# Glendale Elementary School



# 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# Glendale Elementary School

## 4940 8TH ST, Vero Beach, FL 32968

### www.indianriverschools.org

## Demographics

# Principal: Casandra Flores

Start Date for this Principal: 7/21/2020

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>KG-5 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 66% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: B (57%)<br><br>2017-18: C (51%)<br><br>2016-17: B (55%)<br><br>2015-16: C (49%) |
| **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** | N/A |

> \* 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.

Glendale Elementary strives to support a positive and engaging learning environment that fosters collaboration, critical thinking, and creativity. Our school family is committed to developing life-long learners who will become successful and reach their full potential.

### Provide the school's vision statement.

Core Beliefs: Be Responsible, Do Your Best, and Always Remember to Help the Rest.
We will establish a learning partnership of home, school, and community to ensure personal and academic excellence. We will create an environment that will enable all of our students to fully develop their academic, emotional, and social potential,

## 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 |
|---|---|---|
| Faust, Adam | Principal | Principal: Facilitates and conducts meetings by providing current data and support documents. The Principal guides the leadership team through a process of problem solving issues and concerns that arise through an ongoing, systematic examination of available data with the goal of impacting student achievement, school safety, school culture, literacy, attendance, student social/emotional well-being, and prevention of student failure through early intervention. |
| Banack, Michelle | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal: Participate in interpretation, and analysis of data; facilitates the development of intervention plans; provides support for intervention fidelity and documentation; provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection, data analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation; facilitates data-based decision-making activities. |
| Koppelman, Rene | Instructional Coach | Facilitate and support standards-based lesson planning, design and implement coaching cycles with evidence-based instructional strategies, analyze and interpret data in collaboration with teachers to drive decision making, provide job-embedded professional development opportunities to stakeholders aligned to student assessment data, support the development and implementation of intervention and enrichment programs. remain current and knowledgeable regarding content and curriculum expectations from both the district and state, and communicate with all stakeholders regarding support provided and prioritizing of future support. |
| Corey, Jennifer | Instructional Coach | Facilitate and support standards-based lesson planning, design and implement coaching cycles with evidence-based instructional strategies, analyze and interpret data in collaboration with teachers to drive decision making, provide job-embedded professional development opportunities to stakeholders aligned to student assessment data, support the development and implementation of intervention and enrichment programs. remain current and knowledgeable regarding content and curriculum expectations from both the district and state, and communicate with all stakeholders regarding support provided and prioritizing of future support. |
| Odom, Emily | Instructional Coach | Facilitate and support standards-based lesson planning, design and implement coaching cycles with evidence-based instructional strategies, analyze and interpret data in collaboration with teachers to drive decision making, provide job-embedded professional development opportunities to stakeholders aligned to student assessment data, support the development and implementation of intervention and enrichment programs. remain current and knowledgeable regarding content and curriculum expectations from both the district and state, and communicate with all stakeholders regarding support provided and prioritizing of future support. |
| Fletcher, Laurie | Other | Exceptional Student Education (ESE) Teachers: Participates in student data collection, integrates core instructional activities/materials into |

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------|-------|-------------------------------|
| | | instruction and collaborates with general education teachers through such activities as co-teaching. Instruction is delivered through a blend of support facilitation and a resource room model. |
| McGinty, Elaine | Psychologist | |
| Dossantos, Julie | Teacher, K-12 | Serve as a teacher leader, develop and deliver rigorous standard-based instruction, fostering teacher efficacy, stay current on relevant research based educational trends and practices. |
| Valley, Jenna | Teacher, K-12 | Serve as a teacher leader, develop and deliver rigorous standard-based instruction, fostering teacher efficacy, stay current on relevant research based educational trends and practices. |

## Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Tuesday 7/21/2020, Casandra Flores

**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) | 66% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented** (subgroups with 10 or more students) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* |

| (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
|---|---|
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: B (57%)<br><br>2017-18: C (51%)<br><br>2016-17: B (55%)<br><br>2015-16: C (49%) |
| **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** | N/A |
| \* 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 | 71 | 93 | 73 | 85 | 96 | 91 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 509 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 5 | 19 | 6 | 13 | 24 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 79 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 18 |

**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 | 1 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 9 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 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 | 81 | 88 | 76 | 104 | 95 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 544 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 7 | 8 | 15 | 8 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 19 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 |

**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 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |

**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 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| 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 | 81 | 88 | 76 | 104 | 95 | 100 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 544 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 7 | 8 | 15 | 8 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 19 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 |

**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 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |

**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 | 2 | 6 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| 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 | 66% | 58% | 57% | 51% | 54% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 61% | 57% | 58% | 56% | 53% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 51% | 54% | 53% | 60% | 52% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 63% | 63% | 63% | 56% | 60% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 59% | 60% | 62% | 68% | 62% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 49% | 48% | 51% | 53% | 51% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 52% | 54% | 53% | 38% | 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 | 64% | 60% | 4% | 58% | 6% |
| | 2018 | 52% | 56% | -4% | 57% | -5% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 12% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 69% | 61% | 8% | 58% | 11% |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 58% | 56% | 2% | 56% | 2% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 11% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 17% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 61% | 54% | 7% | 56% | 5% |
| | 2018 | 45% | 52% | -7% | 55% | -10% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 16% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 3% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 66% | 64% | 2% | 62% | 4% |
| | 2018 | 58% | 60% | -2% | 62% | -4% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 8% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 67% | 64% | 3% | 64% | 3% |
| | 2018 | 56% | 63% | -7% | 62% | -6% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 11% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 9% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 54% | 57% | -3% | 60% | -6% |
| | 2018 | 53% | 58% | -5% | 61% | -8% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -2% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 50% | 53% | -3% | 53% | -3% |
| | 2018 | 49% | 54% | -5% | 55% | -6% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| 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 | 41 | 51 | 52 | 47 | 60 | 65 | 20 | | | | |
| ELL | 52 | 62 | | 52 | 62 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 50 | 64 | 69 | 42 | 51 | 47 | 36 | | | | |
| HSP | 62 | 48 | 50 | 55 | 44 | 30 | 50 | | | | |
| MUL | 71 | 80 | | 64 | 60 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 71 | 61 | 38 | 70 | 65 | 58 | 54 | | | | |

| 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 |
| FRL | 63 | 56 | 54 | 59 | 58 | 48 | 49 | | | | |

| 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 | 21 | 43 | 46 | 21 | 51 | 42 | 15 | | | | |
| ELL | 42 | 38 | | 47 | 54 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 27 | 43 | 45 | 35 | 52 | 43 | 26 | | | | |
| HSP | 51 | 44 | 20 | 59 | 54 | | 48 | | | | |
| MUL | 50 | 60 | | 75 | 50 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 64 | 62 | 59 | 65 | 56 | 43 | 67 | | | | |
| FRL | 48 | 51 | 44 | 54 | 54 | 47 | 47 | | | | |

| 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 | 19 | 39 | 40 | 20 | 49 | 48 | | | | | |
| ELL | 36 | 61 | | 60 | 89 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 29 | 43 | 38 | 32 | 54 | 45 | 11 | | | | |
| HSP | 41 | 56 | 67 | 63 | 83 | | 31 | | | | |
| MUL | 60 | 73 | | 65 | 73 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 65 | 60 | 69 | 62 | 67 | 53 | 45 | | | | |
| FRL | 50 | 53 | 55 | 53 | 68 | 56 | 37 | | | | |

## 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) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 59 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 71 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 472 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| **Subgroup Data** | |
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 48 |

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

| English Language Learners | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 60 |
| 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 | 51 |
| 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 | 69 |
| 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 | 60 |
| 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 | 57 |
| 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 data that showed the lowest performance was in Math Learning Gains for the bottom quartile. The data shows that Hispanic students in the bottom quartile did not make adequate learning gains. Bottom quartile learning gains have been below the state average for the past two years. Contributing factors include the lack of student fact fluency and lack of time allotted for math instruction.

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

We saw an increase in all data components.

**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 showed the component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state was math learning gains. Factors that contributed to the gap include the lack of gains by black and Hispanic students. We hypothesis this occurred as a result of limited access to grade level core curriculum and adherence to instructional frameworks during the math block.

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

The data that showed the most improvement was achievement in ELA. The actions that our school took in this area included the following: an increased focus in collaborative planning between general education and ESE teachers across all tiers of instruction and a restructuring of ESE services to include the front loading of grade level standards.

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

Attendance
FSA Level 1 in ELA and Math

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

1. Math bottom quartile learning gains.
2. Math learning gains.
3. Science proficiency.
4. ELA proficiency with African American students.
5. Math proficiency with African American students.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

| | |
|---|---|
| **#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation** | |
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | When disaggregating state assessment data, the lowest data components are ELA and Math learning gains in our bottom quartile students. According to 2019 FSA data only 49% of the lowest 25th percentile made learning gains in Math and only 51% made learning gains in ELA. While students are performing slightly lower in Mathematics, both areas are a concern. The school trend over the past 2 years is showing small increases in both areas, but not enough to fill the gaps needed for students to achieve grade level proficiency. One of the identified barriers is students access to Tier 1 instruction. Glendale classrooms are filled with diverse learners who differ not only culturally, but also in their cognitive abilities, background knowledge, and learning preferences. Faced with such diversity, making curriculum accessible to all learners will need to be focused and strategic. We plan to implement differentiated instructional strategies in an effort to effectively address all students' learning needs. To differentiate instruction is to recognize students varying background knowledge, readiness, language,preferences in learning, interests, and to react responsively. Differentiated instruction is a process to approach teaching and learning for students of differing abilities in the same class. The intent of differentiating instruction is to maximize each student's growth and individual success by meeting each student where he or she is, and assisting in the learning process. Our hypothesis is that if we implement an instructional framework that makes grade level content accessible to all learners, then gains will be made by all students, especially our most vulnerable subgroups. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | According to state assessments, we will increase the following data components: ELA Lowest 25th Percentile will increase 5 points to 56% ELA Learning Gains will increase 5 points to 66% Math Lowest 25th Percentile will increase 8 points to 57% Math Learning Gains will increase 8 points to 67% Impact Review Data- 100% of classrooms will use Differentiated Instruction |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Adam Faust (adam.faust@indianriverschools.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Differentiation strategies utilized in all content areas across all tiers of instruction. Differentiation will occur through the modification of four elements: content, process, product, and affect/learning environment. Differentiated instruction will serve to fill gaps in our lowest 25th percentile students as well as provide enrichment opportunities for advanced students. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Currently the data component that shows the lowest performance at Glendale is learning gains in Mathematics by our lowest 25th percentile students. The National Council of Teachers of Mathematics (NCTM), the professional organization whose mission it is to promote, articulate, and support the best possible teaching and learning in mathematics, recognizes the need for differentiation. The first principle of the NCTM Principles and Standards for School Mathematics reads, "Excellence in mathematics education requires equity—high expectations and strong support for all students" (NCTM, 2000, p. 12). In particular, NCTM recognizes the need for accommodating differences among students, taking into account both their readiness and their level of mathematical talent/interest/ confidence, to ensure that each student can learn important mathematics. |

Differentiation strategies are also proven to increase student achievement in the English Language Arts. According to Tomlinson (2001), "Differentiating instruction means 'shaking up' what goes on in the classroom so that students have multiple options for taking in information, making sense of ideas, and expressing what they learn." Differentiation is not a single strategy, but an approach to instruction that incorporates a variety of strategies. In order to increase achievement in not only our bottom quartile students, but also all students, we must change our instructional approach during all tiers of instruction.

### Action Steps to Implement

Create a master schedule with instructional blocks that allow time for tiered instruction.
Evidence: Master Schedule
Completion Date: 8/20/20

| **Person Responsible** | Michelle Banack (michelle.banack@indianriverschools.org) |
|---|---|

Create a schedule for collaborative planning.
Evidence: Schedule
Completion Date: 8/20/20

| **Person Responsible** | Rene Koppelman (rene.koppelman@indianriverschools.org) |
|---|---|

Provide professional learning opportunities facilitated by instructional coaches that focus on strategies for differentiated instruction.
Evidence: PD Agendas, PD Sign-in, Canvas
Completion Dates:9/23/20, 11/18/20, 12/16/20, 1/4/21, 2/24/21, 3/17/21, 4/21/21

| **Person Responsible** | Rene Koppelman (rene.koppelman@indianriverschools.org) |
|---|---|

Data chats to examine the progress of every student but specifically focusing on the lowest 25th percentile.
Evidence: Agenda, Sign in, Meeting notes, Action steps
Completion Dates: 9/29/20, 10/27/20, 11/17/20, 1/4/21, 2/23/21 3/30/21 4/27/21,

| **Person Responsible** | Michelle Banack (michelle.banack@indianriverschools.org) |
|---|---|

Create tiered intervention groups based on student need. Progress monitor student progress weekly.
Evidence: Attendance, Lesson plans, Progress monitoring data, Walkthrough fidelity check data
Completion Dates: Scheduling completed by 9/21/20, other data will be collected and monitored monthly

| **Person Responsible** | Michelle Banack (michelle.banack@indianriverschools.org) |
|---|---|

Create a protocol for planning lessons that allow access for all learners.
Evidence: Protocol, lesson plans, walkthrough data
Completion Dates: Protocol completed on 8/15/20, lesson plans and walkthrough data reviewed monthly.

| **Person Responsible** | Rene Koppelman (rene.koppelman@indianriverschools.org) |
|---|---|

Create a rubric for data collection during classroom observations.
Evidence: Rubric
Completion Date: 9/8/20

| **Person Responsible** | Adam Faust (adam.faust@indianriverschools.org) |
|---|---|

| **#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science** | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Over the course of the past three years, Glendale has shown growth in science achievement but remains below the state and district averages. We hypothesize that the barrier affecting student achievement is the lack of learning opportunities that include inquiry-based approaches.<br><br>We feel that the slight increases that we have experienced are due to our media center shifting to a Science focus. We have also seen a positive impact from the instructional and lesson planning framework that has been implemented in this space. The instructional model is known as "The 5 E Model". Most current research reveals that science teaching should actively engage students, incorporate cooperative learning, and de-emphasize the rote memorization of facts. In addition, the inclusion of inquiry-based teaching methodologies have been shown to positively impact student learning. Also important to note is, Project 2061: Science for All Americans (Rutherford & Alhgren, 1990) and The Standards (NRC, 1996) argue that inquiry needs to be a central strategy of all science curricula. The 5 E Model encompasses all of these components of Science education. From the success that we have already witnessed, we feel that if we were to expand the focus on Science as well as the use of the 5 E Model for teaching and planning, then our student proficiency in Science will greatly increase. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Based on state assessment data 5th grade Science proficiency will increase 8 percentage points bringing the total to 60% |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Adam Faust (adam.faust@indianriverschools.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | 5 E Instructional Model<br>Engagement - students' prior knowledge accessed and interest engaged in the phenomenon<br>Exploration - students participate in an activity that facilitates conceptual change<br>Explanation - students generate an explanation of the phenomenon<br>Elaboration - students' understanding of the phenomenon challenged and deepened through new experiences<br>Evaluation - students assess their understanding of the phenomenon |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Recent research reports, such as How People Learn: Brain, Mind, Experience, and School (Bransford, Brown & Cocking, 2000) and its companion, How Students Learn: Science in the Classroom (Donovan & Bransford, 2005), have confirmed the sustained use of an effective, research-based instructional model can help students learn fundamental concepts in science and other domains. The BSCS 5E Instructional Model is grounded in sound educational theory, has a growing base of research to support its effectiveness, and has had a significant impact on science education. Cognitive research shows that learning is an active process occurring within and influenced by the learner.<br>Hence, learning results from an interaction between what information is encountered and how the student processes that information based on perceived notions and extant personal knowledge. The BSCS 5E Instructional Model applies this research to curriculum materials promoting an increased understanding of processes and content knowledge. |

## Action Steps to Implement

Create a master schedule which departmentalizes grades 3-5 and allows for blocks of Science instruction.
Evidence: Schedule
Completion Date: 8/20/20

| **Person Responsible** | Michelle Banack (michelle.banack@indianriverschools.org) |
|---|---|

Plan Science lessons using the 5 E Model.
Evidence: Schedules, sign in, lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs.
Completion Dates: Collaborative planning occur weekly, lesson plan and walkthrough data examined monthly

| **Person Responsible** | Jennifer Corey (jennifer.corey@indianriverschools.org) |
|---|---|

Provide professional learning for teachers on the 5 E Model.
Evidence: Agenda, sign in
Completion Dates:9/23/20, 11/18/20, 12/16/20, 1/4/21, 2/24/21, 3/17/21, 4/21/21

| **Person Responsible** | Kim Slade (kimberly.slade@indianriverschools.org) |
|---|---|

Schedule data chats to examine Science data gathered from local assessments.
Evidence: Agenda, data, action steps
Completion Dates: 9/29/20, 10/27/20, 11/17/20, 1/4/21, 2/23/21 3/30/21 4/27/21,

| **Person Responsible** | Michelle Banack (michelle.banack@indianriverschools.org) |
|---|---|

| #3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Currently our African American students and are not achieving ELA and Math proficiency at the same rate as their white peers. While black students are making learning gains in all areas, these gains are not great enough for students to achieve proficiency with grade level content. Currently 71% of our white students are reaching proficiency levels in ELA while only 50% of black students are reaching proficiency. In Mathematics, 51% of African American students are proficient compared to 65% of white students. This data highlights the need for additional academic support for African American students to achieve mastery of grade level content<br><br>In order to help close the achievement gap between white and African American students, we plan to provide focused academic supports for our black students These opportunities will occur through the implementation of tiered interventions A Multi-Tiered Support System (MTSS)–Response to Intervention (RtI) is a vital process for improving instruction and providing academic and social-behavioral support to all students. It should be implemented to ensure success for every student in every classroom. The MTSS is a systematic method of identifying, defining, and resolving students' academic and social-behavior difficulties using collaborative, school-wide, problem-solving approaches. While Glendale has always used MTSS to support students, this year we plan to prioritize our African American students to ensure that effective evidence-based instruction and intervention occur daily and with fidelity. In addition, we will create a system for progress monitoring these students to ensure instructional equity in all tiers. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | According to state assessments ELA achievement for African American students will increase 20 percentage points for a total of 70%. Math achievement for African American students will increase 15 percentage points for a total of 66%. Science achievement for African American students will increase 20 percentage points for a total of 56%. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Adam Faust (adam.faust@indianriverschools.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Systemically reviewing progress of students in Tier 2 interventions to eliminate a disproportionate number of African American students requiring more intensive Tier 3 supports. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | In the context of an RTI prevention model, progress monitoring is used to assess student progress or performance in those areas in which they were identified by universal screening as being at-risk for failure (e.g., reading, mathematics, social behavior). It is the method by which teachers or other school personnel determine if students are benefitting appropriately from the typical (e.g., grade level, locally determined, etc.) instructional program, identify students who are not making adequate progress, and help guide the construction of effective intervention programs for students who are not profiting from typical instruction (Fuchs & Stecker, 2003). |

## Action Steps to Implement

Assess African American students in order to identify learning gaps.
Evidence: DIBELS, FKLRS. IReady
Completion: Ongoing assessing throughout year per district calendar

| **Person Responsible** | Michelle Banack (michelle.banack@indianriverschools.org) |
|---|---|

Data chats to progress monitor the progress of African American students.
Evidence: Agendas, data, action steps
Completion: Ongoing (monthly)

**Person Responsible** Michelle Banack (michelle.banack@indianriverschools.org)

Create intervention groups focused on student deficit and ensure instruction is delivered with fidelity.
Evidence: Group attendance sheets, progress monitoring data, lesson plans, classroom walkthroughs
Completion: Group creation completed 9/11/20, Tier 2 start date 9/15/20. Evidence collection ongoing.

**Person Responsible** Rene Koppelman (rene.koppelman@indianriverschools.org)

Administrators will attend the parent/teacher conference for all African American students performing below grade level in ELA and Math.
Evidence: Calendar, sign in
Completion: Fall and Spring conferences

**Person Responsible** Adam Faust (adam.faust@indianriverschools.org)

| | |
|---|---|
| **#4. Other specifically relating to School Theme- School of Science and Engineering.** | |
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Glendale Elementary will begin it's journey to becoming a School of Science and Engineering that incorporates a STEAM and/or Inquiry approach to learning. This was identified as a model that would best serve our students in our quest to increase Math and Science proficiency as well as close gaps between subgroups. Currently out bottom quartile students are not making adequate Math learning gains according to state assessments. Our students are also performing below the state average in Science proficiency. Additionally, we have a gap between the proficiency levels of our sub groups. Our African American, Hispanic, and students with disabilities are not making the learning gains necessary to allow them to be successful with grade level content. For these reasons, we choose to to move toward a STEAM approach for learning. STEAM is an educational approach to learning that uses Science, Technology, Engineering, the Arts and Mathematics as access points for guiding student inquiry, dialogue, and critical thinking. Research not only supports the use of inquiry-based learning, but it shows that it is a more inclusive method of instruction as it increases achievement in all groups of students. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | According to state assessments, we will increase the following data components:<br>ELA Lowest 25th Percentile will increase 5 points to 56%<br>ELA Learning Gains will increase 5 points to 66%<br>Math Lowest 25th Percentile will increase 8 points to 57%<br>Math Learning Gains will increase 8 points to 67%<br>Science proficiency will increase 8 percentage points bringing the total to 60%<br>ELA achievement for African American students will increase 20 percentage points for a total of 70<br>Math achievement for African American students will increase 15 percentage points for a total of 66% |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Adam Faust (adam.faust@indianriverschools.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | School focus will shift to a STEAM and inquiry based learning approach to support content integration, critical thinking, and student engagement. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | According to the Journal of Science Teacher Education, the proficiency rates of all groups of students (regardless of race, gender, school socioeconomic status levels or current performance) can be greatly improved and that the gap between high and low performing students can be significant narrowed when proficient inquiry-based learning is facilitated. Research also shows that inquiry-based instruction yields growth in the processes of analyzing data, interpreting graphs, modeling complex concepts, and increases in content knowledge. |

### Action Steps to Implement

Create a school based STEAM Team.
Evidence: Agenda, sign in, minutes and action steps from meetings
Completion Date: 8/3/20

| | |
|---|---|
| **Person Responsible** | Kim Slade (kimberly.slade@indianriverschools.org) |

Create Math and Science blocks where content integration and inquiry learning can occur.
Evidence: Schedule, lesson plans
Completion Date: 8/20/20, lesson plans examined monthly

| **Person Responsible** | Michelle Banack (michelle.banack@indianriverschools.org) |
|---|---|

Ensure Cultural Arts teachers will integrate content into their area by participating in collaborative planning with instructional coaches.
Evidence: Agendas, lesson plans, walkthrough data
Completion Dates: Ongoing planning twice monthly August- May, lesson plans and walkthrough data examined monthly

| **Person Responsible** | Jennifer Corey (jennifer.corey@indianriverschools.org) |
|---|---|

Provide professional development for teachers focused on STEAM and Inquiry Learning.
Evidence: Agenda, sign in, Canvas course
Completion Dates:9/23/20, 11/18/20, 12/16/20, 1/4/21, 2/24/21, 3/17/21, 4/21/21

| **Person Responsible** | Kim Slade (kimberly.slade@indianriverschools.org) |
|---|---|

Teach Science content through ELA Standards.
Evidence: lesson plans, classroom walkthrough data
Completion Dates: Ongoing

| **Person Responsible** | Rene Koppelman (rene.koppelman@indianriverschools.org) |
|---|---|

Perform coaching cycles to help support teachers with inquiry and engineering integration.
Evidence: Coaching logs, lesson plans
Completion: Ongoing

| **Person Responsible** | Jennifer Corey (jennifer.corey@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 continue to address the issues of student attendance by the following actions:**
**1. Quarterly recognition of students with perfect attendance**
**2. Grade level attendance challenges**
**3. Monthly recognition of staff with perfect attendance**
**4. Monitoring attendance data through weekly leadership meetings**
**5. Administrator phone calls to families with multiple absences or tardies.**
**6. Implement incentives and interventions for students with greater than 10 absences**

## 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 climate is one where individuals feel valued, cared for and respected. Such an atmosphere contributes to effective teaching and learning and to genuine communication, both within and outside the school.Having a positive school culture has an impact, not just on the attitudes of students and teachers, but on the entire learning experience. Glendale Elementary prides itself on having a focus that both builds and sustains positive school culture. Listed below are some of the main contributors to our positive school climate.
1. CHAMPS- This framework falls under the umbrella of PBIS and serves as our main Tier 1 behavioral support.
The overall goal of the CHAMPs classroom management system is to develop an instructional structure in which students are responsible, motivated, and highly engaged in the specific task at hand. Additionally, it allows for expectations to be clearly articulated so environments are structured for student success.
2. Social Emotional Learning- Students emotional well being is monitored and supported by our school based guidance counselor. The counselor is also available to provide support for teachers as well as parents. For students needing more intensive support, social skill groups are facilitated by the counselor. As another support for student emotional well being the Sanford Harmony program taught in all classrooms. This program focuses on developing a sense of community in each classroom as well teaching empathy and critical thinking skills.
3. Recognition Ceremonies- Students and staff are nominated and recognized monthly for exhibiting behaviors that tie into our school mission of "helping the rest". Students are recognized quarterly for academic achievements.
4. Communication- The school maintains an open line of communication. Communication is key to stakeholders working together to accomplish common goals. Newsletters, social media platforms, and weekly Principal calls ensure that all stakeholders are aware of school happenings.

### 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: Differentiation | | | | $2,000.00 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | | 140-Substitute Teachers | 0201 - Glendale Elementary School | School Improvement Funds | | $2,000.00 |
| | | | Notes: Substitute coverage for quarterly data reviews. | | | |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science | | | | $1,500.00 |

| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | 500-Materials and Supplies | 0201 - Glendale Elementary School | School Improvement Funds | | $1,500.00 |
| | | | *Notes: Materials and supplies to support science instruction.* | | | |
| **3** | **III.A.** | **Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity** | | | | **$0.00** |
| **4** | **III.A.** | **Areas of Focus: Other: School Theme- School of Science and Engineering.** | | | | **$0.00** |
| | | | | | **Total:** | **$3,500.00** |