thinking Maps</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Development of The Performing Arts Academy				\$0.00
					Total:	\$100.00