School District of Indian River County

# Pelican Island 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

# Pelican Island Elementary School

1355 SCHUMANN DR, Sebastian, FL 32958

www.indianriverschools.org

**Demographics**

## Principal: Felice Heppern

Start Date for this Principal: 8/19/2019

| | |
|---|---|
| **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) | 56% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented** (subgroups with 10 or more students) (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>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: C (48%)<br>2017-18: C (46%)<br>2016-17: C (47%)<br>2015-16: C (46%) |
| **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.**

Mission: inspire Pelicans to SOAR to success

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Vision: empower our Pelicans to make every day Earth Day, positively impacting our school, our community, and our world

## 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 |
|---|---|---|
| Moree, Rachel | Principal | |
| Keen, Jeramy | Assistant Principal | |
| houston, jody | Instructional Coach | K-3 Interventionist |
| Willems, Josie | Instructional Coach | Literacy Coach |
| Whelan, Kelsey | Instructional Coach | Math Coach |
| DeAquair, Rebecca | Guidance Counselor | School Counselor |
| Lee, Bryan | Teacher, K-12 | Runs Mentor Program |

## Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Monday 8/19/2019, Felice Heppern

**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.*
6

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**
25

### Demographic Data

| | |
|---|---|
| **2020-21 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>PK-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) | 56% |
| **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>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: C (48%)<br>2017-18: C (46%)<br>2016-17: C (47%)<br>2015-16: C (46%) |
| **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 | 43 | 45 | 54 | 52 | 63 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 311 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 10 | 3 | 4 | 9 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 2 | 0 | 2 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |

**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 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| 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**

Sunday 9/13/2020

**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 | 40 | 45 | 57 | 71 | 48 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 316 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 8 | 9 | 21 | 14 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 |

**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 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |

**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 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

**Prior Year - Updated**

**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 40 | 45 | 57 | 71 | 48 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 316 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 8 | 9 | 21 | 14 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 |

**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 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |

**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 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

**School Data**
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

| School Grade Component | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 47% | 58% | 57% | 46% | 54% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 54% | 57% | 58% | 57% | 53% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 65% | 54% | 53% | 63% | 52% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 48% | 63% | 63% | 48% | 60% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 44% | 60% | 62% | 46% | 62% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 37% | 48% | 51% | 36% | 51% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 40% | 54% | 53% | 30% | 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 | 53% | 60% | -7% | 58% | -5% |
| | 2018 | 46% | 56% | -10% | 57% | -11% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 46% | 61% | -15% | 58% | -12% |
| | 2018 | 37% | 56% | -19% | 56% | -19% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 9% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 42% | 54% | -12% | 56% | -14% |
| | 2018 | 52% | 52% | 0% | 55% | -3% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -10% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 5% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 59% | 64% | -5% | 62% | -3% |
| | 2018 | 46% | 60% | -14% | 62% | -16% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 13% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 49% | 64% | -15% | 64% | -15% |
| | 2018 | 42% | 63% | -21% | 62% | -20% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 32% | 57% | -25% | 60% | -28% |
| | 2018 | 48% | 58% | -10% | 61% | -13% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -16% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -10% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 39% | 53% | -14% | 53% | -14% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2018 | 44% | 54% | -10% | 55% | -11% |
| 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 | 21 | 51 | 63 | 30 | 41 | 40 | 22 | | | | |
| BLK | 16 | 26 | 50 | 20 | 23 | 27 | 22 | | | | |
| HSP | 59 | 80 | | 35 | 38 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 61 | 64 | 65 | 65 | 57 | 50 | 49 | | | | |
| FRL | 41 | 52 | 63 | 42 | 45 | 37 | 39 | | | | |

| 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 | 37 | 35 | 23 | 34 | 44 | | | | | |
| BLK | 23 | 35 | 42 | 32 | 47 | 43 | | | | | |
| HSP | 50 | 55 | | 42 | 18 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 55 | 49 | 43 | 52 | 49 | 50 | 62 | | | | |
| FRL | 41 | 42 | 41 | 45 | 46 | 41 | 45 | | | | |

| 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 | 11 | 62 | 60 | 11 | 23 | 35 | 8 | | | | |
| BLK | 24 | 53 | 62 | 33 | 48 | 46 | 11 | | | | |
| HSP | 41 | 38 | | 50 | 47 | | 27 | | | | |
| MUL | 50 | 62 | | 50 | 62 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 55 | 63 | 77 | 53 | 40 | 38 | 42 | | | | |
| FRL | 41 | 58 | 63 | 42 | 45 | 35 | 26 | | | | |

## 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 | 48 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 335 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |

## Subgroup Data

| Students With Disabilities | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 38 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| English Language Learners | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Asian Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Asian Students | |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Black/African American Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 26 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 1 |

| Hispanic Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 53 |
| 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 | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| 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 | 59 |
| 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.**

Our learning gains in math for our bottom quartile was our lowest performing area in 2019 (only 37% of our bottom quartile students made a learning gain). In 2018, 45% of our bottom quartile students made a learning gain in math (8% decrease). In addition, our African American students and students with disabilities are performing below 41%. In 2020, 25% of our students in grades K-5 met their typical growth on the winter iReady diagnostic. An increase in our ESE population without proper resources in place to support our staff is one possible contributing factor.

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

Science proficiency showed the greatest decline from the prior year with only 40% of our students demonstrating proficiency in 2019. Only 50% of our students were proficient in 2018. This is a 10% decline. There was no designated science instruction in every grade level, which is one potential contributing factor. Pelican Island Elementary had a weighted average of 71% on district science unit assessments for 3rd and 4th grade in the 19-20 school year. 2019 was also the year the district implemented our newly adopted science curriculum. Additionally, professional development and training was not adequately implemented and could be another contributing factor.

**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 greatest gap when compared to the state was our math learning gains. In 2019, 44% of our students made learning gains, when compared to the state's average of 62%. One possible contributing factor to the 18% difference could have been the large increase in our ESE population without proper resources in place to support our staff.

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

The data component showing the most improvement was our ELA bottom quartile, with 65% of our students making learning gains in 2019. This was a 22% increase from only 43% of our bottom quartile students making learning gains in 2018. In 2020, 47% of students in grades 3-5 met their typical growth on the winter iReady diagnostic. New actions our school took included a focus on small targeted groups, RtI using Phonics for Reading, and incorporating data monitoring and goal setting with the students.

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

According to our EWS data, one area of concern is the number of students scoring level 1 on the state assessments. An additional area of concern is the number of students with attendance below 90%.

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

1. Increase proficiency across all areas (ELA, Math, and Science) through improving tier 1 instruction
2. Increase achievement for students with disabilities and African American students
3. Culture and climate
4. School-wide focus on environmental science

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

| #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Data-driven, differentiated and multi-tiered ELA instruction is our area of focus at PIE.<br><br>Using ELA data to drive instruction, the core instructional program is aligned to Florida ELA standards through weekly grade level meetings, professional development, monthly data chats, and weekly collaborative ELA planning. ELA pacing guides and test item specifications are utilized to align standards-based instruction, reteach and fidelity of reading instruction. The weekly collaborative planning meetings with coaches present will have a focus on differentiation (specifically targeting small group instruction initially), based on formative assessment results. This will also help increase the achievement of our students with disabilities and African American students. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Our area of focus is differentiation, and it will be observed through school-wide walk-throughs by the leadership team monthly.<br>1st Quarter: 50% evident<br>2nd Quarter: 60% evident<br>3rd Quarter: 75% evident<br>4th Quarter: 90% evident<br>Another measurable outcome is our predicted proficiency rate, using unit assessment scores of at least 60%, reviewed monthly with individual teachers and grade levels, and quarterly as a school. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Rachel Moree (rachel.moree@indianriverschools.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | The Tier 1 Reading instruction taking place at PIE will focus on differentiation using the district's core curriculum. Differentiation will be an intentional focus during planning, both for small group instruction, and utilizing the strategies from our school-wide "Visible Learning" PD/book study for whole group instruction. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Walk-through data and current lesson plans reveal that differentiation is almost non-evident at PIE. Hattie, Fisher, & Frey's (2017) meta-analyses of effect sizes of various strategies reveals classroom discussion (0.82), teaching strategies (0.62), direct instruction (0.60), and professional development (0.51) provide effective means for improving achievement. By implementing research-based practices as a school with an intentional focus on differentiation, achievement and proficiency scores should increase. |

**Action Steps to Implement**

Hold initial data meeting to review previous year's data and fall iReady data, and then have a data meeting after each unit test, diagnostic, or DIBELs assessment to drive instruction for all students. Data meetings will also include a focus on expected goals for predicted proficiency and learning gains for all students, reviewing unit assessments, FSA, iReady and formative assessments.

**Person Responsible** Rachel Moree (rachel.moree@indianriverschools.org)

"Visible Learning" PLC/Book Study (Mathematics, Literacy, Science, or Learning depending on content areas) to grow as educators and differentiate whole group instruction

**Person Responsible** Rachel Moree (rachel.moree@indianriverschools.org)

Oversee weekly collaborative planning with academic coaches and/or administration

**Person Responsible** Josie Willems (josephine.willems@indianriverschools.org)

Implement coaching cycle for all ELA teachers, using the ELA coach to help with differentiation or anything else to increase pedagogy of all teachers throughout the year

**Person Responsible** Josie Willems (josephine.willems@indianriverschools.org)

Initiate Tier 2 instruction for all students to remediate or enrich, based on data. Initial groups are formed after the fall diagnostic assessment and then adjusted every 6-8 weeks, based on additional data.

**Person Responsible** Rachel Moree (rachel.moree@indianriverschools.org)

Create 4-hour collaborative planning sessions quarterly with teachers and the coaches to bridge the gap and improve differentiation, helping all student achieve success.

**Person Responsible** Rachel Moree (rachel.moree@indianriverschools.org)

Conduct walk-throughs to ensure the fidelity of differentiated standards-based instruction.

**Person Responsible** Rachel Moree (rachel.moree@indianriverschools.org)

| #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Data-driven, differentiated and multi-tiered Math instruction is our area of focus at PIE. Using Math data to drive instruction, the core instructional program is aligned to Florida Math standards through weekly grade level meetings, professional development, monthly data chats, and weekly collaborative Math planning. Math pacing guides and test item specifications are utilized to align standards-based instruction, reteach and fidelity of reading instruction. The weekly collaborative planning meetings with coaches present will have a focus on differentiation (specifically targeting small group instruction initially), based on formative assessment results. This will also help increase the achievement of our students with disabilities and African American students. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Our area of focus is differentiation, and it will be observed through school-wide walk-throughs by the leadership team monthly.<br>1st Quarter: 50% evident<br>2nd Quarter: 60% evident<br>3rd Quarter: 75% evident<br>4th Quarter: 90% evident<br>Another measurable outcome is our predicted proficiency rate, using unit assessment scores of at least 60%, reviewed monthly with individual teachers and grade levels, and quarterly as a school. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Rachel Moree (rachel.moree@indianriverschools.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | The Tier 1 Math instruction taking place at PIE will focus on differentiation using the district's core curriculum. Differentiation will be an intentional focus during planning, both for small group instruction, and utilizing the strategies from our school-wide "Visible Learning" PD/book study for whole group instruction. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Walk-through data and current lesson plans reveal that differentiation is almost non-evident at PIE. Hattie, Fisher, & Frey's (2017) meta-analyses of effect sizes of various strategies reveals classroom discussion (0.82), teaching strategies (0.62), direct instruction (0.60), and professional development (0.51) provide effective means for improving achievement. By implementing research-based practices as a school with an intentional focus on differentiation, achievement and proficiency scores should increase. |

| Action Steps to Implement | |
|---|---|
| Hold initial data meeting to review previous year's data and fall iReady data, and then have a data meeting after each unit test or diagnostic to drive instruction for all students. Data meetings will also include a focus on expected goals for predicted proficiency and learning gains for all students, reviewing unit assessments, FSA, iReady, and formative assessments. | |
| **Person Responsible** | Rachel Moree (rachel.moree@indianriverschools.org) |
| "Visible Learning" PLC/Book Study (Mathematics, Literacy, Science, or Learning depending on content areas) to grow as educators and differentiate instruction | |
| **Person Responsible** | Rachel Moree (rachel.moree@indianriverschools.org) |
| Oversee weekly collaborative planning with academic coaches and/or administration. | |
| **Person Responsible** | Kelsey Whelan (kelsey.whelan@indianriverschools.org) |

Implement coaching cycle for all Math teachers, using the Math coach to help with differentiation or anything else to increase pedagogy of all teachers throughout the year.

**Person Responsible** Kelsey Whelan (kelsey.whelan@indianriverschools.org)

Create 4-hour collaborative planning sessions quarterly with teachers and the coaches to bridge the gap and improve differentiation, helping all student achieve success.

**Person Responsible** Rachel Moree (rachel.moree@indianriverschools.org)

Conduct walk-throughs to ensure the fidelity of differentiated standards-based instruction.

**Person Responsible** Rachel Moree (rachel.moree@indianriverschools.org)

| #3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | During the 2019-2020 school year, of the 53 office discipline referrals (through March 13), 62% of the referrals were assigned to African American students, while only 20% of our student population is African American.<br><br>Because of this, PIE will be focusing on cultural responsiveness. "Cultural responsiveness is not a practice; it's what informs our practice so we can make better teaching choices for eliciting, engaging, motivating, supporting, and expanding the intellectual capacity of ALL our students (Hammond, 2015). This will help not only reduce ODRs, but also improve academics for our students. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Quantitative discipline data will be collected. Our goal is to decrease our ODRs for African American students to less than 40% of our total number by mid-March 2021. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Jeramy Keen (jeramy.keen@indianriverschools.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Implementation of culturally responsive teaching practices and Positive Behavior Interventions and Supports to promote authentic engagement and rigor among diverse students (Hammond) will be utilized to support our area of focus. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Positive culture and climate strategies, as well as school wide PBIS, have shown to support student learning (Eyler, 2014; Fitzgerald, Geraci, & Swanson, 2014; Kocyigit, 2017; Mac Neil, Prater, & Busch, 2009; Netzel &<br>Eber, 2003; Raappana, 2014).<br><br>PBIS has shown a decrease in our number of referrals over the past two year, and based on this year's data we became a bronze level PBIS Model school. |

| Action Steps to Implement | |
|---|---|
| "Culturally Responsive Teaching and the Brain" school-wide Professional Development through a PLC | |
| **Person Responsible** | Jeramy Keen (jeramy.keen@indianriverschools.org) |
| Create a mentoring program for African American males | |
| **Person Responsible** | Bryan Lee (bryan.lee@indianriverschools.org) |
| Create a weekly newsletter for staff with strategies to engage and support African American students | |
| **Person Responsible** | Rachel Moree (rachel.moree@indianriverschools.org) |
| Conduct weekly calls home to parents for positive office referrals | |
| **Person Responsible** | Rachel Moree (rachel.moree@indianriverschools.org) |
| Generate PIE MVP tickets for staff and Dojo points for students to be used at the PBIS store and for the staff raffle | |
| **Person Responsible** | Rachel Moree (rachel.moree@indianriverschools.org) |

Execute PBIS school-wide. Host monthly meetings to discuss the data related to decreasing referrals, improving attendance, positive rewards, and interventions that the whole school supports. This research-based program has shown a decrease in our ODRs for the last 2 years.

**Person Responsible** Rebecca DeAquair (rebecca.deaquair@indianriverschools.org)

| #4. Other specifically relating to Environmental Science | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | During the 19-20 school year, Pelican Island Elementary refocused our efforts and branded ourselves “A School of Environmental Science.” For this reason, we will be focusing on science instruction, with an emphasis on classroom discussion/discourse.<br><br>“With the ever-increasing complexity in the scientific world, providing a strong foundation through a conceptual understanding of scientific processes, crosscutting concepts, and disciplinary core ideas is essential to supporting learners’ progression toward increasing levels of sophistication and application to innovative contexts and problems.” (Hattie, Fisher, Frey, & Almarode, 2018) |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Our area of focus is student classroom discussion/discourse (accountable talk) related to environmental science, and it will be observed through school-wide walk-throughs in the Science blocks by the leadership team monthly.<br>1st Quarter: 50% evident<br>2nd Quarter: 60% evident<br>3rd Quarter: 75% evident<br>4th Quarter: 90% evident<br><br>Another measurable outcome is our predicted proficiency rate, using unit assessment scores of at least 60%, reviewed monthly with individual teachers and grade levels, and quarterly as a school.<br><br>Another measurable outcome emphasizing environmental science will be to increase student achievement in nature of science from 6/10 to 8/10 and in life science 9/14 to 12/14 on the 2021 FSSA. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Jeramy Keen (jeramy.keen@indianriverschools.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | The Tier 1 Science instruction taking place at PIE will focus on student classroom discussion/discourse using the district's core curriculum. Student led learning will be an intentional focus during planning, both for small group instruction, and utilizing the strategies from our school-wide "Visible Learning for Science" PD/book study for whole group instruction. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Walk-through data and current lesson plans reveal that student based classroom discussion/discourse in the Science block is almost non-evident at PIE. Hattie, Fisher, & Frey’s (2017) meta-analyses of effect sizes of various strategies reveals classroom discussion, discourse (0.82), teaching strategies (0.62), direct instruction (0.60), and professional development (0.51) provide effective means for improving achievement. By implementing research-based practices as a school with an intentional focus on differentiation, achievement and proficiency scores should increase. |

| Action Steps to Implement | |
|---|---|
| Develop school-wide environmental science units (one per semester) for all students K-5 with administrative walk-throughs for fidelity of implementation and alignment | |
| **Person Responsible** | Jeramy Keen (jeramy.keen@indianriverschools.org) |
| Hold initial data meeting to review previous year's data and then have a data meeting after each unit test to drive instruction for all students. Data meetings will also include a focus environmental science and the | |

alignment of expected goals for predicted proficiency for all students, reviewing unit assessments, FSA, and formative assessments.

**Person Responsible** Jeramy Keen (jeramy.keen@indianriverschools.org)

"Visible Learning" school-wide PLC/Book Study (Mathematics, Literacy, Science, or Learning depending on content areas) to grow as educators and differentiate instruction.

**Person Responsible** Jeramy Keen (jeramy.keen@indianriverschools.org)

Conduct weekly walk-throughs in the Science blocks to ensure the fidelity of the implementation of student-led learning (i.e. student discussion, discourse, and accountable talk)

**Person Responsible** Jeramy Keen (jeramy.keen@indianriverschools.org)

Oversee weekly collaborative planning with academic coaches and/or administration.

**Person Responsible** Jeramy Keen (jeramy.keen@indianriverschools.org)

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

**Attendance has changed this year with the pandemic, and thus we need to be cognizant of reasons students are out of school. There is a process in place for teachers to call home if a student is absent for more than 3 consecutive days (this will resume after COVID-19), and the next step is for administration to call. At 10 absences, a note from the school is sent home. If the absences continue, the district attendance officer is contacted to create an attendance contract with the family involved.**

## 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.

Pelican Island 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.

**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: ELA** | | | | **$12,000.00** |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | 5100 | 100-Salaries | 0121 - Pelican Island Elementary School | | | $5,000.00 |
| | | | *Notes: salaries for teachers who will run before- or after-school tutoring, remediation, or enrichment (for ELA and Math areas of focus)* | | | |
| | 5100 | 750-Other Personal Services | 0121 - Pelican Island Elementary School | | | $5,000.00 |
| | | | *Notes: substitutes needed for collaborative planning and professional development (for ELA and Math areas of focus)* | | | |
| | 5100 | 510-Supplies | 0121 - Pelican Island Elementary School | | | $2,000.00 |
| | | | *Notes: materials needed to differentiate instruction (ex. "Visible Learning" books (for ELA and Math areas of focus)* | | | |
| **2** | **III.A.** | **Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math** | | | | **$0.00** |
| **3** | **III.A.** | **Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity** | | | | **$6,500.00** |
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2020-21 |
| | 5100 | 510-Supplies | 0121 - Pelican Island Elementary School | | | $1,500.00 |
| | | | *Notes: materials needed to support culturally responsive practices (ex. "Culturally Responsive Teaching and the Brain" books)* | | | |
| | 5100 | 750-Other Personal Services | 0121 - Pelican Island Elementary School | | | $5,000.00 |
| | | | *Notes: Substitutes needed for professional development* | | | |
| **4** | **III.A.** | **Areas of Focus: Other: Environmental Science** | | | | **$0.00** |
| | | | | | **Total:** | **$18,500.00** |