

School District of Indian River County

Indian River Academy



2022-23 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	12
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Indian River Academy

500 20TH ST SW, Vero Beach, FL 32962

www.indianriverschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Christine Good

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	71%
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 Black/African American Students Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (60%) 2020-21: (55%) 2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan 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.

To inspire and educate all students to become tomorrow's leaders.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To create a caring community of students, parents, and school staff working together to ensure all students reach their full potential.

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
Good, Kelly	Principal	
Norwood, Jayde	Assistant Principal	
Brown, Rebecca	Instructional Coach	
Durwin, Brenda	Instructional Coach	
Ragley, Elaine	Instructional Coach	
Laverack, Dayna	Guidance Counselor	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Christine Good

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.*

1

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.*

18

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

35

Total number of students enrolled at the school

422

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

6

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	68	74	68	62	64	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	410
Attendance below 90 percent	6	25	23	15	19	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	102
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	4	15	18	14	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62

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	0	3	12	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33

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	3	4	2	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 10/21/2022

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	79	63	63	67	62	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	406
Attendance below 90 percent	31	22	21	22	14	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	137
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	4	10	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	10	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	8	9	12	10	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	2	11	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	5	7	5	5	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	78	67	60	72	66	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	411
Attendance below 90 percent	9	19	13	19	13	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	9	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	9	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	8	9	12	10	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
	0	0	0	4	9	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	12	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	4	6	3	5	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	50%	58%	56%	51%			54%	58%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	62%	61%	59%			53%	57%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	55%	52%	59%			31%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	63%	61%	60%	53%			53%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	74%	60%	64%	62%			53%	60%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	68%	54%	55%	45%			35%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	57%	51%	51%	57%			47%	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	51%	60%	-9%	58%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	56%	61%	-5%	58%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2022					
	2019	44%	54%	-10%	56%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

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	43%	64%	-21%	62%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	54%	64%	-10%	64%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2022					
	2019	55%	57%	-2%	60%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	45%	53%	-8%	53%	-8%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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	18	46	56	26	62	73	29				
ELL	31	60	62	46	67	54	36				
BLK	32	41	27	49	67	57	40				
HSP	45	61	56	57	75	69	50				
WHT	64	67		74	77		69				
FRL	46	57	48	61	77	77	48				
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	15	33	40	29	40	36	17				
ELL	37	69		46	62		55				
BLK	40	56		38	56		35				
HSP	46	71		51	42		55				
MUL	50			57							
WHT	64	50		67	80		76				
FRL	49	55	50	50	57	44	52				
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				

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	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	67
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	484
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

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

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
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	53
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	45
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	60
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	70
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	60
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?

ELA achievement is the only area that has shown regression over the last three years. There are no ESSA groups below 41%. When filtered out for only ELA achievement, the following percentages are evidence:

- Black Students- 32%
- ESE- 21%
- ELL- 31%

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

As a leadership team we looked at the following data components:

- FAST Progress Monitoring fall of 2022
- 2022 FSA ELA
- iReady beginning of year diagnostic scores

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

The contributing factor to this need for improvement was a large number of students entering school from virtual learning and so we had a significant number of students currently working below grade level in reading specifically. When ESSA is filtered out for subject area there is a discrepancy between reading and math specifically in three subgroups of ESE, ELL and black students. On assessments students scored much lower in reading than in math. In order to address this need for improvement, teachers, coaches and administration collaboratively plan for standards aligned instruction weekly (with a focus on ELA), so that achievement will increase for all students.

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

The most improvement was seen in math achievement FSA scores with an increase of 10% from 2019-2022. There was also a 21% increase in math learning gains from 2019-2022 and a 33% increase in our lowest 25th percentile from 2019-2022.

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

Our school implemented math practices for thinking in grade 5. In 3rd and 4th classrooms teachers had partial implementation in their classrooms. The math instructional coach modeled and planned weekly with math teachers. Professional developments were offered to aid in complete implementation of math thinking practices. This year 2nd-5th grade classrooms will be fully implementing math practices for thinking.

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

We use a multi-tiered system of support school wide. All students receive grade level instruction and opportunities to practice in tier 1. Students needing additional time or support receive another level of support during tier 2 instruction which is 30 minutes a day. Students who do not make growth in tier 1 and tier 2 instruction will be given an additional layer of support with a tier 3 instructional group. Students progressing in tier 1 will receive enrichment to accelerate learning in reading, math or science. Data is reviewed every 6-8 weeks to adjust groupings as needed.

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.

Professional development was provided on pacing guides and curriculum maps to ensure standards aligned lesson plans. Professional development is going to be provided on managing response rates, monitoring methods and accountable talk.

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

To ensure sustainability of improvement, teachers will continue to have professional developments based on data received during district and school walk throughs. They will also have professional development opportunities based on their own professional growth plan.

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.

ELA achievement is the only area that has shown regression over the last three years. There are no ESSA groups below 41%. When filtered out for only ELA achievement, the following percentages are evidence: Black Students- 32% ESE- 21% ELL- 31%

Measurable

Outcome:

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

If 100% of teachers, coaches, and administrators collaboratively plan for standards aligned instruction weekly (with a focus on ELA), then achievement will increase to 55% for all students.

Monitoring:

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

In fall FAST progress monitoring, ELA was at 22% meeting grade level achievement 3rd-5th grade. We will use FAST MOY and EOY data to assess what percentage of students are then at benchmark expectations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Rebecca Brown (rebecca.brown@indianriverschools.org)

Evidence-based

Strategy:

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

The evidence-based strategy chosen was collaborative planning. In the first nine weeks a focus was standards aligned instruction within collaborative planning. In the second nine weeks, the focus will be on monitoring/feedback and formative assessments.

Rationale for Evidence-based

Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

If 100% of teachers, coaches, and administrators collaboratively plan for standards aligned instruction weekly (with a focus on ELA), then achievement will increase to 55% for all students. With a focus on collaborative planning, teachers and coaches will intentionally plan for accountable talk in all subject areas, daily with structures in place. Professional development opportunities will be on managing response rates, monitoring methods and accountable.

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.

Professional development will be provided on managing response rates, monitoring methods, and accountable talks.

Coaches will model and collaborate with teachers for ways to include monitoring and formative

assessments in lesson plans during collaborative planning

Teachers and coaches will intentionally plan for (and become actively involved in) accountable talk in all subject areas, daily with structures in place.

School leadership team completes quarterly walk throughs.

Individual teacher data chats include review of SIP goal data by classroom and grade level

Person Responsible Kelly Good (kelly.good@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

In collaborative planning, coach models evidence-based strategies for teaching specific reading skills embedded in the chosen curriculum. The coach also models and side by side teaches lessons. Coaches also model evidence-based interventions for tier groups.

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

In collaborative planning we will plan for standards aligned instruction. Focusing on formative assessments and monitoring to ensure students understand what is being taught. The coach also models and side by side teaches lessons using evidence-based strategies. Coaches also model evidence-based interventions for tier groups.

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)

Currently according to STAR assessments, these percentages of students are at or above benchmarks:

K: 27%

1st: 41%

2nd level 3 or above: 27%

Our end of year school goal for ELA achievement is 55%

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

According to FAST fall progress monitoring the following shows the percentage of students who scored a level 3 or higher:

3rd: 17%

4th: 22%

5th: 25%

Our end of year school goal for ELA achievement is 55%.

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.

The school will use FAST, STAR progress monitoring. We will also review iReady. The school's primary focus is reading. We will review data quarterly with staff to evaluate students that need intervention groups. Instructional leadership team reviews data weekly to monitor fidelity of interventions in all tiers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Good, Kelly, kelly.good@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?

As a school we only use district approved curriculums. In reading we use Amplify K-5, iReady, Lexia and Sonday. These programs are approved in the district reading plan. The district approved curriculum and district pacing guides align to the B.E.S.T ELA standards.

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?

The programs were chosen by the district. These programs were chosen because they are research based and address B.E.S.T ELA standards.

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
Professional Development on district curriculum guides and district pacing guides.	Durwin, Brenda, brenda.durwin@indianriverschools.org
Professional developments offered on approved district curriculum.	Good, Kelly, kelly.good@indianriverschools.org
Coaching on how to implement these curriculums and evidence based strategies with fidelity.	Brown, Rebecca, rebecca.brown@indianriverschools.org