

School District of Indian River County

# Pelican Island 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>

# Pelican Island Elementary School

1355 SCHUMANN DR, Sebastian, FL 32958

www.indianriverschools.org

## Demographics

Principal: Felice Heppern

Start Date for this Principal: 6/9/2021

<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)	56%
<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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2021-22: C (50%) 2020-21: (35%) 2018-19: C (48%) 2017-18: C (46%)
<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, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## 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.

Inspire our Pelicans to SOAR to Success.

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

Empower our Pelicans to make Everyday Earth Day, positively impacting the school, the local community, and the world.

### 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
Bagley, Felice	Principal	
Whelan, Kelsey	Assistant Principal	
Williams, Rachel	Guidance Counselor	
Rowe, Jena	Reading Coach	
Corey, Jennifer	Math Coach	

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 6/9/2021, Felice Heppern

**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.*

15

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

37

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

338

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

4

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

5

**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	45	55	53	40	40	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	281
Attendance below 90 percent	5	14	15	7	6	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	3	7	7	4	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

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	1	0	3	4	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	7	4	2	4	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
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	63	54	39	48	48	69	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	321
Attendance below 90 percent	22	21	9	6	16	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	97
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	1	10	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	10	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	8	10	6	10	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
	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	1	4	1	0	9	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	7	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	61	52	41	49	47	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	325
Attendance below 90 percent	41	15	5	7	10	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	11	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	10	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	1	11	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
	0	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	5	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	5	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data Review**

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

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	51%	58%	56%	50%			47%	58%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	67%	62%	61%	34%			54%	57%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	64%	55%	52%	33%			65%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	43%	61%	60%	46%			48%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	48%	60%	64%	25%			44%	60%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	54%	55%	17%			37%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	37%	51%	51%	38%			40%	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.**

<b>ELA</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	53%	60%	-7%	58%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	46%	61%	-15%	58%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
05	2022					
	2019	42%	54%	-12%	56%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

<b>MATH</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
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	49%	64%	-15%	64%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
05	2022					
	2019	32%	57%	-25%	60%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

<b>SCIENCE</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
05	2022					
	2019	39%	53%	-14%	53%	-14%

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	26	37		20	43		21				
ELL											
BLK	41	64		34	41		38				
HSP	57			40	60						
WHT	53	67	63	47	51	47	31				
FRL	43	63	63	35	45	44	31				
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	30	17		13			13				
BLK	22	8		24	13		8				
HSP	60			73							
WHT	60	41		52	29		47				
FRL	50	44		40	19		36				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	21	51	63	30	41	40	22				
BLK	16	26	50	20	23	27	22				
HSP	59	80		35	38						
WHT	61	64	65	65	57	50	49				
FRL	41	52	63	42	45	37	39				

**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	50
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	46

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	396
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	46
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Asian Students</b>	
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
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	44
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
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
<b>Multiracial Students</b>	
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
<b>Native American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Native American Students	

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	51
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

## 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?**

For reading, vocabulary and comprehension are the lowest domains school wide. Vocabulary remained consistently low for all grade levels, all but one grade level was low in literature compared to informational text. For math, number sense and operations and geometry are the lowest domains followed by algebra and measurement and data. Fourth and fifth are lowest in geometry, all others are lowest in number sense and operations. According to Power BI the FAST ELA data by subgroup shows that our Hispanic population has the lowest achievement rate in grades 3-5. Our Asian population has the highest achievement rates in graded 3-5. According to Power BI the FAST Math data by subgroup shows that all subgroups other than our Asian population have low achievement rates.

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

For ELA the greatest need for improvement is in vocabulary and literature comprehension. For Math the greatest need for improvement is in Number sense and operations, and geometry.

**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 factors for the areas that need improvement are students' low achievements on the PM1 FAST assessment and iReady Diagnostic, as well as poor attendance. The new actions to be taken are teachers will consistently use effective monitoring and student engagement strategies as discussed in weekly collaborative planning. Schoolwide attendance incentives, and professional development snippets into schoolwide pelican press for teachers.

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

The data components are ELA LG increased from 34% to 67%. BQ ELA increased from 33% to 64%. Math LG increased from 25% to 48%. Math BQ increased from 17% to 40%. Overall percentage went from 35% to 50%. In ELA achievement for African American students increased from 22% to 41% ELA LG for African American students increased from 8% to 64%.

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

The contributing factors to this improvement include instructional coaches pulling BQ students, students back on campus from being virtual the previous year, and electing distance learning. Other actions included targeted collaborative planning, and before and after school tutoring.

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

Strategies that will need to be implemented to accelerate learning will be; A2 tutoring groups that will assist students in reading and math to close gaps in their learning. Incentives for student attendance, continuation of weekly collaborative planning with monitoring and high yield implementation strategies.

**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.**

Instructional coaches submit weekly PD snippets into the schoolwide Pelican Press (weekly newsletter). Additionally, the instructional coaches will be giving a PD in January on Engagement, monitoring, and High Yield Strategies as based off our SIP goals. Teachers were provided a PD on Building Thinking Classrooms in August by the Math Coach.

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

Services that will be implemented for this school and beyond will be; A2 tutoring groups, ongoing PD from SDIRC and school based opportunities.

**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 Science**

**Area of Focus Description and**

**Rationale:**

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

Increasing achievement rates in math and science will improve school grade.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

The average end of chapter science assessments will increase to 50% achievement in grade 5.

**Monitoring:**

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

Weekly collaborative planning, data chats, classroom walkthroughs focusing on monitoring, explicit support facilitation, STEAM integration, and Building Thinking Classrooms Integration.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Felice Bagley (felice.bagley@indianriverschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

The evidence based strategy being used is monitoring through formative assessments to check for student understanding.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

We are going to use formative assessment to remediate students on the spot to close achievement gaps.

**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.

Weekly collaborative planning, data chats, classroom walkthroughs focusing on monitoring, explicit support facilitation, STEAM integration, and Building Thinking Classrooms Integration.

**Person Responsible**

Felice Bagley (felice.bagley@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**

Monitoring will allow for remediation on the spot to close gaps in learning and meet students independent learning needs. This was selected because learning gaps were identified from iReady from end of year to the fall diagnostic.

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

Monitoring will allow for remediation on the spot to close gaps in learning and meet students independent learning needs. This was selected because learning gaps were identified from iReady from end of year to the fall diagnostic.

**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)**

Based on the end of year iReady data from 21/22 students:

K- 90% of the grade level was on or above Kindergarten level. 10% of the grade level was one grade level below.

1-69% of the grade level was on or above 1st grade level. 29% of the grade level was one grade level below, and 4% of the grade level was two grade levels below.

2- 48% of the grade level was on or above 2nd grade level. 46% of the grade level was one grade level behind, and 5% of the grade level was two grade levels behind.

Outcomes for this year are :

K-2 students proficiency rate will be at or above 75% after the final diagnostic.

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

FSA proficiency rates from 21/22 are:

3rd- 39%

4th- 55%

5th-57%

Outcomes for this year will be at or above 60%

#### 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.

Monitoring- The school's areas of focus will be monitored for the desired outcome by conducting leadership team walkthroughs with fidelity and leaving purposeful feedback each time. Using Power BI and school created data sheets admin and instructional coaches will hold data chats with grade level teams to create next steps for instruction based off of the most recently collected data.

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Whelan, Kelsey, kelsey.whelan@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?

BTC, AMPLIFY, SAVVAS, iReady, FAST, STAR, Lexia Core5, DIBELS, Standards Mastery, Science comprehensive assessments

#### 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 above evidence based practices address the identified needs and are approved by the SDIRC. The effect size of the formative assessments for monitoring is 0.9.



**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
Literacy Leadership- 1. Collaborative Planning 2. Lesson plans with high yield strategy 3. Monitoring for high yield strategies using walk throughs. Literacy Coaching- 1. Full Coaching cycles 2. Mini coaching cycles 3. Teacher assistance Assessment- 1. Backwards design 2. Formative 3. Summative Professional Learning- 1. Weekly PLC input to schoolwide newsletter 2. Embedded PD during collaborative planning 3. Continuation of formative assessment PD	Rowe, Jena, jena.webster@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:

- Staff Attendance Rate (2021-2022) – 93.3%
- Student ODR Count (2021-2022) – 79

Rationale for Selection of Data:

- Increasing recognition will improve staff attendance rates.
- Increasing recognition will reduce ODR counts.

## High Yield Strategy: Relationships

### Goals:

- The average staff attendance rate for quarter 2 will remain 95% or higher.
- Office discipline referrals (ODR's), during the school day, for quarter 2 will be no more than 5.

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

#### (All Staff) Staff MVP of the Month

- Obtain donations
- Choose monthly staff MVP

#### SOAR Ticket Reward System

- Develop system
- Cash in SOAR tickets

#### (Principal and Assistant Principal) Staff VIP Tickets

- Obtain donations / Purchase items
- Organize raffle / choose names

#### Positive Student Office Referrals

- Nominate students
- Call home

#### (School Counselor) STAR Student

- Nominate students
- Print Certificates
- Celebrate during Lunch

#### (School Counselor and PBIS Team) Quarterly PBIS Celebration

- Collect behavior data/ODR's
- Plan celebration
- Obtain materials
- Attend party