

Brevard Public Schools

Indialantic Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Indialantic Elementary School

1050 N PALM AVE, Indialantic, FL 32903

<http://www.indialantic.brevard.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Colleen Lord

Start Date for this Principal: 6/13/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	22%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Asian Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: A (69%) 2014-15: A (77%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard County School Board.

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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	18

Indialantic Elementary School

1050 N PALM AVE, Indialantic, FL 32903

<http://www.indialantic.brevard.k12.fl.us>

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)
Elementary School PK-6	No	24%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	15%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard County School Board.

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 Indialantic community cultivates an environment where students are encouraged to strive for personal progress, where perseverance is the passion and growth is the goal.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Creating a unified and challenging learning environment where all students are inspired to succeed.

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
Braga, Lori	Principal	Cultivate a positive school culture among the students, faculty, parents, and community members.
Etherton, Carla	Teacher, K-12	4th grade teacher, writing liaison, administrative support, mentor teacher
Kublin, Mary	Teacher, K-12	5th grade teacher, SAC Co-Chair, Mentor teacher,
Schneider, Julie	Teacher, K-12	5th Grade teacher, Science Lead, Mentor Teacher, Author, SAC Co-Chair
Donovan, Kim	Instructional Coach	Literacy coach works with teachers to determine appropriate instructional strategies for classroom core instruction and targeted interventions. Attends parent conferences, leadership team meetings, and participates in the MTSS team. Oversees i-Ready diagnostic testing. Plans with teachers and leads focus team meetings and faculty PD.

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	90	114	106	97	102	110	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	724
Attendance below 90 percent	1	3	2	3	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	8	23	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

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	1	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	3	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

53

Date this data was collected or last updated

Saturday 9/7/2019

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	39	31	22	32	26	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	176
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	1	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	8	23	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

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	1	4	1	5	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	19

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	79%	62%	57%	77%	63%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	60%	58%	60%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	57%	53%	49%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	78%	63%	63%	76%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	68%	65%	62%	58%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	53%	51%	46%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	87%	57%	53%	73%	56%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Number of students enrolled	90 (0)	114 (0)	106 (0)	97 (0)	102 (0)	110 (0)	105 (0)	724 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	1 ()	3 ()	2 ()	3 ()	1 ()	2 ()	2 ()	14 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (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)	8 (0)	23 (0)	9 (0)	40 (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
03	2019	86%	64%	22%	58%	28%
	2018	83%	63%	20%	57%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	77%	61%	16%	58%	19%
	2018	91%	57%	34%	56%	35%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	88%	60%	28%	56%	32%
	2018	65%	54%	11%	55%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		23%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
06	2019	70%	60%	10%	54%	16%
	2018	73%	63%	10%	52%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	85%	61%	24%	62%	23%
	2018	83%	62%	21%	62%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	70%	64%	6%	64%	6%
	2018	90%	59%	31%	62%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				
05	2019	90%	60%	30%	60%	30%
	2018	69%	58%	11%	61%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		21%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	70%	67%	3%	55%	15%
	2018	78%	68%	10%	52%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	89%	56%	33%	53%	36%
	2018	66%	57%	9%	55%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		23%				
Cohort Comparison						

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	65	51	40	61	61	72	56				
HSP	85	62		67	67						
MUL	94	62		94	100						
WHT	78	61	52	78	66	58	85				

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
FRL	66	51	41	61	55	46	71				
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	59	45	39	68	44	36	36				
ASN	73	70		82	50						
HSP	76	55		76	63		90				
MUL	88	55		69	45						
WHT	79	61	54	81	59	57	64				
FRL	61	48	38	72	50	59	46				
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	47	49	50	57	54	52	31				
ELL	33	40		50	40						
ASN	67	71		73	71						
HSP	66	65		67	71						
MUL	75	50		75	60						
WHT	79	59	43	78	56	47	77				
FRL	57	46	39	62	54	57	65				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	484
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	58
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Students With Disabilities	
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	70
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	88
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	68
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	56
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.

The overall lowest performing area for the school was ELA lowest 25% learning gains. The school average was 51%, the district average was 57%, and the state average was 53%. While ELA learning gains increased slightly from 2018 (48%) to 2019 (51%), and the lowest 25% increased from 2018 (38%) to 2019 (41%), the students are struggling to make significant overall learning gains. In Math, learning gains increased from 2017-2018 (50%) to 2018-2019 (55%), but the lowest 25% decreased from 2017-2018 (59%) to 2018-2019 (46%). The lowest 25% of students will be targeted through school wide Walk to Literacy/, data driven tiered interventions, and Ready ELA and Math Instruction.

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

4th grade Math showed the greatest decline 20% from the previous year. They went from 90% to 70%. The biggest factor that contributed to this decline were that there were 2 teacher changes in the grade level. Students rolled up with a teacher from 3rd to 4th and that teacher resigned the second year in the Spring. The decline in scores could be directly related to this class.

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.

Two data areas have gaps. ELA lowest 25% was 6% (51% School, 57% State) below district average and 2% below our district average. 4th grade Math showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average. The school-state comparison was 6%.

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

5th grade Science showed the greatest improvement. They improved 23% going from 66% to 89% scoring a 3 or higher. We were 3rd in the district. We implemented a change in the way science was taught. We went from individual teachers each teaching a specific group of students, to departmentalization for Science/Math. Two teachers on the 5th grade team taught all the Science curriculum. They worked with Michelle Farro, the district science coordinator to test, develop, and

implement high-quality science instruction. They attended and presented at the state science conference (FAST) together to incorporate new ideas into their science lessons. Their team planning and consistency of teaching to the rigor of the standards played a major role in the improvement of our science scores. We will continue this method of teaching for the 2019-2020 school year.

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

One area of concern is 23 levels 1's currently in 5th grade. This shows a need for closing gaps, intervention, and differentiation. Contributing factors are a change in teacher mid year and a new teacher was hired for that class. Office referral/suspensions counts have increased in recent years. In 2018-19 school year, there were 234 accumulated referrals and in 2017-18 school year there were 119 referrals. In addition, we have seen an increase of students being referred to the counselor for social emotional issues.

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

1. ELA Lowest 25%. (Strengthen through core instruction and intervention)
2. Discipline and social emotional strategies.
3. Math Lowest 25%

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA Lowest 25% (Core instruction and Intervention)
Rationale	In the area of ELA, the school average was 51% which is below both the district average of 57%, and the state average of 53%. The overall lowest performing area for our school was ELA lowest 25% learning gains. Our school wants to see an increase in students moving to a Tier 1 (core instruction) group after a student has received intensive small group interventions. Students that don't show improvement will continue more intensive interventions and be brought up to address academic concerns with our IPST team.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Core Instruction: Overall ELA proficiency will increase from 51% to 56%. Intervention + Core Instruction: ELA learning gains for the lowest 25% will show a 5% increase in learning gains. Upon completion of intervention 5% of students identified as Tier 2 or Tier 3 will move into a Tier 1 group.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lori Braga (braga.lori@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Core Instruction: School wide writing across the content area that focuses on the targeted priority standards. Text based writing with complex text will be utilized to ensure students are mastering writing skills in every content area. Intervention: Walk to Literacy tiered-small group instruction using Barton, iReady Teacher Toolbox, Phonics Lesson Library, FCRR resources and Voyager.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Core Instruction: The problem seems to be occurring because of a misalignment between the level of the standard and the task complexity. If these two were more closely aligned with text based writing incorporated into daily tasks, we believe learning gains will increase. Intervention: In previous years grade level teams could determine how they provided intervention among students. It is possible that daily targeted intervention was not consistent among grade levels. By purposely incorporating school wide intervention time into the daily schedule, this will allow targeted intervention based on data. Literacy Coach will support teachers in determining the researched based intervention to match student need.
Action Step	
Description	Core Instruction: 1. Teachers will participate in i-Ready professional training provided by i-Ready trainers and Focus meetings with the Literacy Coach targeting diagnostic data and intervention tools to inform instruction and intervention. 2. Leadership team will create a strategic assessment plan, set specific standards driven goals for growth and proficiency, and monitor data. Teachers will be supported in using this data to drive instruction. 3. Analyze data during bi-weekly Data Chats with Literacy Coach, Administration, and i-Ready Trainers. 4. Determine domains where students are struggling and provide additional support, ie. teacher toolbox, differentiated activities, etc.

6. Our IPST will track the number of students that move from one Tier group to another.
7. This year we have a grade level representative on our school wide writing committee. Our school will work to implement a consistent writing plan using the TEA method and RACE strategies responding to complex text. Indialantic will have school wide writing days with prompts decided upon by our writing committee. Finished writing pieces will be shared in grade level and faculty meetings.
8. Classroom walk throughs using the IPG tool focusing on text complexity and standards focused instruction. Timely feedback will be provided to teachers to discuss areas of strength and improvement.
9. Each class will have a Focus Wall with updated standards for reference in lessons.

Intervention:

1. Daily school-wide scheduled time for Walk to Literacy. K-6 classes are scheduled during the same block.
2. Tier 2 & 3 students are targeted for small group instruction based on diagnostic data (IReady, KLS, p.s.i., QLA, formative and summative assessments)
3. Tier 1 and Gifted students are provided enrichment activities to enhance standards mastery.
4. Diagnostic data is collected. Teachers meet by-weekly for Data Chats with the Literacy Coach and Administration. Every six weeks we meet to discuss intervention strategies, successes, and student movement within the Tiers to determine if students need to be recommended to the Individual Problem Solving Team.
5. Ongoing Walk to Literacy intervention strategy PD will be provided by the Literacy Coach and Teacher Leaders.

**Person
Responsible**

Kim Donovan (donovan.kimberly@brevardschools.org)

#2	
Title	Implementation of Ready Math texts grades K-6
Rationale	The overall school average Math score decreased by 4% points from 2018 (80%) to 2019 (76%). Fourth grade decreased from 2018 (90%) to 2019 (70%) and sixth grade decreased from 2018 (78%) to 2019 (70%). Economically disadvantaged students increased learning gains from 2018 (50%) to 2019 (55%), while those in the lowest 25% decreased learning gains from 2018 (59%) to 2019 (46%). Students with disabilities made significant increase from 2018 (44%) to 2019 (61%), and those in the lowest 25% increased from 2018 (36%) to 2019 (72%).
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	During the 19-20 school year, the overall math learning gains will increase from 76% to 81%. Student who fall in the lowest 25%, with a special focus on economically disadvantaged students will increase from 46% to 51%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kim Donovan (donovan.kimberly@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Our school wide curriculum is horizontally and vertically aligned across the grade levels. The Florida Ready program by Curriculum Associates is designed to meet the rigor of the Florida Standards. All Florida Focus Math Standards are met through this curriculum. In additional, all grade levels are using common assessments in Mathematics. These assessments will be analyzed to determine areas of strengths and weaknesses, and adjustments will be made to achieve content mastery.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The rationale for selecting this strategy is to provide a level of consistency across grade levels. In previous years, even grade levels were providing different math programs that made it difficult for students as they progressed from grade to grade to firmly establish a common math language. Additionally using differing programs made it difficult for teachers to communicate through data discussions as few common assessments were being utilized.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Purchase Ready MAFS student workbooks for grades K-6. 2. IReady representative and Literacy Coach provide ongoing PD and support on MAFS program. 3. Create a strategic assessment plan, set specific standards driven goals for growth and proficiency, and monitor data. 4. Analyze data during bi-weekly Data Chats with Literacy Coach, Administration, and IReady Trainers. 5. Determine domains where students are struggling and provide additional support, ie. teacher toolbox, differentiated activities, etc.
Person Responsible	Kim Donovan (donovan.kimberly@brevardschools.org)

#3	
Title	Skills Streaming- Social Emotional Support program
Rationale	Teaching prosocial behavioral alternatives at an early age may enhance a child's personal development and help prevent more serious difficulties in later childhood, adolescence, and early adulthood. The Skills Streaming Program provides classroom teachers and others working with young children with guiding strategies and concrete techniques for instruction in prosocial skills.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Office referral/suspensions counts increased from 118 in the 2017-2018 school year to 234 in the 2018-2019 school year. Student office discipline referrals/suspensions will decrease by 5% for the 2019-20 school year. We have seen an increase of students being referred to the counselor for social emotional issues. In the 2019-20 school year, this number will decrease by 5%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lori Braga (braga.lori@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Students are coming to school unequipped to deal with real life situations. Additionally students, perhaps due to an increase of technology use, are experiencing social isolation and often seem to lack a sense of belonging. By incorporating the Skills Streaming Model, students will have an opportunity to engage in role playing, get and provide feedback, and practice the skills they have acquired.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will utilize the Act like AKT (always respectful, kind and truthful) program to teach and discuss for understanding on how to behave in a kind, respectful and truthful way in all social situations. Students will learn to deal with social emotional issues by practicing activities from the Skills Streaming Program.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Secure District Trainer to provide professional development on Skills Streaming SE Program. 2. Incorporate Skills Streaming activities once a week through Walk to Literacy preschedule time. 3. SE Committee will provide support to each grade level through age appropriate lesson development. 4. SE Committee will provide ongoing meetings to reflect and continuing growing the social emotional focus. 5. School wide roll out of Act Like AKT book
Person Responsible	Julie Schneider (schneider.julie@brevardschools.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).

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA Lowest 25% (Core instruction and Intervention)				\$7,399.08
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	520-Textbooks	6081 - Indialantic Elementary School	General Fund		\$7,399.08
			<i>Notes: Student and Teacher Workbooks</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Implementation of Ready Math texts grades K-6				\$8,220.69
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
	5100	520-Textbooks	6081 - Indialantic Elementary School	General Fund		\$8,220.69
			<i>Notes: Teacher and Student Workbooks</i>			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Skills Streaming- Social Emotional Support program				\$0.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			6081 - Indialantic Elementary School			\$0.00
			<i>Notes: District Social Emotional Grant Awarded at the end of the 2017/2018 School Year for \$1500.</i>			
Total:						\$15,619.77