

School District of Indian River County

Dodgertown Elementary School



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

Dodgertown Elementary School

4350 43RD AVE, Vero Beach, FL 32967

www.indianriverschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Aretha Vernetta

Start Date for this Principal: 6/26/2017

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)	74%
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: C (49%) 2020-21: (37%) 2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (48%)
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 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 make a difference by educating, inspiring, and serving all students with excellence.

Provide the school's vision statement.:

Dodgertown Elementary is known for its quality education system which engages and prepares all students for success.

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
Vernette, Aretha	Principal	
Patterson, Ataaba	Assistant Principal	
Miller, Stacey	Reading Coach	
Davis, Jennifer	Reading Coach	
Swanigan, Denise	Math Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/26/2017, Aretha Vernette

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.*

0

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

53

Total number of students enrolled at the school

481

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

12

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

10

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	82	86	82	73	67	52	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	442
Attendance below 90 percent	11	39	33	19	15	205	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	322
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	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	14	25	22	8	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	93

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	5	11	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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	3	3	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/20/2022

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	80	70	61	65	48	64	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	388
Attendance below 90 percent	31	24	20	22	13	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124
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	6	13	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	7	13	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	6	19	15	20	13	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97

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	4	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	10	13	9	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	86	82	63	65	55	70	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	421
Attendance below 90 percent	11	35	20	24	12	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	10	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	0	0	2	13	4	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	13	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	7	13	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	6	13	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

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	21	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42

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	10	13	7	9	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Students retained two or more times	0	0	2	4	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	42%	58%	56%	32%			29%	58%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	62%	62%	61%	43%			56%	57%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	55%	52%	61%			65%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	43%	61%	60%	28%			40%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	54%	60%	64%	28%			61%	60%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	54%	55%	47%			58%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	31%	51%	51%	20%			26%	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	22%	60%	-38%	58%	-36%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	32%	61%	-29%	58%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-22%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	30%	54%	-24%	56%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-32%				

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	29%	64%	-35%	62%	-33%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	45%	64%	-19%	64%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-29%				
05	2022					
	2019	48%	57%	-9%	60%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	24%	53%	-29%	53%	-29%
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	28	52		22	48		20				
ELL	41	65		44	65	70	19				
BLK	35	57	47	29	43	46	15				
HSP	41	61		47	63		36				
WHT	59	64		78	79						
FRL	37	58	55	38	49	57	28				

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	36	57	16	32		7				
ELL	36	46		33	46						
BLK	26	44	58	22	20	30	18				
HSP	43	36		41	36						
MUL	64			45							
WHT	31			28							
FRL	31	43	65	24	26	57	21				

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	6	54	63	15	76	87					
ELL	28	55		56	55		23				
BLK	25	51	55	35	60	56	15				
HSP	33	58		56	53		39				
WHT	25	73		29	75						
FRL	26	56	64	39	61	58	27				

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	406
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	95%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	34
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	52
-------------------------------------------	----

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	39
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	52
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	48
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?

Low percentages of Reading Achievement Levels in grades 3, 4, 5: 40%, 49%, 38% respectively.
 Low percentages of Math Achievement Levels in grades 3, 5: 47%, 25% respectively.
 Low percentages of Science Achievement Levels in grade 5: 31%.
 High percentage of Math Achievement Levels in grade 5: 54%, 60% respectively.
 High percentage of Reading learning gains for "all" and "BQ": 62%, 54% respectively.
 High percentage of Math learning gains for "all" and "BQ": 54%, 60% respectively.
 ESSA subgroups performing under 41%: SWDs and Black/African American students.

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

Proficiency/Achievement levels for Reading, Math and Science.

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

One contributing factor to the need for improvement in the area of proficiency is Tier 1 instruction was not delivered with fidelity as planned.

Another contributing factor to the need for improvement in the area of proficiency is poor student attendance, which further compounds the delivery of planned Tier 1 instruction.

The following new action steps need to be addressed to improve the delivery of Tier 1 instruction in order to increase proficiency and achievement levels:

- 1) Provide feedback to teachers visited during impact classroom walks/observations.
- 2) Monitor the implementation of "Morning Meetings" to foster relationships with students and build culture.
- 3) Create lesson plans during collaborative planning to include "monitoring and formative assessment" strategies that if executed will ensure ratings of "evident" for
 - a) teacher checks for understanding throughout the lesson;
 - b) Learners receive/respond to feedback from teachers/peers to improve understanding; and
 - c) learners monitor their own learning progress or have mechanisms whereby their learning progress is monitored.
- 4) Put the plan of monitoring daily into action, in the classroom to check for understanding (ex. a colored marker to quickly monitor students' work, circulating and checking for understanding)
- 5) During small group instruction, implement expectations for students to be accountable (chart for

Reflex green lights, i-Ready lessons passed, etc.)

6) To help with time management, a use of a timer for pacing, or a place to put materials will be helpful.

7) Planning for a cooperative structure to encourage accountable talk/collaborative work from all students

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

The learning gains for ELA increased from 43% to 62% last year and the learning gains for math also increased from 28% to 51% last year. The bottom quartile for math increased from 47% to 60%.

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

Contributing factors included small group instruction of targeted students, extended learning opportunities, and intentional review activities. We identified students who needed remediation and supported learning in Moonshot, A2 Tutoring, GEER, and Saturday tutoring sessions.

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

We are using high-yield strategies such as collaborative planning with coaches, monitoring, formative assessments, differentiation, engagement and participation, and learning environment to enhance Tier 1 instruction. We also will use coaches to support teachers with full coaching cycles, mini-cycles, teacher assistance, and one-on-one planning meetings with teachers to support learning.

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.

During pre-planning, teachers received training on high-yield strategies, building thinking classrooms, engagement and participation, and multiple-response strategies. Julie Green provided professional development on I-Ready monitoring and data. On October 31st, teachers will receive professional development on monitoring by the literacy coaches and administration and data analysis with school grade prediction from Jody Houston. Coaching cycles have been taking place in each grade level and we are planning to support teachers by also sending them to observe teachers at other schools.

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

We will consistently have walk-throughs by the leadership team and collaborate to provide feedback and support teachers in Tier 1 improvement with high-yield strategies. We will have reflections on what went well to reproduce results. General Education teachers will work closely with ESE staff members to determine appropriate goals for our students. We will continue to be departmentalized so teachers can strengthen understanding of curriculum and standard based instruction and tasks aligned to each lesson.

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 Standards-aligned Instruction

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

Due to the low proficiency during the 2021-22 school year in ELA, math, and Science, this area was identified as a critical need from the data. In ELA, our proficiency was 42%, in math 43%, and in Science 31%. In our African American subgroup and ESE subgroup, the proficiency was below 41%.

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

To achieve the outcome in our goal of 62% proficiency, we will have 133 students in ELA and math meet grade level proficiency, and 25 students will meet grade level proficiency in Science. This relates to 69% 69%, and 48% respectively.

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

We will analyze progress monitoring from the state, I-Ready spring results, and teacher's ratings through leadership and district walk-throughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Aretha Vernette (aretha.vernette@indianriverschools.org)

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

Monitoring using formative assessments is the evidence based strategy for this area of focus.

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

Based upon our school improvement plan, district walk-throughs, and lack of proficiency in the 2021-22 school year, we selected this high-yield strategy to support all stakeholders.

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.

During small group instruction, expectations should be in place and a way for students to be accountable (chart for Reflex green lights, i-Ready lessons passed, etc.)

Person Responsible Aretha Vernette (aretha.vernette@indianriverschools.org)

To help with time management, a use of a timer for pacing, or a place to put materials will be helpful.

Person Responsible Ataaba Patterson (ataaba.patterson@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

The instructional practice we are focusing on is monitoring through formative assessments.

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

The instructional practice we are focusing on is monitoring through formative assessments.

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)

Seventy percent (70%) of students in Kindergarten through second grades will score on or above grade level on their spring I-Ready assessment.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Sixty-two percent (62%) of students in third through fifth grades will score proficient on the state assessment at the end of the 2022-23 school year.

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 area of focus, monitoring, will be monitored through weekly leadership walk-throughs, district walk-throughs, and results of assessments. The evaluating impact at the end of the year will be measured through proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Vernette, Aretha, aretha.vernette@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?

The programs we are using to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade include Sunday during Tier 2 and after school Moonshot, I-Ready Magnetic for A2 tutoring, and Performance Coach during our Science Saturdays. Progress is being monitored in Tier 2 and Moonshot through DIBLES, and through ORF's in A2 tutoring. The ELA coach will monitor whether these programs are taught with fidelity weekly. The high-yield strategy of monitoring through formative assessments is another evidence based practice we are using to achieve the measurable outcome in each grade. These practices will be monitored with leadership walkthroughs and district level walkthroughs.

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?

For grades K-2, we used the DIBLES beginning of year test along with STAR testing and I-Ready assessment data to determine areas of need. In grades 3-5, we used the FAST and I-Ready results to determine areas of need. Students were divided into groups based upon deficiencies and invitations were given for after school programs. These programs, whether Tier 2 or after school based tutoring, meet the identified needs of students. The identified programs show a proven record of effectiveness for the target population.

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
Provide feedback to teachers visited during weekly walkthroughs and district impact walks (and school feedback to all).	Davis, Jennifer, jennifer.davis@indianriverschools.org
Put the plan of monitoring daily into action, in the classroom to check for understanding (ex. a colored marker to quickly monitor students' work, circulating and checking for understanding).	Miller, Stacey, stacey.miller@indianriverschools.org

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Data Findings: Student ADA: 90.2%; Teacher ADA: 94.7%

Rationale for Selection of Data: Absent students miss instruction which impacts student achievement and creates gaps in learning; Absent teachers cannot deliver instruction which impacts teaching and learning.

High Yield Strategy: Relationships

Goal: Build, sustain and use relationships to encourage an increased average daily attendance to 95% or greater for students and staff.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive school culture and environment.

- (Principal and Assistant Principal)
- Promote Superintendent's Student Attendance Challenge with stakeholders
 - Promote Superintendent's Staff Attendance Challenge

- Provide daily, weekly and quarterly student attendance recognition
- Provide daily, weekly and quarterly staff attendance recognition
- Provide staff and student attendance incentives