

School District of Indian River County

# Vero Beach Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

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

# Vero Beach Elementary School

1770 12TH ST, Vero Beach, FL 32960

www.indianriverschools.org

## Demographics

Principal: Lyndsey Matheny

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2021-22 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	74%
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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 Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: C (50%) 2020-21: (38%) 2018-19: C (46%) 2017-18: D (39%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	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](http://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.**

At Vero Beach Elementary, we empower our Tribe, within our campus and the community, to SLIDE into innovation. Through collective problem solving and engagement, we will achieve excellence in Science, Literacy, Inquiry, Design, and Engineering.

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

At Vero Beach Elementary, our Tribe inspires authentic learning through engagement and innovation.

### 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
Matheny, Lyndsey	Principal	
Van Brimmer, Sarah	Assistant Principal	
Dunn, Paul	Math Coach	
Conway, Shawn	Reading Coach	
Leopold, Sarah	Reading Coach	
Reed, Rebecca	Other	Interventionist

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Lyndsey Matheny

**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.*

2

**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**

49

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

601

**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.

6

**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	92	112	86	99	74	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	537
Attendance below 90 percent	7	29	20	27	16	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	10	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	20	23	26	35	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	132

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	7	14	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

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	5	4	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**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	99	95	84	83	75	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	517
Attendance below 90 percent	28	31	32	24	25	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162
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	7	12	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	6	16	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	34	26	54	12	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	156

**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	13	14	15	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	65

**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	8	16	3	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	1	0	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	107	96	79	79	73	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	510
Attendance below 90 percent	10	16	23	28	17	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	115
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	1	7	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	7	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	10	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	6	15	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	8	10	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	23	11	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54

**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	9	13	2	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

**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%	37%			39%	58%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	62%	61%	30%			44%	57%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	56%	55%	52%	43%			57%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	49%	61%	60%	40%			48%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	58%	60%	64%	35%			47%	60%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	62%	54%	55%	57%			45%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	31%	51%	51%	22%			44%	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	41%	60%	-19%	58%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	37%	61%	-24%	58%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				
05	2022					



ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	35%	54%	-19%	56%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				

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	59%	64%	-5%	62%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	54%	64%	-10%	64%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
05	2022					
	2019	29%	57%	-28%	60%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	43%	53%	-10%	53%	-10%
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	22	48	43	39	61	46	13				
ELL	27	37	40	50	55		29				
BLK	36	55	64	38	61	57	14				
HSP	40	37	33	56	58	64	37				
MUL	33			40							
WHT	49	64		53	54		31				
FRL	39	54	57	48	58	60	32				

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	17	25	45	36	53	60	18				
ELL	28	29		51	43		9				
BLK	23	21		30	26		18				
HSP	36	38		36	43		11				
MUL	29			47							
WHT	47	29		46	38		29				
FRL	35	32	44	37	35	53	20				

  

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	46	21	44	43	22				
ELL	28	44	40	50	46		39				
BLK	31	40	42	38	41	47	24				
HSP	30	39	53	49	52	54	38				
MUL	39	43		61	29						
WHT	50	51	73	50	50	31	55				
FRL	38	42	52	45	46	47	43				

**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	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	52
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	405
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	96%

  

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
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	41
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	46
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	48
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	37
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	47
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	51
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?

Overall, schoolwide data shows that we have high growth, but low proficiency in ELA and math. Our mid-level students and highest achieving students had lower rates of learning gains compared to lower performing students. For subgroups, multiracial students did not meet the federal index criteria for proficiency in the 2021-2022 SY. Data show that 33% of multiracial students were proficient in ELA and 40% were proficient in math, based on FSA results. No growth data was included because these students were 3rd graders and growth did not apply.

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

2021-22 3rd - 5th grade FSA results show 42% of students are demonstrating proficiency in ELA and 49% in Math. Both subject areas have seen an increase in proficiency over the past three years. Local progress monitoring data in iReady shows 44% (K-2) and 25% (3-5) students are performing on or above grade level in ELA and 51%(K-2) and 29% (3-5) at or above level in Math.

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

Attendance continues to be a contributing factor in ELA and Math proficiency. We have a very transient population therefore, maintaining a stable student enrollment starting from kindergarten through 5th grade is a challenge. Within the past 3 years, there have been 3 different reading coaches and 2 different math coaches due to promotion opportunities so having a consistent leadership team has been a factor. .

New actions include: using Title One resources to fund professional development and support staff. Another new action we took this year was to become the Moonshot Acceleration School. This provides us access to more interventionists, coaches and an administrator (coordinator). This team assist in implementing best practices in collaborative planning, data chats, coaching, and intervention. As well as weekly paid professional development and extended learning opportunities for tutoring after school free to students performing below the 45th percentile in K-3.

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

ELA Learning Gains showed the greatest improvement in our school-grade components. In 20-21, overall learning gains were 30%. In 2021-2022, ELA Learning Gains were 55%. This represents a 25-point increase. Math learning gains also made marked improvement increasing from 35% in 20-21 to 58% in 21-22.

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

Strong collaborative planning structure was implemented with fidelity, walk to intervention in order to remediate and enrich, multiple and intentional classroom walkthroughs and feedback cycles for improvement.

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

The strategies implemented to accelerate learning will include all students receiving an additional 30 minutes of intervention or enrichment in literacy. Every teacher is provided with coaching support within the Tiered instructional blocks. A focus on Formative Assessments during collaborative planning: what we're collecting, how we're collecting it and how we're responding to student needs both within the moment and during tier 2/3 instruction are planned and implemented.

**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.**

Vero Beach Elementary offered a Summer Literacy Institute a week prior to the 2022-23 school year which offered sessions on the Science of Reading and components of the Reading Rope. We offer paid weekly professional development after school for teachers around the science of reading and the FLDOE Literacy Components (Explicit, Systematic, Scaffolded, Corrective Feedback and Differentiated Instruction) with time to plan instruction. Not only are coaching cycles in place, on the spot coaching occurs when the need arises while the VBE leadership team is conducting walk throughs. Collaborative planning is an expectation and requirement for all teachers, this space allows for professional development around school improvement goals, specifically formative assessment and monitoring.

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

Our goal is to continue to retain our teachers, we do this by providing ongoing professional development with follow-up coaching to build both knowledge and skill in teaching reading and math. We also partner with local nonprofit organizations that provide yearly support in providing extended learning opportunities for our students both in and after school with resources and tutoring. We also are dedicated to maintaining the VBE core leadership team to provide consistency to our staff and students.

**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.**

42% of students in grades 3-5 scored proficient on the 21-22 Florida Standards Assessment (ELA).  
 49% of students in grades 3-5 scored proficient on the 21-22 Florida Standards Assessment (math).  
 Overall school focus will shift to proficiency. If formative Assessments (Monitoring) are planned for THROUGHOUT the lesson student proficiency will increase.

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

49% of students in grades 3-5 scored proficient on the 21-22 Florida Standards Assessment (math).

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

Through school-wide walkthroughs and weekly data chats during collaborative planning.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Lyndsey Matheny  
 (lyndsey.matheny@indianriverschools.org)

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

Professional development embedded in collaborative planning on ways to monitor student learning.

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

When formative assessment and monitoring is planned for fidelity of implementation increases.

**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.

Master schedule for collaborative agenda and sign in sheets for participation, finished lesson plans, and walkthrough data that reflects formative assessment and monitoring as evidence in the classroom.

**Person Responsible**

Lyndsey Matheny  
 (lyndsey.matheny@indianriverschools.org)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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.

**Monitoring:**

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented 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.

**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.

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

**#3. -- Select below -- specifically relating to**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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.

**Monitoring:**

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented 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.

**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.

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

## 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

According to iReady end of year diagnostics, 40% of Kinder, 59% of first grade and 69% of second grade students were performing below grade level.

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

3rd - 5th grade FSA results show 42% of students are demonstrating proficiency in ELA., which means 58% of 3-5 students are below level 3. 59% of 3rd grade, 53% of 4th grade, 61% of 5th grade students performed below level 3. According to end of year iReady results 63% of 3rd graders, 72% of 4th graders, 88% of 5th graders performed below grade level expectations.

### 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)



According to STAR Early Literacy 61% of Kinder and 50% of first graders are performing below grade level expectations. STAR Reading indicates 83% of 2nd graders are performing below grade level. Our goal is 80% proficiency for K-2 by the end of the year.

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

According to FAST assessments 90% of 3rd graders, 75% of 4th graders, and 77% of 5th graders are scoring at a level 1 or 2. Our goal for 2022-23 school year will be 53% of students achieving proficiency in ELA 3rd-5th.

**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.

If formative assessments and monitoring strategies are planned for and embedded throughout daily lessons as

evidenced by walk-throughs in 100% of classrooms, student achievement will increase by 10 percentage points, or more. This will be monitored through walk-through data, formative data discussion leading to change in instruction during collaborative planning, student achievement is expected to improve as a result of the instructional shifts, coach and teacher modeling for expected evidence of immediate and specific feedback to ALL students, improved walkthrough data specifically in the area of monitoring.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Matheny, Lyndsey, lyndsey.matheny@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?

In tier 1, CKLA Amplify curriculum is implemented which is evidence based and aligned to the science of reading and B.E.S.T ELA Standards. As well as in tier 2/3, Amplify's Assessment and Remediation, iReady Magnetic Reading, Sonday Level 1 and 2, Wilson, and lexia to close learning gaps for students.

**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?

STAR Early Literacy, STAR, DIBELS, FAST and iReady diagnostics are analyzed to initially identify student needs in literacy instruction for tier 2/3. Ongoing student data in oral reading fluency, Amplify unit assessments, and/or weekly and biweekly progress monitoring through DIBELS is used to adjust student instruction and/or flex groups as needed.

**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
1. Walkthrough data 2. Formative data discussion leading to change in instruction during planning student achievement is expected to improve as a result of the instructional shifts 3. Coach and teacher modeling for expected evidence of immediate and specific feedback to ALL students, improved walkthrough data specifically in the area of monitoring	Matheny, Lyndsey, lyndsey.matheny@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:  
 - 91.3% overall average daily attendance for 21-22 SY.

- Proficiency rates declined in ELA by at least 10 percentage points from adequate to severe to chronic attendance categories.
- Proficiency rates declined in Math by 28 percentage points from adequate to chronic attendance categories.

Rationale for Selection:

This area directly impacts student achievement.

High Yield Strategy: Relationships

Goal: If Vero Beach Elementary works collaboratively with parents and community partners to build positive relationships, we will be able to reduce barriers for attendance and increase our average daily attendance to 95%. 1st Quarter goal is to have 50% of parents/ families attend engagement events.

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

(Assistant Principal and ESOL Para)

- Attendance Survey for parents & families- used results to target families and their barriers- used info to design Attendance Night

(Principal and Attendance Secretary)

- Monthly attendance celebrations for students
- Quarterly attendance celebrations for students & staff
- Attendance Letters, Attendance Phone Calls, Attendance Contracts
- Monthly Principal Challenges- "First to Five"

(K-2 Coach and School Counselor)

- Donation Day for uniforms, school supplies, & books

(School Counselor and Attendance Secretary)

- Attendance Club / Contract procedures

(Principal)

- Create video for parents regarding important attendance data
- Attendance Dinner Family Engagement Event