

Brevard Public Schools

Ocean Breeze 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	0

Ocean Breeze Elementary School

1101 CHEYENNE DR, Indian Harbour Beach, FL 32937

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

Demographics

Principal: Shelley Michaud

Start Date for this Principal: 7/9/2018

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)	26%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (73%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: A (70%) 2015-16: A (71%) 2014-15: A (71%)
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	0

Ocean Breeze Elementary School

1101 CHEYENNE DR, Indian Harbour Beach, FL 32937

<http://www.ocean.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	31%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	19%

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.

Ocean Breeze Elementary School's mission is to develop motivated and confident life-long learners who are prepared for future challenges (updated 2019).

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to maintain a safe, respectful, and inclusive school community where responsibility for learning is shared, and everyone counts. Ocean Breeze will nurture and encourage every child to discover personal strengths and talents, develop a passion for learning, and acquire the skills to be a creative and collaborative problem solver. (updated 2019).

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
Michaud, Shelley	Principal	Oversee the day to day operations of the school including: fiscal monitoring, data analysis, supervision and evaluation, curriculum and instructional planning, behavior management, facilitate collegiality and collaboration, engaging stakeholders, talent recruitment and management, and all other duties necessary in building leadership.
Hill-Brodigan, Elizabeth	Assistant Principal	Assist the principal in overseeing the day to day operations of the school including: fiscal monitoring, data analysis, supervision and evaluation, curriculum and instructional planning, behavior management, facilitate collegiality and collaboration, engaging stakeholders, talent recruitment and management, and all other duties necessary in building leadership.
Del Vecchio, Francine	Instructional Coach	Support teachers with the collection and analysis of student data to inform instructional decisions based on data and promote student performance growth. Model and support best practice literacy instruction.

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	86	77	79	73	72	91	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	552
Attendance below 90 percent	9	5	5	5	4	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
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	1	18	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	18	17	17	29	24	31	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	158

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	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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)

44

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/19/2019

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	10	6	8	12	11	13	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	6	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	80%	62%	57%	80%	63%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	68%	60%	58%	64%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	57%	53%	45%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	81%	63%	63%	83%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	79%	65%	62%	79%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	53%	51%	68%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	76%	57%	53%	74%	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	86 (0)	77 (0)	79 (0)	73 (0)	72 (0)	91 (0)	74 (0)	552 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	9 ()	5 ()	5 ()	5 ()	4 ()	4 ()	6 ()	38 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (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)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	18 (0)	9 (0)	28 (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	77%	63%	14%	57%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	73%	61%	12%	58%	15%
	2018	75%	57%	18%	56%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	84%	60%	24%	56%	28%
	2018	66%	54%	12%	55%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
06	2019	80%	60%	20%	54%	26%
	2018	67%	63%	4%	52%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	77%	61%	16%	62%	15%
	2018	79%	62%	17%	62%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	71%	64%	7%	64%	7%
	2018	73%	59%	14%	62%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	79%	60%	19%	60%	19%
	2018	80%	58%	22%	61%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
06	2019	95%	67%	28%	55%	40%
	2018	84%	68%	16%	52%	32%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	74%	56%	18%	53%	21%
	2018	77%	57%	20%	55%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
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	51	55	52	57	67	64	40				
HSP	88	78		92	76						
MUL	88	82		71	82						
WHT	81	67	67	84	81	73	75				
FRL	73	68	64	73	66	59	61				
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	29	30	25	27	39	33	31				
BLK	40			20							
HSP	73	40		82	67						
MUL	86	60		91	93						
WHT	71	52	35	81	70	58	77				
FRL	62	40	22	68	65	56	57				
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	49	57	44	54	64	56	30				
HSP	82	71		76	79						
MUL	95			84							
WHT	79	62	43	83	79	68	72				
FRL	75	61	50	78	77	67	71				

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	73
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	514
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	55
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	84
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	81
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	75
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	66
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 lowest data component was ELA achievement for students with disabilities. While above State and district average, this is an area in which we were targeted for support and intervention in 2017-2018.

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

We improved in all areas, however we had the smallest gains in math learning gains and math learning gains for the lowest 25% for our economically disadvantaged group (MLG 65% to 66% and MLGL25 56%-59%).

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.

All of our scores were above state average, however we saw the smallest difference above state average in our science scores among white students (75.5 OB, 69.8 State).

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

Proficiency among the ESE subgroup showed the most improvement. We purchased the iReady instructional component for the lowest 25% in grades 3-6. SMART/intervention time was more focused on tiered interventions and student needs.

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

In looking at the EWS data, I was not able to filter the student data for 2018-2019 to look at the number of students with 2+ EWS indicators. However, for 2019-2020, we have 158 students with 2+ early warning indicators which is roughly 28% of our student population.

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

1. ESE subgroup
2. Learning gains especially for lowest 25%
3. Economically disadvantaged
4. School-wide positive behavior support/social emotional learning
5. Parent engagement opportunities

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1

Title Increase ELA and math proficiency in ESE subgroup

Rationale We were targeted for support and improvement by the state for our students with disabilities subgroup in 2017-2018 but not in 2018-2019. Due to the 3 year analysis, process we will continue to implement strategies to support growth in proficiency for students with disabilities.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve We will increase ESE student proficiency in ELA from 51% to 60% and ESE math proficiency from 56% to 65%. 4th grade staff will attend training on inclusion to implement differentiated strategies. In addition, all staff will receive training and support in tiered instruction and small group interventions. Teacher practice will change through consistent implementation of interventions for our ESE students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome Shelley Michaud (michaud.shelley@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy Teachers will analyze student data and focus individual interventions and goals and objectives on student growth. The iReady instructional component will be implemented 45 min. per subject/per wk.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy Our implementation of targeted interventions and the iReady instructional component aided in our not score below the 41% federal index in this subgroup in 2018-2019.

Action Step

Description

1. iReady instructional component utilized 45 mins. per wk/per subject.
2. Tiered interventions during SMART time.
3. Have ESE students push in as much as possible into grade level math and ELA courses.
4. ESE teachers will join grade level PLC groups monthly to review student data
5. Target the top 50% of level 2's for learning gains.

Person Responsible Shelley Michaud (michaud.shelley@brevardschools.org)

#2	
Title	Increase the percentage of all students making learning gains with a focus on the lowest 25%
Rationale	68% of all students made ELA learning gains and only 65% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in 2018-2019. Only 65% of the lowest 25% made learning gains in math.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	At least 70% of all students will make a learning gains in ELA and math, including the lowest 25%. Staff will work to develop and implement differentiated strategies. In addition, all staff will receive training and support in tiered instruction and small group interventions. Teacher practice will change in that they will consistently implement interventions for struggling students. ESE staff will attend monthly PLC and data meetings with classroom teachers to review student performance data and discuss growth strategies. Teachers will implement the iReady instructional component with fidelity for our lowest learners (45 mins. p/wk p/subject).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Francine Del Vecchio (delvecchio.francine@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Implementing tiered interventions targeted at learning gains and the iReady instructional component for the lowest 25% of students 3-6. The lowest performers in K-2 will have access to Lexia.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Our implementation of targeted interventions and the iReady instructional component aided in our growth last year and not being identified for support and intervention for learning gains and learning gains for the lowest 25%.
Action Step	
Description	1. iReady instructional component utilized 45 mins. per wk/per subject. 2. Tiered interventions during SMART time. 3. Target the top 50% of level 2's for learning gains. 4. Monthly grade level PLC groups review lowest 25% student improvement data to adjust instruction and interventions.
Person Responsible	Francine Del Vecchio (delvecchio.francine@brevardschools.org)

#3	
Title	Implement a school wide positive behavior system to enhance social emotional learning
Rationale	School wide rules exist, however there is not a school-wide positive behavior focus. Our quest is to implement a unified program focused on the following four traits: Cooperate, Achieve, Respect, Empathy to reinforce our social emotional learning program.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The total number of discipline referral incidents will decrease by 20%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Elizabeth Hill-Brodigan (hill-brodigan.elizabeth@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Implement a school-wide positive behavior support system focused on CARE (cooperate, achieve, respect, empathize), redesign the student recognition program centered on the CARE characteristics, and promote SEL through classroom implementation of the Sanford Harmony program.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The number of documented behavior incidents increased from 33 in 2018 to 127 in 2019. This increase was largely due to more accurate documentation in AS400 and more accurate reporting of incidents of restraint. One of the issues brought up in our BPIE was that we do not have a school-wide/consistent program in place. School-wide implementation of positive behavior and student recognition programs have proven to reduce behavior incidents. Observation of the PATHS and Sanford Harmony lessons, student recognition, and behavior data will be used to assess effectiveness.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Share the CARE slogan with all students and staff- Administration will have CARE posters made to display throughout the building. 2. Expressly teach what CARE means in all classes and the various areas of the building. Staff will specifically identify Cooperation Achievement Respect and Empathy in various locations throughout the building. These will be administrative "look fors" in classrooms. Students will participate in describing and identifying these attributes through a variety of mediums (e.g. skits, writing, photos, demonstrations, drawings, etc...). 3. Embed Sanford Harmony SEL strategies in daily classroom instruction. Administrators will "look for" Sanford Harmony/SEL strategies when conducting learning walks. 4. Recognize students who exemplify the CARE concepts- student of the week/month awards. The assistant principal will lead a school-wide recognition program focused on CARE concepts. Grade level staff will designate students weekly/monthly to receive recognition from administration. 5. Engage students in SEL activities and assemblies and engage parents in SEL information sessions and learning opportunities. The school counselor, administrators, and SAC will promote parent engagement activities related to SEL. Students will attend assemblies on SEL topics.
Person Responsible	Elizabeth Hill-Brodigan (hill-brodigan.elizabeth@brevardschools.org)

#4	
Title	Increase the number of economically disadvantaged students making learning gains math.
Rationale	While we improved in this area from 2018 to 2019, the gains were extremely small (65 to 66 and 56-59).
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	At least 70% of ED students will make learning gains in math (including the lowest 25% of ED students). Staff will work to develop and implement tiered instruction and small group interventions for ED students. Teacher practice will change in that they will consistently implement math interventions for ED students. Teachers will meet in grade level PLCs monthly to review student performance data and discuss growth strategies.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Shelley Michaud (michaud.shelley@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers will analyze ED student data and focus individual interventions on learning gains. The iReady instructional component will be implemented 45 min. per wk.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Our implementation of targeted interventions and the iReady instructional component aided in our growth last year, and we were not identified for support and intervention for our economically disadvantaged population. However, since we made such small gains in that area, we will target this subgroup.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. iReady instructional component utilized 45 mins. per wk in math 2. Tiered interventions during SMART time. 3. PLC data chats to review math data for ED students LG's and L25%LG's 4. Target economically disadvantaged students for learning gains in math on Performance matters.
Person Responsible	Shelley Michaud (michaud.shelley@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).