

School District of Indian River County

# Indian River Charter High School



## 2019-20 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>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>16</b>

# Indian River Charter High School

6055 COLLEGE LN, Vero Beach, FL 32966

[www.indianriverschools.org](http://www.indianriverschools.org)

## Demographics

**Principal: Gregory Zajicek**

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2019

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	High School 9-12
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	25%
<b>2018-19 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>	2018-19: A (65%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: B (60%) 2015-16: A (66%) 2014-15: A (75%)
<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>	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

### School Board Approval

N/A

### 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.

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>16</b>

# Indian River Charter High School

6055 COLLEGE LN, Vero Beach, FL 32966

[www.indianriverschools.org](http://www.indianriverschools.org)

## School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
High School 9-12	No	19%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	29%

## School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	B	A

## School Board Approval

N/A

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://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.

The mission of the Indian River Charter High School is to give its students the opportunity to develop a new set of competencies and foundational skills that will help them enjoy a productive, full, and satisfying life. This school will be a high-performance organization.

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

The goal of Indian River Charter High School is to give its students in grades 9-12 with individualized opportunities to realize their potential in an environment that is welcoming, nurturing, wholistic, and emphasizes responsibility.

### School Leadership Team

#### Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Sielinski, Brent	Principal	
Zajcek, Gregory	Assistant Principal	
Kelly, Jessica	Assistant Principal	

### Early Warning Systems

#### Current Year

The number of students by 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	186	194	158	163	701
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22	9	8	16	55
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	24	24	34	100
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	41	24	4	92

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	12	6	13	46

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	3	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

**FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)**

660

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Wednesday 8/14/2019

### Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Attendance below 90 percent														
One or more suspensions														
Course failure in ELA or Math														
Level 1 on statewide assessment														

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
Students with two or more indicators														

### Prior Year - Updated

**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	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

### School Data

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	73%	58%	56%	72%	55%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	62%	54%	51%	56%	49%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	40%	42%	38%	34%	41%
Math Achievement	59%	48%	51%	44%	44%	49%
Math Learning Gains	44%	46%	48%	31%	38%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	39%	45%	28%	31%	39%
Science Achievement	78%	68%	68%	78%	64%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	86%	68%	73%	89%	74%	70%

### EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)				Total
	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	186 (0)	194 (0)	158 (0)	163 (0)	701 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	22 ( )	9 ( )	8 ( )	16 ( )	55 (0)
One or more suspensions	5 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	18 (0)	24 (0)	24 (0)	34 (0)	100 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	23 (0)	41 (0)	24 (0)	4 (0)	92 (0)

### Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (\*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
09	2019	73%	55%	18%	55%	18%
	2018	75%	52%	23%	53%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
10	2019	69%	51%	18%	53%	16%
	2018	68%	51%	17%	53%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	78%	64%	14%	67%	11%
2018	81%	61%	20%	65%	16%
Compare		-3%			
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	85%	64%	21%	70%	15%
2018	88%	70%	18%	68%	20%
Compare		-3%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	48%	58%	-10%	61%	-13%
2018	55%	61%	-6%	62%	-7%
Compare		-7%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	70%	53%	17%	57%	13%
2018	57%	50%	7%	56%	1%
Compare		13%			

### Subgroup Data

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	33	34	19	22	33	29		53			
ELL	50	50		73	62						
BLK	47	50		38	33					100	50
HSP	73	66	64	67	44		70	70		93	64

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
MUL	91	100									
WHT	73	60	40	60	46	42	81	89		98	65
FRL	70	58	37	51	45	38	68	62		89	58
2018 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	41	55	53	31	46	42	58			93	31
BLK	47	44		20	15						
HSP	64	56	41	45	55	55	71	82		80	67
MUL	80	50									
WHT	76	60	56	59	46	31	84	94		93	67
FRL	69	59	54	46	50	50	88	77		88	65
2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	31	46	41	29	24	25	50			82	
BLK	73	33		30	26						
HSP	64	58	34	41	38	24	69	91		100	70
MUL	60	33		41	46						
WHT	75	58	38	46	28	29	83	89		93	67
FRL	55	36	31	29	32		69	82		91	63

### ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	65
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	647
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32

Students With Disabilities	
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	59
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	53
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	68
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	96
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	65
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	58
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

## Analysis

### Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

**Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.**

Students with Disabilities tested at 32%. Some students and families chose not to repeat taking the EOCs where they were below pass rate for graduation and chose to take alternate accepted exams with concordant scores for graduation - SAT, ACT, and PERT. Passing scores on these assessments would not be reflected in State data.

**Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.**

An area where the school underperformed was with Students with Disabilities in the lowest quartile on English Language Arts Assessments. The school's score for this subgroup fell 34 points between 2017-18 and 2018-2019. A second area where the school underperformed was with learning gains on English Language Arts assessments for Students with Disabilities in the lowest quartile, which fell 21 points. Possibly the greatest change that occurred at the school which had an impact on these scores was a change in personnel within the department. There has been a large turnover within the English Language Arts department within the past three years.

Math scores for Students with Disabilities dropped from 31 points to 22. The largest drop in Mathematics for Students with Disabilities was in learning gains, which fell from 42 points to 29 points. In both of these areas of study, many students opted to attempt a test which could be used as a concordant score for the FSA (SAT, ACT, and PERT). The passing scores on these concordant tests would not be reflected in State data.

**Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.**

Math Learning Gains fell below the state average of 48% with IRCHS at 44%. In Mathematics, the lowest quartile fell below the state average of 45% to 40%. The students who demonstrated a need for practice had an extra hour added to their weekly schedule for remedial work. This remedial work was readying the students for the FSA, but also preparing them for exams with concordant scores (SAT, ACT, and PERT). This year, the remedial course meets five days a week for a total of 250 minutes.

**Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?**

In all other areas, the school exceeded the state and district averages. In these areas, no major changes in approach have taken place for the last several years.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)**

100 students, or 14% of the school's population, failed an English Language Arts or Mathematics assessment.

93 students or, 13% of the school's population, received a Level 1 on their state exams.

**Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.**

1. Development of classes in Language Arts and Mathematics that are designed for students who are underperforming on State-mandated exams. The Language Arts department developed an intensive class for these students - Critical Thinking Skills, and the Mathematics department has instituted an Intensive Math class.
2. Strive for smaller classroom sizes for this population.
3. More individual progress monitoring held at least twice per semester.
4. Development of test-taking strategies.
5. Implementation of more comprehensive formative assessments to identify areas of deficiency for targeted subgroups.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

#1	
<b>Title</b>	Instructional Diversification for Students with Disabilities
<b>Rationale</b>	To strengthen teachers techniques for developing best practices for Students With Disabilities through Professional Development classes.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Students in the lowest quartile will increase performance from 19% proficiency to 40% proficiency on ELA assessments. Students in the lowest quartile will increase learning gains from 29% to 36% on ELA assessments.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Brent Sielinski (brent.sielinski@irchs.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	The school will incorporate smaller intensive classes that meet daily, focusing on areas of concern for Students with Disabilities. These classes will be in accordance with Level 2 intervention. Within the classes, students will be broken into smaller groups. The instructor will incorporate best practices for differentiation and remediation.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Differentiation will help the school target individual students for success. The intensive courses for Students with Disabilities in Language Arts will base their curriculum on "Essential Reading Skills - Preparation for High School Equivalency Tests" and the Math department will base their curriculum on Algebra Nation for Florida.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Review of student data to determine students that meet the criteria of SWD with low EOC and State scores.</li> <li>2. Placement of students into intensive classes.</li> <li>3. Close monitoring of students individually through pre- and post-assessments to chart their success in Level 2 classes.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Brent Sielinski (brent.sielinski@irchs.org)

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

**After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).**

The school's most critical areas of focus are with Students with Disabilities who test in the lowest quartile for English Language Arts as well as learning gains for students in Mathematics. For other mandated State assessments, the school continues to outperform the District and State averages. For these two areas of focus, the school does not outperform and had a significant drop-off over the last two school years.

The deficit between the 2016-2017 and the 2017-2018 scores for Students with Disabilities who test in the lowest quartile on learning gains for either the English Language Arts FSA or Mathematics FSA will be recovered by one-third every year for the next three years until these scores are restored to 2016-2017 levels or exceeds them.

To address these areas of concern: teachers will collaborate with the ESE department to review research-based best practices for differentiating instruction for the targeted subgroup of students with disabilities who test in the lowest quartile. The ESE department will also offer in-house professional

development opportunities for all teachers at the school. Participation in these professional development activities will be factored into a teacher's overall evaluation. This expectation has been communicated to all faculty in meetings. The next step will be to have teachers incorporate these practices in their classrooms. Then administrators will review implementation of best practices through more frequent walkthroughs and observations. Teachers will be provided feedback by administrators in a collaborative effort to implement effective instructor practices for the targeted subgroups.

Another plan to address areas of concern is creating professional learning communities based primarily on grade level taught. These PLCs meet monthly to share best practices that have proven effective for Students With Disabilities, review data, and create instructional strategies to implement in the future. These PLCs, called pods, have already been created and are meeting regularly at the school. Students will be given pre-tests on benchmarks in each subject to assess their present needs, and to be used as a basis for the development of their plan of study. Formative assessments will be administered more frequently. These assessments will identify which specific content areas targeted subgroups struggle with. Teachers will be responsible for providing administration with their plans for collecting data more frequently and using it to drive instruction.

This plan of action was adopted because the school excels at creating in-house professional development which is aligned with research-based best practices. In addition, the school's ESE department is qualified to create and provide professional development, and has a successful history in this area. Teachers meet twice monthly. One meeting is for professional learning communities (PODS) and the other is for all-faculty. These meetings have been a part of the school's operations for many years and will be utilized to help implement the school improvement plan.

School administrators and the school curriculum coordinator will be responsible for ensuring that this plan of action is implemented with fidelity.

## Part V: Budget

**The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.**

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Diversification for Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00