

School District of Indian River County

Vero Beach 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	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Positive Culture & Environment	21
Budget to Support Goals	22

Vero Beach Elementary School

1770 12TH ST, Vero Beach, FL 32960

www.indianriverschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Lyndsey Matheny

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 PK-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)	74%
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 (46%) 2017-18: D (39%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: F (31%)
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.

At Vero Beach Elementary, we empower our Tribe, within our campus and the community, to SLIDE into innovation. Through collective problem solving and engagement, we will achieve excellence in Science, Literacy, Inquiry, Design, and Engineering.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Vero Beach Elementary, our Tribe inspires authentic learning through engagement and innovation.

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
Matheny, Lyndsey	Principal	
Van Brimmer, Sarah	Assistant Principal	
Keeley, Sharon	Instructional Coach	
Patterson, Ataaba	Instructional Coach	ELA COACH
Norwood, Jayde	Instructional Coach	Math Coach

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/21/2020, Lyndsey Matheny

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.*

0

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.*

0

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 PK-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)	74%
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 (46%) 2017-18: D (39%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: F (31%)
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	81	104	97	84	95	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	553
Attendance below 90 percent	10	19	21	16	17	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	3	5	5	14	12	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	10	6	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/27/2020

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	106	95	85	103	95	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	574
Attendance below 90 percent	5	16	18	19	12	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	0	4	5	3	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	2	11	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	37	18	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90

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	2	4	10	14	8	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54

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	9	12	5	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	106	95	85	103	95	90	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	574
Attendance below 90 percent	5	16	18	19	12	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	0	4	5	3	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	2	11	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	37	18	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90

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	2	4	10	14	8	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54

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	10	6	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	39%	58%	57%	31%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	44%	57%	58%	39%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	54%	53%	43%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	48%	63%	63%	42%	60%	61%
Math Learning Gains	47%	60%	62%	66%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	48%	51%	69%	51%	51%
Science Achievement	44%	54%	53%	33%	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	41%	60%	-19%	58%	-17%
	2018	25%	56%	-31%	57%	-32%
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	37%	61%	-24%	58%	-21%
	2018	36%	56%	-20%	56%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
05	2019	35%	54%	-19%	56%	-21%
	2018	30%	52%	-22%	55%	-25%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	59%	64%	-5%	62%	-3%
	2018	39%	60%	-21%	62%	-23%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	54%	64%	-10%	64%	-10%
	2018	41%	63%	-22%	62%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				
05	2019	29%	57%	-28%	60%	-31%
	2018	35%	58%	-23%	61%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	43%	53%	-10%	53%	-10%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	38%	54%	-16%	55%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
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	16	38	46	21	44	43	22				
ELL	28	44	40	50	46		39				
BLK	31	40	42	38	41	47	24				
HSP	30	39	53	49	52	54	38				
MUL	39	43		61	29						
WHT	50	51	73	50	50	31	55				
FRL	38	42	52	45	46	47	43				
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	17	39	43	15	29	14	25				
ELL	14	56	57	40	47	36	20				
BLK	16	33	44	26	41	22	30				
HSP	26	54	55	41	42	33	37				
MUL	29	44		35	38						
WHT	44	50		44	51		53				
FRL	29	47	50	38	45	25	35				
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	21		21	36						
ELL	16	30	42	40	72	86	24				
BLK	26	42	40	26	57	60	18				
HSP	25	33	39	45	75	87	32				
MUL	42	83		58	91						
WHT	40	35	40	45	57	58	37				
FRL	32	40	43	39	63	67	33				

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

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
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	72
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	396
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

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

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

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - English Language Learners	46
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	38
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
--------------------------	--

Federal Index - Hispanic Students	48
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

Multiracial Students	
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	51
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	48
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.

Lowest performing areas include 5th ELA and 5th Math scores. When looking at this data, we discovered that students moving from 4th grade to 5th grade show regression in academic achievement as evidenced in a two-year trend on FSA assessments. Factors contributing to this include, lack of engagement in instruction, lack of appropriate scaffolding techniques for all students, non-departmentalized grade level, and lack of solid structure for instructional blocks.

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

The greatest area of decline include 5th grade ELA and 5th grade math. When looking at this data, we discovered that students moving from 4th grade to 5th grade show regression in academic achievement as evidenced in a two-year trend on FSA assessments. Factors contributing to this

include, lack of engagement in instruction, lack of appropriate scaffolding techniques for all students, non-departmentalized grade level, and lack of solid structure for instructional blocks.

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 most significant gap compared to the state average was in 5th grade math. Students coming into 5th grade have been lacking conceptual understanding of mathematical processes and concepts which reflects a need to increase content knowledge and scaffolding practices in the math block. Non-departmentalized classrooms led to the teachers not being able to dive deep into specific content areas which is required in order to plan in the most efficient way.

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

The most significant area of improvement was in 3rd grade ELA and 3rd grade Math. Intentional interventions and Extended Learning Opportunities (ELO camps after school) played a major role to close the gap to improve student proficiency. Additionally, in the 2019-2020 school year, teachers were departmentalized which lead to higher levels of predicted proficiency than in 2018-2019.

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

Discipline data, and learning gains for ESE and AA students

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

1. Increasing proficiency and accelerating learning gains for SWD subgroup.
2. Increasing proficiency and accelerating learning gains for the Black/African American Students subgroup.
3. Increasing proficiency and accelerating learning gains for 5th grade ELA and Math.
4. Supporting SECL (c= cognitive)
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Provide appropriate and evidenced-based scaffolds and supports for SWD in Tier 1 instruction to make rigorous standards based instruction accessible to all learners. Although VBE's other subgroups doubled ELA from 2018 to 2019, our students with disabilities scoring proficiency increased only 4 percentage points which fell below the school growth average, math proficiency for the SWD subgroup was comparable to the overall school growth average, 17% of our SWD subgroup were proficient in science which was 26 percentage points below the proficiency of the total 5th grade. Our SWD subgroup fell below the 41% ESSA threshold.

Measurable Outcome: Increase the Federal Index of the SWD subgroup by at least 5% to 41% or higher. This will be accomplished by improving proficiency in all areas and accelerating learning gains.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lyndsey Matheny (lyndsey.matheny@indianriverschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Support facilitation and differentiation in Tier 1 instruction will be a focus. This will provide equity, access, and support to access grade level expectations.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: "By providing advanced support, in-class support, and a student centered, needs-based approach VBE can increase proficiency and accelerate learning gains. These are elements of inclusive practices that have proven to meet the needs of diverse learners." F.A.C.T. Folio: Administrator Tools for Inclusive Schools. (2004). Florida Inclusion Network. According to the Florida Department of Education, "equity, access, and support are critical components for all students. Standard curricula should be adapted or modified to meet the needs of individual students."

Action Steps to Implement

Create instructional schedules that maximize human resources to most efficiently and effectively deliver support facilitation. This would include collaborative discussions with ESE support staff, classroom teachers, coaches, and administrators.

Evidence: schedules, walkthroughs for fidelity

Person Responsible Lyndsey Matheny (lyndsey.matheny@indianriverschools.org)

Create planning schedules and facilitate collaborative planning sessions that help teachers (ESE and Gen ed) align instructional and instructional strategies to meet the needs of diverse learners.

Evidence: schedules, plans that include specific differentiated strategies, increased student achievement/ learning gains as evidenced on formative assessments and PM data points on IEPs

Person Responsible Lyndsey Matheny (lyndsey.matheny@indianriverschools.org)

Schedule data chats that are specific to SWD subgroup and specific to student progression toward goals

Evidence: data chat agendas, data spreadsheets, action plans for after data chats

Person Responsible Lyndsey Matheny (lyndsey.matheny@indianriverschools.org)

Administrators and coaches will ensure that specific goals reflect the largest area of deficit specific to each student. Intensive supports will be provided to students based on individual needs and eligibility.

Person Responsible Lyndsey Matheny (lyndsey.matheny@indianriverschools.org)

Admin and coaches will conduct walkthroughs through Tier 1 instruction in ELA & Math to ensure appropriate scaffolds & supports are being utilized with fidelity in classrooms.

Evidence: Walkthrough data, lesson plans with specific scaffold & supports

Person Responsible Lyndsey Matheny (lyndsey.matheny@indianriverschools.org)

Provide opportunities for reflection, re-training, and additional problem-solving on an as needed basis determined by walkthrough data.

Person Responsible Lyndsey Matheny (lyndsey.matheny@indianriverschools.org)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: VBE has identified student behavior as an area of focus. Total of 92 Office Discipline referrals in the 19-20 school year (40 were bus referrals). When desegregating the data, 59% of those referrals were for Black students, 35.8% were for White students, and 4% were for Hispanic students. Overall 25% of students receiving ODRs were SWD. Due to this data and discrepancies between racial groups, VBE will focus on empowering teachers and students through culturally responsive (diverse) teaching and learning practices coupled with implicit bias professional growth opportunities.

Measurable Outcome: After staff members implement culturally responsive practices and participate in professional learning experiences around implicit bias, overall referrals will be reduced by half to 12 or less (per quarter average 2019-2020 SY 23), with Black student referrals reduced to half of the school average- from 59% to 28% of overall referrals).

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lyndsey Matheny (lyndsey.matheny@indianriverschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Implement culturally responsive practices and participate in professional learning experiences around implicit bias.

Culturally responsive practices "empower students intellectually, socially, emotionally, and politically by using cultural referents to impart knowledge, skills, and attitudes." Furthermore, research suggests that these practices allow educators to address social barriers that cause disparities in student achievement. <https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/edlabs/regions/midwest/blogs/culturally-responsive-instruction-best-practices.aspx>

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Researchers from Stanford University discovered that educators' implicit bias affected discipline outcomes between black and white students. "Researchers found that infractions by a black student were more likely to be viewed as connected, meaning that the black student's misbehavior was seen as more indicative of a pattern, than when the same two infractions were committed by a white student." Further research indicates that giving students and adults access to counter-stereotypical exemplars help reduce these implicit biases. Implicit bias awareness: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0098628314537969>

According to research by Wlodkowski and Ginsberg (<http://www.ascd.org/publications/educational-leadership/sept95/vol53/num01/A-Framework-for-Culturally-Responsive-Teaching.aspx>) 4 conditions necessary for CR teaching that promote safe and optimal learning environments: conditions include establishing inclusion, developing positive attitudes, enhancing meaning, and engendering competence. This framework leads to higher engagement and a holistic approach child development. Three studies of culturally responsive pedagogy found improvements in outcomes such as student academic achievement and behavioral management. (Protes, Canche, and Whatley). (<http://raymondwlodkowski.com/Materials/Fostering%20Motivation%20in%20Professional%20Development%20Programs.pdf>)

Action Steps to Implement

Administration will reach out to "Tykes and Teens" (Dorothy Oppenheiser) to re-train teachers on Trauma Informed Care and train VBE staff members on Implicit Bias. (done)

Person Responsible Lyndsey Matheny (lyndsey.matheny@indianriverschools.org)

Coaches will be trained with the TLA on SEL practices. The coaches will provide professional learning for teachers and staff. (done)

Person Responsible Lyndsey Matheny (lyndsey.matheny@indianriverschools.org)

Teachers and staff will implement Unity Week (10 days) plans to complete with students upon return to school. This plan includes ways to build inclusionary practices within classroom environments as well as builds community within the classroom and school.

Person Responsible Ataaba Patterson (ataaba.patterson@indianriverschools.org)

Administration will complete walkthroughs after the training to provide feedback regarding implicit bias and culturally responsive teaching practices.

Person Responsible Lyndsey Matheny (lyndsey.matheny@indianriverschools.org)

Meet with director of transportation to determine a needs analysis related to bus discipline referrals.

Person Responsible Lyndsey Matheny (lyndsey.matheny@indianriverschools.org)

Re-visit office discipline referrals and classroom walkthrough data to determine if additional or re-training needs to occur.

Person Responsible Lyndsey Matheny (lyndsey.matheny@indianriverschools.org)

#3. Other specifically relating to Project Based Learning- School Theme

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Vero Beach Elementary is a Project Based Learning School. Research shows that students participating in the Buck Institute Gold Model outperformed their peers in reading growth and proficiency. In our VBE cohort, students who were in an identified PBL cohort were three times more likely to be proficient in reading than peers in a traditional instructional model (Gil, 2019). Data from this same school report, showed all students in a PBL settings outperformed their peers on I-Ready diagnostic assessments. The subgroup that outperformed all others on this same measure, was Black/African American (by 66 scale points).
 Research: https://www.pblworks.org/sites/default/files/2020-01/PBLWorks%20HQPBL%20Teacher%20Case%20Study%20Report_FINAL.pdf

Measurable Outcome: Increase participation in Project Based Learning Model. By the end of the 20-21, each grade level will have collaborated and participated in at least 1 PBL project. We plan to have 64% of students scoring at the proficiency level in ELA, according to end-of-year view in iReady.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lyndsey Matheny (lyndsey.matheny@indianriverschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: The design elements of PBL are strongly linked with high student motivation and engagement to increase student achievement. The design elements include: A challenging problem or question, sustained inquiry, authenticity, student voice/choice, reflection, critique and revision, and a public product.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Based on a study of 2nd grade students done by researchers from the University of Michigan and Michigan State, students participating in PBL outperformed their peers in both content-area knowledge and reading proficiency. In the PBL group, gains were 63 percent higher for social studies and 23 percent higher for informational reading than in the control group (Duke, Halvorsen, Strachan, Konstantopoulos, & Kim, 2017).
<https://www.nellkduke.org/project-place-papers>

Action Steps to Implement

Provide continuous training utilizing staff with extensive experience in PBL for all staff on required elements of PBL Gold Model project. In the first nine weeks, the school will focus on the elements of a high-quality Buck Institute Model PBL project. Second nine weeks the focus will be on designing and planning projects. Third and fourth nine weeks our school focus will be focused implementation and reflection.

Person Responsible Jayde Norwood (jayde.norwood@indianriverschools.org)

Develop a Project Based Learning Committee that includes staff members from all areas and is guided by our PBL Coordinator- Jayde Norwood. The coordinator will meet monthly with the established committee to create focused PD around PBL implementation.

Person Responsible Jayde Norwood (jayde.norwood@indianriverschools.org)

Facilitate collaborative planning to create at least one PBL project per grade level by end of 2nd nine weeks.

Person Responsible Ataaba Patterson (ataaba.patterson@indianriverschools.org)

Provide job-embedded coaching during implementation of PBL project for each grade level during third and fourth nine weeks.

Person Responsible Jayde Norwood (jayde.norwood@indianriverschools.org)

Facilitate learning walks and reflection throughout the year to observe PBL exemplars in action on VBE campus. Provide additional training and support based on walkthrough data.

Person Responsible Sarah Van Brimmer (sarah.vanbrimmer@indianriverschools.org)

Monitor student participation in Project Based Learning experiences – noting equitable participation with particular attention to African American students.

Person Responsible Lyndsey Matheny (lyndsey.matheny@indianriverschools.org)

At the end of 20-21 school year, faculty and staff will participate in a reflection cycle to create action steps for the continuation of PBL in the following school year.

Person Responsible Jayde Norwood (jayde.norwood@indianriverschools.org)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Improving structures and routines to facilitate active student response to engage all learners in in rigorous, standards-based instruction. Active student response such as multiple response strategies and accountable talk engage all learners in the thinking and questioning facilitated by the teacher.

Measurable Outcome: During classroom walkthroughs, 100% of classes will have opportunities for active student response. By engaging all learners, we plan to have 64% of students scoring at the proficiency level in ELA and Math, according to end-of-year view in iReady.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lyndsey Matheny (lyndsey.matheny@indianriverschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: First semester: Focus on 2 multiple response strategies to practice, receive feedback, and refine structure. <https://www.evidencebasedteaching.org.au/evidence-based-teaching-strategies/>

Second semester: Focus on 2 Accountable talk structures to practice, receive feedback, and refine practices.

<http://www.ascd.org/publications/books/108035/chapters/Procedures-for-Classroom-Talk.aspx>

Benefits of high-ASR strategies include increases in students’ active participation during instruction; increases in students’ correct responding, including scores on quizzes and tests; and decreases in their challenging behavior (Randolph, 2007).

[http://www.centeril.org/publications/Active%20Student%20Response%20\(Final\).pdf](http://www.centeril.org/publications/Active%20Student%20Response%20(Final).pdf)

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Proactive whole-group response systems paired with formative assessment charts have the potential to result in more effective instruction that actively engages students in the learning process (<https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/pdf/10.1177/0040059916640749>) In addition, these strategies also benefit students in our targeted subgroups. Proactive strategies encourage active engagement of all students, including students with learning disabilities (Reglin, Akpo-Sanni, & Losike-Sedimo, 2010).

In addition, providing students opportunities to talk and have collaborative conversations increase literacy outcomes. <http://www.ascd.org/publications/books/108035/chapters/Why-Talk-Is-Important-in-Classrooms.aspx>

Action Steps to Implement

Provide professional development related to a specific multiple response strategies.

1st strategy: Pinch Cards

2nd Strategy: White board (Show Down Strategy) - training will occur the ER Day in September

Person Responsible Ataaba Patterson (ataaba.patterson@indianriverschools.org)

1st Nine Weeks Plan for Walk Throughs

SIP Team (Matheny, Van Brimmer, A. Patterson, J. Norwood, S. Conway, S. Keeley, J. Mosher) will

conduct walkthroughs during each implementation cycle (2 cycles during the first nine weeks)- Feedback will be given to grade levels and individual teachers regarding level of implementation.

Person Responsible Sarah Van Brimmer (sarah.vanbrimmer@indianriverschools.org)

Leadership Team (Administration and IC Coaches) will monitor data on a weekly basis. Data will be reviewed at weekly Tribal Council meetings. Sources will include (Unit assessments, I-Ready, classroom formative assessments with teachers)- Source Power BI

Person Responsible Lyndsey Matheny (lyndsey.matheny@indianriverschools.org)

Based on walkthrough data, provide additional opportunities for re-training or practice with feedback from instructional coaches to reach mastery.

Person Responsible Lyndsey Matheny (lyndsey.matheny@indianriverschools.org)

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.

Vero Beach Elementary has created a Focus Area in Section III which addresses Positive Culture and Climate in greater depth than required in this section, please reference that section of the plan for this information.

Vero Beach Elementary has a strong connection with community partners and our families. Although we are currently experiencing a pandemic we have continued to strengthen our community and family partnerships. We have a strong presence on social media platforms which has been a constant link to our school family. We are able to use the platforms to communicate with stakeholders during school and non-school hours.

This year, we scheduled individual orientation sessions to meet social distancing guidelines. It was shared by both parents and staff that the one-on-one attention was a great experience. VBE will continue this format in future years. We are currently in the process of revamping our PTA with the guidance of Julia

White, SDIRC PTA representative. Our goal is to get more parents actively involved with supporting our students and school. Furthermore, we have developed a list based on parent interest for our SAC committee and will be reaching out to these parents to invite them to our upcoming meetings. To date, we have posted our draft Parent Compact on social media and have asked for parent/family input. Currently, we have received 14 replies for input from our parents and community.

VBE has several community partners. One of those partners is First United Methodist Church. Their involvement has included: creating "to-go" supply kits for all of our students regardless of their instructional option. Students in our remote options have been invited to get these materials to support their learning. On an "as needed" basis, students will receive a supply kit if they must switch their instructional option. This group has purchased reusable face masks for all of our students in the event parents cannot afford their own masks. They have also created a program to support students and families by providing food for the weekend. On the first day of school for students, this group held welcome back signs for our students when they returned.

Moving further into the school year, FUMC will be providing strawberries to our master gardener program so that students can experience enriching activities after school.

Another supporting partner is our local Elks Club. This club supports our school and students by funding our PBIS store. Currently, they are working on a choice system where students can select their PBIS reward to be delivered at a future date. Throughout the year, they will continue to support our PBIS initiatives which is directly tied into our school improvement plan goals.

We have been working closely with the Master Gardener in our area to sustain flower beds and gardens around our campus. Starting in September, we will be establishing a student club after school to enrich our students in the area of horticulture.

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

Part V: Budget						
1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation				\$6,900.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0161 - Vero Beach Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		\$2,300.00
			<i>Notes: Teachers and staff will be afford 1/2 days of planning/training that will support differentiation strategies and how to effectively scaffold instruction to meet the needs of ALL learners. (total of 3 half days days for each grade level)</i>			
			0161 - Vero Beach Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$4,600.00
			<i>Notes: Teachers and staff will be afford 1/2 days of planning/training that will support differentiation strategies and how to effectively scaffold instruction to meet the needs of ALL learners. (total of 3 half days days for each grade level)</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Project Based Learning- School Theme				\$1,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0161 - Vero Beach Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$1,000.00

						<i>Notes: Materials needs for approved PBL projects.</i>
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Student Engagement				\$500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0161 - Vero Beach Elementary School	Title, I Part A		\$500.00
						<i>Notes: print shop materials for multiple response strategies</i>
Total:						\$8,400.00