
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	12
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Fellsmere Elementary School

50 N CYPRESS ST, Fellsmere, FL 32948

www.indianriverschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Ramon Echeverria J

Start Date for this Principal: 7/28/2010

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 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 Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (57%) 2020-21: (46%) 2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (53%)
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 was approved by the Indian River County School Board on 10/24/2022.

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.

We exist to empower globally competent learners while bridging cultures, languages, and academics.

Provide the school's vision statement.:

As educators, we strive to create an environment that engages students in challenging curriculum, resulting in high levels of achievement.

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Echeverria, Ramon	Principal	
Justice, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	
Essig, Paula	Math Coach	
Mowery , Jessica	Reading Coach	
Digiacomio, Meghan	Reading Coach	
Robertson, Meaghan	Science Coach	
Arce, Annie	Guidance Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/28/2010, Ramon Echeverria J

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

3

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

14

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

46

Total number of students enrolled at the school

593

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.

5

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

2

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	90	104	111	88	76	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	552
Attendance below 90 percent	14	27	47	22	17	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	13	19	41	38	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	150

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	2	5	11	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	6	7	7	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
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

Monday 10/10/2022

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	92	104	84	84	82	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	551
Attendance below 90 percent	0	34	44	28	30	23	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	187
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	22	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	19	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	10	20	18	22	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	3	10	17	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	2	8	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	95	105	85	86	80	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	560
Attendance below 90 percent	10	24	16	17	16	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	104
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	21	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	5	19	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	8	21	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	9	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	8	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
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 Review

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	48%	58%	56%	42%			41%	58%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	62%	61%	45%			46%	57%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	57%	55%	52%	55%			50%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	54%	61%	60%	44%			57%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	69%	60%	64%	54%			67%	60%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	76%	54%	55%	43%			63%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	45%	51%	51%	40%			37%	54%	53%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	45%	60%	-15%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	45%	61%	-16%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	30%	54%	-24%	56%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	51%	64%	-13%	62%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	63%	64%	-1%	64%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2022					
	2019	53%	57%	-4%	60%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	35%	53%	-18%	53%	-18%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	13	60	75	39	54		9				
ELL	41	53	61	49	68	72	29				
HSP	47	53	59	55	71	79	44				
WHT	68	57		52	64		50				
FRL	48	53	57	54	69	76	45				

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	10	29		18	32	36					
ELL	39	42	56	40	56	53	37				
HSP	42	43	56	44	54	56	36				
WHT	49	73		54	64						
FRL	42	45	55	44	54	43	40				
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	12	38	50	25	63	65	5				
ELL	37	45	52	55	67	68	30				
HSP	40	46	49	58	68	64	37				
WHT	45	40		55	60						
FRL	41	46	50	57	67	63	37				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
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	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	457
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
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	54
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	58
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	57
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Trends: Based on the 2021/2022 FSA assessment data, there was an increase in all areas from 2020/2021 to 2021/2022. Fellsmere was below the state average in all areas of proficiency based on the 2021/2022 FSA data.

Subgroups: Fellsmere Elementary does not currently have any ESSA subgroups.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The greatest area of improvement is proficiency. The state average for 3-5 ELA proficiency was a 55%. We were at 48% proficient. The state average for 3-5 math proficiency was a 57%. We were at 54% proficient. The state average for 5th grade science proficiency was a 48%. We were at 45% proficient. Therefore, we were below the state average in all areas of proficiency.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Contributing Factor: 40.7% of the population as Fellsmere Elementary is classified as English Language Learners. 41% of our ELL students were proficient in ELA. 49% of our ELL students were proficient in math. 29% of our ELL students were proficient in science.

Actions: If 70% of classes show evidence of Monitoring for Understanding, then proficiency for our ELL students will increase from 41% to 55% or higher in ELA, from 49% to 65% or higher in math, and from 29% to 45% or higher in science.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

The data components that showed the most improvement from 2020/2021 to 2021/2022 were math achievement, math learning gains, and math bottom quartile. Our math proficiency increased from 44% in 2020/2021 to 54% in 2021/2022. Our math learning gains increased from 54% in 2020/2021 to 69% in 2021/2022. Our math bottom quartile increased from 43% in 2020/2021 to 76% in 2021/2022.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The contributing factors for this improvement were after school super star camp, math lab during special areas, and morning tutoring.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

We will implement a focus on attendance by distributing the attendance policy and sending school messenger calls to remind/celebrate attendance. We will post it on Facebook and the school marquee. We will have attendance celebrations. Additionally, our school improvement plan goal focuses on the high yield strategy of "Monitoring for Understanding." 70% of classrooms will show evidence of monitoring for understanding.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

A school PD with a focus on "Monitoring for Understanding" will take place on our school PD day. We will proactively plan for "Monitoring for Understanding" during our collaborative planning sessions. We will provide individualized coaching cycles with a focus on monitoring to support teachers in putting PD into practice.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Attendance will be monitored daily using Focus and weekly using the Power Bi app and analyzing "Average Daily Attendance." Monitoring for Understanding will be monitored using the impact review tool. Using the "Impact Review Collection Tool" we will collect feedback weekly and provide feedback to teachers in real time (within 48 hours). Additionally, we will analyze data trends on Power Bi.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Based on the 2021/2022 FSA data, our greatest area of improvement is proficiency. The state average for 3-5 ELA proficiency was a 55%. We were at 48% proficient. The state average for 3-5 math proficiency was a 57%. We were at 54% proficient. The state average for 5th grade science proficiency was a 48%. We were at 45% proficient. Therefore, we were below the state average in all areas of proficiency.

Math: 23 out of 159 students were in the 2.0 and 16 out of 159 students were in the 2.5 Achievement Bucket.
 ELA: 16 out of 159 students were in the 2.0 and 24 out of 159 students were in the 2.5 Achievement Bucket

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

If 70% of classes show evidence of Monitoring for Understanding, then proficiency will increase from 48% to 55% or greater in ELA and from 54% to 65% or greater in Math.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Using the Impact Review Collection Tool (Digital Form) we will collect feedback weekly. We'll provide feedback to teacher(s) in real time and/or within 48 hours in order to produce the necessary instructional tweaks to get better in this strategy.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ramon Echeverria (ramon.echeverria@indianriverschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

The use of formative assessment has 2 components. First, it tells the student where they are in their understanding. It is designed with questions that are asked during a lesson that give students an opportunity to gauge their own understanding. Second, the formative assessment gives valuable feedback during a lesson. Changes can be made to adapt instruction to meet the needs of the students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

The school leadership team reflected on previous impact review data from 2021/2022 on the implementation of high yield strategies. It was determined that our school would benefit from a focus on monitoring for understanding.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

- 1.) Students have been identified in 3-5 that scored 2.0-2.5. These students have been invited and will attend that Pro Camp (an after-school camp).
- 2.) Charts have been created with the names of students. This chart is referenced in all coaching and data meetings, to ensure that we are closely monitoring this specific group of students. The leadership team will be able to physically identify the targeted population within the classroom setting.
- 3.) Using the Impact Review Collection Tool (Digital Form) we'll continue to collect classroom data weekly. We'll provide feedback to teacher(s) in real time and/or within 48 hours to produce the necessary instructional tweaks to get better in this strategy.
- 4.) October 31, 2022 PD geared towards Monitoring for Understanding
- 5.) Weekly collaborative planning done with academic coaches/admin with a focus on monitoring strategies, and a strategy to help students monitor their own learning.

Person Responsible Ramon Echeverria (ramon.echeverria@indianriverschools.org)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Attendance

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Average Daily Attendance (ADA) was 92% for K-5 for the 2021-22 school year. Student attendance has a direct impact on instruction and the proficiency of our students.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	Goal: Increase Average Daily Attendance from 92% to 95% or higher in all grade levels.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	FES will monitor average daily attendance by looking at Focus daily and Power Bi weekly.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ramon Echeverria (ramon.echeverria@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Relationships
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Students are more likely to come to school if they have a relationship with a trusted adult and their peers.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

- 1.) Distribute the attendance policy
- 2.) Send school messenger calls to remind/celebrate attendance.
- 3.) We will post it on Facebook and the school marquee.
- 4.) We will have attendance celebrations.
- 5.) Attendance Proactive Letter (SM, FOCUS Messenger, FES PTA, FES FB, Marquee) to persuade parents to have students make use of the holiday break (18 days).

Person Responsible Annie Arce (annie.arce@indianriverschools.org)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Family Engagement

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale:

Families are not signed up or using the FOCUS platform and other online platforms in SDIRC. Technology and the understanding of these platforms are a barrier in the community that we serve at FES. If FES doesn't grow the technological capacity of its families, FES community will lack the connectivity not only now but also in the future as students and families move to different levels of education at the district.

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Goal: To connect/expose a minimum of 15 new families to any technology platforms used within SDIRC. For example: FOCUS, electronic lunch applications, PBIS Rewards, FES Facebook, and FES PTA Facebook. This goal will be ongoing throughout the school year.

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

- 1.) Print usage report from PBIS Rewards App showing participation from the community.
- 2.) Monitor each technology platform usage log monthly. FES FB: FOCUS: Mrs. Marsiglia PTA FES FB: Brenda B.
- 3.) Monitor appointments log.
- 4.) Pull a FOCUS Data Report of the updated verified parent account.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ramon Echeverria (ramon.echeverria@indianriverschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Connections (networks): Parents must be able to use digital platforms to connect to the school district in order to stay informed.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Technology and the understanding of these platforms are a barrier in the community that we serve at FES. If FES doesn't grow the technological capacity of its families, FES community will lack the connectivity not only now but also in the future as students and families move to different levels of education at the district

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

- 1.) A parent night will be created to show parents PBIS Rewards APP.
- 2.) School Messenger is used to promote the different technology platforms.
- 3.) Mustang Newsletter will display contact information to set up individual appointments.
- 4.) FACES (Family and Community Engagement Series)

5.) Currently we have 151 parents with no FOCUS account. FES will make 5 phone calls out of 151 a week.

Person Responsible Ramon Echeverria (ramon.echeverria@indianriverschools.org)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Area of Focus: Monitoring for Understanding

Description: The use of formative assessment has 2 components. First, it tells the student where they are in

their understanding. It is designed with questions that are asked during a lesson that give students an opportunity to gauge their own understanding. Second, the formative assessment gives valuable feedback during a lesson. Changes can be made to adapt instruction to meet the needs of the students.

Rationale: School wide, we are scoring below the state average in reading proficiency.

Goal: If 70% of classes show evidence of Monitoring for Understanding, then proficiency will increase.

Data:

Kinder: 41% below proficiency on iReady end of year Reading diagnostic

1st Grade: 66% below proficiency on iReady end of year Reading diagnostic

2nd Grade: 69% below proficiency on iReady end of year Reading diagnostic

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Area of Focus: Monitoring for Understanding

Description: The use of formative assessment has 2 components. First, it tells the student where they are in

their understanding. It is designed with questions that are asked during a lesson that give students an opportunity to gauge their own understanding. Second, the formative assessment gives

valuable feedback during a lesson. Changes can be made to adapt instruction to meet the needs of the students.

Rationale: School wide, we are scoring below the state average in proficiency.

Goal: If 70% of classes show evidence of Monitoring for Understanding, then reading proficiency will increase.

Data:

3rd Grade: 48% below a level 3 on 2021/2022 Reading FSA

4th Grade: 51% below a level 3 on 2021/2022 Reading FSA

5th Grade: 54% below proficient on 2021/2022 Reading FSA

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

If 70% of classes show evidence of Monitoring for Understanding, then proficiency will increase from 41% to 50%.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Goal: If 70% of classes show evidence of Monitoring for Understanding, then proficiency will increase from 48% to 55% or greater in ELA

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Using the Impact Review Collection Tool (Digital Form) we'll continue to collect classroom data weekly. We'll provide feedback to teacher(s) in real time and/or within 48 hours to produce the necessary instructional tweaks to get better in this strategy.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Justice, Jennifer, jennifer.justice@indianriverschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

- 1.) Weekly Collaborative Planning with a focus on monitoring for understanding
- 2.) October 31, 2022 PD geared towards Monitoring for Understanding
- 3.) Individualized coaching cycles to support teachers in putting PD to practice.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Weekly collaborative planning sessions allow us to proactively plan for and embed strategies to monitor for understanding. The professional development will provide teachers with new strategies. The coaching cycles will ensure that teachers have the necessary support to effectively implement these strategies.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
<p>Students have been identified in 3-5 that scored 2.0-2.5. These students have been invited and will attend after school camp. Charts have been created with the names of students. This chart is referenced in all coaching and data meetings, to ensure that we are closely monitoring this specific group of students. The leadership team will be able to physically identify the targeted population within the classroom setting.</p>	<p>Digiacomio, Meghan, meghan.gregoire@indianriverschools.org</p>
<p>Using the Impact Review Collection Tool, we'll continue to collect classroom data weekly. We'll provide feedback to teacher(s) in real time and/or within 48 hours to produce the necessary instructional tweaks.</p>	<p>Echeverria, Ramon, ramon.echeverria@indianriverschools.org</p>
<p>October 31, 2022 PD geared towards Monitoring for Understanding</p>	<p>Garcia, Kimberly, kimberly.garcia@indianriverschools.org</p>
<p>Weekly collaborative planning done with academic coaches/admin with a focus on monitoring strategies, and a strategy to help students monitor their own learning.</p>	<p>Digiacomio, Meghan, meghan.gregoire@indianriverschools.org</p>
<p>Individualized coaching cycles to support teachers in putting PD to practice.</p>	<p>Digiacomio, Meghan, meghan.gregoire@indianriverschools.org</p>