

School District of Indian River County

Indian River Academy



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	22

Indian River Academy

500 20TH ST SW, Vero Beach, FL 32962

www.indianriverschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Christine Good

Start Date for this Principal: 7/21/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	71%
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (47%)
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.

Inspire and educate all students to become tomorrow's leaders.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Create a caring community of students, parents and school staff working together to ensure all students are career and college-ready.

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
Good, Kelly	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.
Davis, Meghan	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
Vollbracht, Kim	Instructional Coach	Facilitate and support standards based lesson planning, design and implement of 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 the state, and communicate with all stakeholders regarding support provided and prioritizing of future support.
Ragley, Elaine	Instructional Coach	Facilitate and support standards based lesson planning, design and implement of 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 the state, and communicate with all stakeholders regarding support provided and prioritizing of future support.
Vollbracht, Leo	Instructional Coach	Facilitate and support standards based lesson planning, design and implement of 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 the state, and communicate with all stakeholders regarding support provided and prioritizing of future support.
Durwin, Brenda	Instructional Coach	Analyze and interpret data in collaboration with teachers to provide ongoing intervention for students in grades K-3..Remain current and knowledgeable regarding content and curriculum expectations from both the district and the

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		state, and communicate with all stakeholders regarding support provided and prioritizing of future support.

D'Albora, Amy	Instructional Media	Create lessons that use robotics tied to science standards and provide opportunities to secure books through the library
---------------	---------------------	--

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/21/2020, Christine Good

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

29

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)	71%
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (47%)

	2017-18: C (49%) 2016-17: C (51%) 2015-16: C (47%)
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Attendance below 90 percent	5	18	19	14	12	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	1	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	2	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	24	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

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	8	5	6	15	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

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	5	8	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	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	77	80	77	68	81	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	454
Attendance below 90 percent	0	4	17	9	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	6	25	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	6	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

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	2	6	1	6	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	77	80	77	68	81	71	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	454
Attendance below 90 percent	0	4	17	9	11	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	6	25	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	6	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

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	1	2	6	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	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	54%	58%	57%	46%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	57%	58%	52%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	31%	54%	53%	43%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	53%	63%	63%	47%	60%	61%
Math Learning Gains	53%	60%	62%	62%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	48%	51%	67%	51%	51%
Science Achievement	47%	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	51%	60%	-9%	58%	-7%
	2018	55%	56%	-1%	57%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	56%	61%	-5%	58%	-2%
	2018	55%	56%	-1%	56%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	44%	54%	-10%	56%	-12%
	2018	40%	52%	-12%	55%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-11%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	43%	64%	-21%	62%	-19%
	2018	49%	60%	-11%	62%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	54%	64%	-10%	64%	-10%
	2018	59%	63%	-4%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	55%	57%	-2%	60%	-5%
	2018	51%	58%	-7%	61%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	45%	53%	-8%	53%	-8%
	2018	52%	54%	-2%	55%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
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	33	26	50	36	25				
ELL	40	50		56	63		36				
BLK	40	38	36	36	42	31	26				
HSP	56	63		53	64		55				
MUL	42			33							
WHT	66	57	25	67	53		68				
FRL	55	54	29	51	53	33	48				

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	19	22	23	32	48	38	40				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
ELL	42	42		53	62						
BLK	39	35	31	47	64	44	32				
HSP	59	49		64	61		62				
MUL	45			64							
WHT	52	48	41	53	52	43	58				
FRL	46	44	41	52	58	48	50				

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	20	25		20	57		27				
ELL	43	59		39	59		17				
BLK	38	49	37	34	61	67	29				
HSP	49	57	50	51	70		38				
MUL	60			60							
WHT	52	48		53	60	55	55				
FRL	46	50	42	45	62	69	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	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	41
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	367
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
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	48

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	36
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	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	38
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	56
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	46
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 component that showed the lowest performance is ELA Lowest 25th Percentile. Contributing factors include: implementation of a new Tier 1 core curriculum, a new team of teachers in 3rd and 5th grade, master schedule did not include designated Rtl time and support facilitation model for ESE programming in 3rd - 5th that was not fully developed or implemented.

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 in our school data was Math Lowest 25th Percentile.

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 ELA Lowest 25th Percentile had a 22 percentage point gap. Contributing factors to this low performance was the implementation of a new Tier 1 core curriculum, a new team of teachers in 3rd and 5th grade, master schedule did not include designated Rtl time and support facilitation model for ESE programming in 3rd - 5th that was not fully developed or implemented.

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 the Learning Gains in ELA. The classroom model changed from a 90-minute ELA block to a 120-minute ELA block.

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

Student attendance is an area of concern, though we recognize it will be impacted by the COVID-19 pandemic in ways that we have never encountered.

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

1. Increase Learning Gains of Lowest 25th Percentile Students in Reading, 3rd - 5th
2. Increase Learning Gains of Lowest 25th Percentile Students in Math, 3rd - 5th
3. Increase Science Proficiency score in 5th grade
4. Academic achievement of the subgroups of Black students, Multi-racial students and Students with Disabilities.
5. Student attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

The area of focus is on our bottom quartile ELA and MATH learning gains. When disaggregating data these areas are our greatest needs. Our identified barrier is Tier 1 access to grade level standards. Students at IR Academy are diverse learners with diverse learning preferences and background knowledge. We will implement differentiated instructional strategies in an effort to effectively address all student needs. Differentiating instruction means to meet students where they are and provide what is needed to support the learning process. If these strategies are implemented, we believe all students will maximize their potential.

Measurable Outcome:

According to the state assessments, we will increase the following data components;
 ELA Lowest 25th will increase 6 percentage points to 37%
 Math Lowest 25th will increase 6 percentage points to 41%
 ELA Learning Gains will increase 10 percentage points to 63%
 Math Learning Gains will increase 10 percentage points to 63%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kelly Good (kelly.good@indianriverschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Differentiation across content areas for all tiers. According to the ASCD, "In a differentiated classroom, the teacher assumes that different learners have differing needs and proactively plans lessons that provide a variety of ways to "get at" and express learning. The teacher may still need to fine tune instruction for some learners, but because the teacher knows the varied learner needs within the classroom and selects learning options accordingly, the chances are greater that these experiences will be an appropriate fit for most learners."

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

The data from FSA 2019 shows the lowest performance area is our LQ ELA. Differentiation will occur for content, process, and product with routines and procedures consistently in place.

Action Steps to Implement

Create a master schedule that provides time for tiered instruction.
 Evidence: Lesson plans, walkthroughs, schedules, meeting notes

Person Responsible

Kelly Good (kelly.good@indianriverschools.org)

Created Collaborative planning schedules that allow all teachers to plan and collaborate lessons and tasks that allow access for all learners. Content area teachers and ESE Resource teachers.

Evidence: Agenda, Walkthroughs, Student Work

Person Responsible

Kelly Good (kelly.good@indianriverschools.org)

Provide Professional Learning Opportunities specifically designed to give teachers an ongoing understanding and knowledge about how to implement differentiated strategies.

Evidence: Agendas, walkthroughs

Person Responsible

Leo Vollbracht (leo.vollbracht@indianriverschools.org)

Facilitate Ongoing data chats to examine walkthrough data and the progress of ALL students with a heightened focus on our SWD and Lowest quartile students.

Evidence: Agendas, Data from Unit Assessments

Person Responsible Kelly Good (kelly.good@indianriverschools.org)

Create tiered intervention groups that are progress monitored weekly.

Evidence: Agendas, Attendance , PM Data, Lesson Plans, Walkthroughs

Person Responsible Meghan Davis (meghan.davis@indianriverschools.org)

Conduct walk throughs of all classrooms weekly with admin and coaches to gather data on the implementation of differentiation strategies.

Evidence: Walkthrough agendas and recors of clasroom look fors

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

The 2019 Science Assessment shows the decline of 6 points from 2018-2019. The main barrier was the lack of time for Science instruction and application. Our 4th and 5th grade students will be able to fully master the standards by participating in hands on activities that connect the content. Our Media Center will be converted to a space for inquiry focused on the application of science standards. Students will have ongoing opportunities to engage in tasks utilizing robotics and aerospace.

Measurable Outcome:

The opportunities for 5th grade students to engage in application of Science standards through the use of robotics will increase from zero opportunities in 2019-2020 to eight week-long opportunities in 2020-2021, as measured by lesson plans and instructional walks from September 2020 to May 2021.

Evidence: Class schedules for Science and Media, Teacher Lesson Plans

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Meghan Davis (meghan.davis@indianriverschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Having been effectively implemented in many studies in the setting of technology-supported science education, the use of robotics in conjunction with the building of content knowledge has been the most successful way to encourage students to apply Science, Technology, Mathematics and other subjects using robotics.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

According to a study from NYU of 4th grade students using robotics in conjunction with classroom instruction in Science and Math content... "The evaluations showed students increased conceptual understanding of the subject content and enthusiasm towards utilizing robotics as a sense-making tool. Furthermore, the activity exposed students to real- world applications of mathematics outside of classroom. Such examples are important for students' development and connecting their minds to real-world applications of STEM at a young age." Our media specialist and Science/Math 4th and 5th grade teachers creating and implementing units of study to complement the use of robotics and instruction in content knowledge will allow for hands on and minds on opportunities.

Action Steps to Implement

Collaborative planning time for Media Specialist and 5th grade science teachers to plan together for the content knowledge, vocabulary, and expectations of application of the standards. Math coach also participates in planning.

Evidence: Walkthrough, lesson plans

Person Responsible

Elaine Ragley (elaine.ragley@indianriverschools.org)

Departmentalization to allow for teachers to become experts in science content and standards

Evidence: Science lesson plans, student data, schedule

Person Responsible

Meghan Davis (meghan.davis@indianriverschools.org)

Data chats for Science to identify areas of strengths and weaknesses for ongoing planning

Evidence: Unify assessment data,

Person Responsible

Kelly Good (kelly.good@indianriverschools.org)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

When disaggregating data, it is noted that our Black, Multi Racial, and Students With Disabilities currently fall below the 41% expectation in ESSSA.

Measurable Outcome:

The use of CRT strategies within the classroom will lead to a decrease in learning gaps among subgroups as well as an increase in achievement for all subgroups as measured through impact reviews from September 2020 through May 2021.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kelly Good (kelly.good@indianriverschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Need for increased culturally relevant instructional practices in tier 1 instructional frameworks. According to Brown University, "Culturally Responsive Teaching is a pedagogy that recognizes the importance of including students' cultural references in all aspects of learning". "In our multicultural society, culturally responsive teaching reflects democracy at its highest level. [It] means doing whatever it takes to ensure that every child is achieving and ever moving toward realizing her or his potential."

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

The use of CRT strategies allows for increased engagement and opportunities for all students to maximize their potential. As staff increases their pedagogy in the area of CRT more strategies will be utilized and thus will have a positive effect on student access to grade level content.

Action Steps to Implement

Training in culturally responsive instructional practices.

Evidence: Attendance and participation in training on CRT.

Person Responsible

Kelly Good (kelly.good@indianriverschools.org)

Collaborative planning includes planning for CRT practices.

Evidence: Lesson plans, walkthroughs

Person Responsible

Meghan Davis (meghan.davis@indianriverschools.org)

Create a schedule for walkthroughs for monitoring of the use of CRT strategies within all classrooms. This will take place twice each quarter.

Evidence: Schedule, student seating charts, student opportunities for response, differentiation, redirections, teacher/ parent communication

Person Responsible

Kelly Good (kelly.good@indianriverschools.org)

ELO opportunities extended first to students in the following subgroups: for SWD, Black, and Multi Racial. This includes Rising K and GEER grant ELO and A2 opportunities.

Evidence: Rosters for ELO, Invitations/parent contacts for offer of opportunity, parent conference summary forms

Person Responsible

Meghan Davis (meghan.davis@indianriverschools.org)

Data Chats include specific focus on the three identified subgroups, SWD, Black, Multi Racial Students. Next steps identified for support if students are not making expected progress.

Evidence: Agenda, Data for Tier 1, Tier 2

Person Responsible Kelly Good (kelly.good@indianriverschools.org)

#4. Other specifically relating to School Choice

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The area of focus is Science with an emphasis on aerospace and robotics. Based on the data from 2018-2020 students are not meeting the state average for Science. In addition our Math scores are not meeting the district or state averages in any area. We believe if we focus on providing grade level standards in the areas of math and science in the classroom setting while providing hands on real world problem solving using robotics with the media specialist supporting the classroom teachers then students will be engaged in purposeful learning.

Measurable Outcome: The State Science Assessment proficiency score will increase from 47% to 55%.
The State Math Assessment Learning Gains score for grade 5 will increase from 53% to 63%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kelly Good (kelly.good@indianriverschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: According to California State University, "Robotics offers many potential benefits to educators. Teachers feel rewarded because of the way students successfully use current knowledge to apply to their robotics assignments and projects. Wendy Wooten (2002) discussed how a good robotics program is rich in the everyday subject areas, encourages problem solving and critical thinking, and develops self-confidence for students."

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The media specialist started to use robotics in 2019 with 5th grade though was not planning with the science teacher. The students were engaged but the content was disjointed as the co planning was not taking place. This planning piece is now being added and the joint effort will bring about more application of standards/vocabulary usage in real world opportunities.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide time for collaboration in planning for content and real world tasks among 5th grade teacher, Math Coach, Media Specialist

Evidence: Collaborative Planning, Lesson plans, Science and math district assessments

Person Responsible Elaine Ragley (elaine.ragley@indianriverschools.org)

Facilitate data reviews biweekly when planning to identify the strengths and weaknesses in student's understanding and usage of skills/standards in the areas of math and science.

Evidence: Collaborative planning, lesson plans, walk throughs, science and math data

Person Responsible Elaine Ragley (elaine.ragley@indianriverschools.org)

Conduct quarterly walk-throughs with administration and coaches to monitor for implementation of planned science and math tasks to include grade level content and real world tasks.

Evidence: Walk-through data

Person Responsible Kelly Good (kelly.good@indianriverschools.org)

Expand teacher support in the areas of aerospace and robotics through training and modeling.

Evidence: Membership, Faculty Weekly Newsletter with links

Person Responsible Amy D'Albora (amy.d'albora@indianriverschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Attendance is monitored monthly through MTSS Individual Problem Solving Team. Teachers contact families when there have been 3 consecutive absences. The administration is then notified and contact the family or monitor for further absences if a health concern is documented. With the pandemic, more absences may occur this school year for students. Remote learning is an option.

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.

IRAcademy of Aerospace and Robotics has a diverse student population. All families are invited to attend and participate in our Title 1 family engagement nights where we teach parents about what students are doing in their classrooms and the expectations for end of the year. Our students are able to participate in clubs, such as the Audubon Club, where they are able to visit areas around the school to learn about nature with members of the Audubon Society. Our partner, the Indian River Club, is a group of volunteers that live close to the school building. They give their time to regularly upkeep our school landscaping, tutor, mentor, and donate materials students' need on a grand scale. Our staff work together to provide a safe, clean, and supportive environment for all of our students. Collaborative planning among teachers and coaches takes place weekly. Data reviews will happen weekly with administration and coaches. This will allow for a temperature check on instruction/response to instruction.

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				\$7,200.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	750-Other Personal Services	0221 - Indian River Academy	Title, I Part A		\$7,200.00
			<i>Notes: Substitutes for half day of planning lessons with a focus on implementation of differentiation strategies for each grade level team. Coaches will support this learning and planning. This will take place in November, February, and April.</i>			

2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity				\$10,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5000	100-Salaries	0221 - Indian River Academy	Title, I Part A		\$8,000.00
			<i>Notes: We will offer Extended Learning Opportunities to students in grades 3-5 afterschool in the areas of Math and ELA</i>			
	5100	510-Supplies	0221 - Indian River Academy	Title, I Part A		\$2,000.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: School Choice				\$0.00
					Total:	\$17,200.00