School District of Indian River County

Fellsmere Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics 3

Purpose and Outline of the SIP 4

School Information 7

Needs Assessment 11

Planning for Improvement 15

Positive Culture & Environment 22

Budget to Support Goals 22

Fellsmere Elementary School

50 N CYPRESS ST, Fellsmere, FL 32948

www.indianriverschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Ramon Echeverria J

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (46%)
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	TS&I

* 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 Indian River 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 11

Planning for Improvement 15

Title I Requirements 0

Budget to Support Goals 22

Fellsmere Elementary School

50 N CYPRESS ST, Fellsmere, FL 32948

www.indianriverschools.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	85%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Indian River 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.

We exist to empower globally competent learners, while bridging cultures, languages, and academics. Gallop for Success...Nothing Less!

Provide the school's vision statement.

As educators, we strive to create an environment that engages students in challenging and globally empowering curricula that results in a high level of achievement.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Echeverria, Ramon	Principal	Data analysis and monitoring. Walkthroughs and classroom Observations with feedback.
Justice, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	Data analysis and monitoring. Walkthroughs and classroom Observations with feedback.
Essig, Paula	Instructional Coach	Math Coach K-5
Marsiglia, Judy	Administrative Support	Administrative Assistant to the Principal
Farmer, Dionna	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach
Arce, Annie	School Counselor	Support FES Culture and Climate; PBIS Coordinator and Attendance Support.
Robertson, Meaghan	Teacher, K-12	Science Coordinator 3-5, Grade level chairman 5th grade
marsiglia, lilly	Teacher, K-12	Science Coordinator Grades K-2, 2nd grade teacher

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Ramon Echeverria J

Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*

39

Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

40

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: C (53%) 2016-17: C (49%) 2015-16: C (46%)
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	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

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	91	97	80	91	111	73	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	543
Attendance below 90 percent	14	12	12	11	18	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	71
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	16	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	12	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	2	6	4	7	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

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	0	2	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/22/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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	94	81	82	122	73	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	548
Attendance below 90 percent	0	8	8	5	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	15	19	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	1	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	
Number of students enrolled	94	81	82	122	73	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	548
Attendance below 90 percent	0	8	8	5	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	15	19	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	1	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times	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	41%	58%	57%	36%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	46%	57%	58%	52%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	54%	53%	53%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	57%	63%	63%	48%	60%	61%
Math Learning Gains	67%	60%	62%	62%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	63%	48%	51%	62%	51%	51%
Science Achievement	37%	54%	53%	32%	48%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	45%	60%	-15%	58%	-13%
	2018	50%	56%	-6%	57%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	45%	61%	-16%	58%	-13%
	2018	40%	56%	-16%	56%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	30%	54%	-24%	56%	-26%
	2018	31%	52%	-21%	55%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	51%	64%	-13%	62%	-11%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	56%	60%	-4%	62%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	64%	-1%	64%	-1%
	2018	54%	63%	-9%	62%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	53%	57%	-4%	60%	-7%
	2018	54%	58%	-4%	61%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	35%	53%	-18%	53%	-18%
	2018	46%	54%	-8%	55%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
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	12	38	50	25	63	65	5				
ELL	37	45	52	55	67	68	30				
HSP	40	46	49	58	68	64	37				
WHT	45	40		55	60						
FRL	41	46	50	57	67	63	37				

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	12	28	40	29	56	50	29				
ELL	33	42	52	50	66	59	26				
BLK	27	30		18	60						
HSP	39	42	45	57	73	62	46				
WHT	58	43		66	67		69				
FRL	41	42	47	57	71	63	50				

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	11	56	58	25	53	55					
ELL	21	45	58	39	60	69	11				
BLK	29	62		31	64						
HSP	36	52	52	49	62	61	32				
WHT	41	50		44	64						
FRL	36	52	53	48	62	62	32				

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	52
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	56
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	417
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	51
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
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

Multiracial Students	
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

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	52
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	52
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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.

Science achievement showed the lowest performance. One of the contributing factors was science not being a priority in other grade levels. We need to be more mindful of science planning at other grade levels, beyond science. Our students with disabilities subgroup is also below the 41%, and they are at 38%.

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

Science was the area that showed the greatest decline from the prior year. The decline was from 57% proficiency to 37%. We feel that we did not maintain a consistency that we had in years past, with science training, planning and deliberate instruction at all grade levels. This is an area of focus that we were already working on last year in the 2019-20 school year.

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.

Our ELA learning gains and our science proficiency had the greatest gap when compared to the state average.

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

Math learning gains showed the greatest improvement. Our school was working with our instructional coach, using modelling, and being strategic with our data analysis.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Attendance was an area of concern. Last year, we put practices in place to better communicate with families, and work to improve attendance among students that were at less than 90%

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

1. Science Instruction
2. Formative Assessments
3. Dual Language Program implementation
4. Attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Implement the evidence based strategy of formative assessments, with strategic learning targets in ELA. This was identified as a critical need based on school data from FSA, unit assessments and school level assessments.
Measurable Outcome:	Overall proficiency in ELA scores will increase from 41% to 50% or greater.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Justice (jennifer.justice@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Formative Assessments
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The average effect size for other-directed formative assessment was positive and substantively important (Klute, et al. 2017). The results of this study confirm the overall positive effect of formative assessment reported in earlier reviews (Black & Wiliam, 1998a, 1998b; Kingston & Nash, 2011, 2015). This consistency with previous reviews, along with the requirement that studies meet evidence standards to be included, lends continuing support to the claim that formative assessment has a positive impact on student academic achievement. Based on their meta-analysis, Black and Wiliam (1998) report effect sizes of between .4 and .7 in favor of students taught in classrooms where formative assessment was employed (Popham 2008, 19). The essential argument put forth by these and other numerous advocates is that empirical research proves formative assessment causes medium to very large achievement gains (Bennett, 2011).

Action Steps to Implement	
Set expectations for weekly planning meetings for all teachers with instructional coaches. These meetings will include planning for common learning targets, and the development of daily formative assessments.	
Person Responsible	Ramon Echeverria (ramon.echeverria@indianriverschools.org)
Monitor at least one formative weekly- reporting to grade level teams, sharing this data in grade level SharePoint for common access and reflection.	
Person Responsible	Dionna Farmer (dionna.farmer@indianriverschools.org)
Participate in data chats with coaches, administration, interventionist and grade level teams, looking at the data, and student placement in intervention groups. At this time, we will also be reflective of our Tier 1 instructional practices.	
Person Responsible	Ramon Echeverria (ramon.echeverria@indianriverschools.org)
Monitoring formatives based on learning targets will occur in a variety of ways: Walk-throughs, instructional rounds, grade level data chats, formal and informal observations.	
Person Responsible	Jennifer Justice (jennifer.justice@indianriverschools.org)

Provide additional training and PD, as needed, from coaches on learning targets, and how those align to formatives.

Person Responsible	Paula Essig (paula.essig@indianriverschools.org)

Repeat this cycle, and plan for PD, coaching cycles, and data chats as needed.

Person Responsible	Ramon Echeverria (ramon.echeverria@indianriverschools.org)

#2. Other specifically relating to School Theme Dual Language	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Dual Language Instruction- English instruction in Language Arts, and Math. Spanish instruction in Language Arts, Social Studies, and Science. Instruction is designed intentionally to connect the two languages. Students from both native languages learn to speak, read, write and comprehend in both languages, using higher levels of cognitive skills, becoming biliterate, and raising multicultural awareness.

Measurable Outcome:	Increase proficiency in both languages. This will be measurable with the growth of our Dual Language students being equal to, or greater than the average district growth for Kindergarten classrooms.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ramon Echeverria (ramon.echeverria@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Bridge Lesson. A lesson co-taught by both teachers, in order to connect the two languages.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The focus of the Bridge is language—specifically, the metalinguistic analysis of language. Research in the field of biliteracy finds that bilinguals who recognize, understand, and can articulate the similarities and differences between their languages reach higher levels of academic achievement and higher levels of language development in both languages (Cummins et al., 2005; DeJong, 2011; Dressler, Carlo, Snow, August, & White, 2011; Jiménez, García, & Pearson, 1996).

Action Steps to Implement	
Analysis of students language proficiency in both languages, as a baseline measure	
Person Responsible	sara hulings (sara.hulings@indianriverschools.org)
On-going Dual Language training for teachers will occur with the University of Central Florida.	
Person Responsible	Ramon Echeverria (ramon.echeverria@indianriverschools.org)
Monitor the delivery of instruction in Dual Language classrooms through administrative walk-throughs and observations.	
Person Responsible	Jennifer Justice (jennifer.justice@indianriverschools.org)
Provide opportunities for collaborative planning between the Co-Teachers, instructional coaches, and the traditional Kindergarten team based on data collected from assessments or observations.	
Person Responsible	Jennifer Justice (jennifer.justice@indianriverschools.org)
Repeat the cycle for assessments, observations and data analysis.	
Person Responsible	Ramon Echeverria (ramon.echeverria@indianriverschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	After data analysis we determined a need for improved instructional practices in science. We strive to help students develop critical thinking skills and take responsibility for their learning in the area of science. One of our areas of focus was students with disabilities, and increasing this practice in science will increase their achievement in this area. Another area of focus will be with our African American subgroup, in this area of science
Measurable Outcome:	Through classroom walkthroughs, we will see greater delivery of 5 E instruction being implemented. We will increase our state science scores from 37% proficiency to 55% proficiency or greater.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ramon Echeverria (ramon.echeverria@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Inquiry Based Instruction (5 E's: Engage, Explore, Explain, Elaborate, Evaluate)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research suggests that inquiry-based science instruction enhances students' understanding of concepts in science and increases students' interest in the field (Hoftsein and Mamlok-Naaman 2007).

Action Steps to Implement	
Provide teachers with ongoing professional development in the area of science, to improve planning and implementation of lessons.	
Person Responsible	Jennifer Justice (jennifer.justice@indianriverschools.org)
Teacher will engage Students with picture observations, video clips, and demonstrations for example	
Person Responsible	Aleida Gamez (aleida.gamez@indianriverschools.org)
Teachers will guide the students to explore with hands on activities and digital simulations.	
Person Responsible	Meaghan Robertson (meaghan.morales@indianriverschools.org)
Teacher provides resources that explain the science content through texts, articles and literacy materials.	
Person Responsible	Aleida Gamez (aleida.gamez@indianriverschools.org)
Evaluation of effectiveness of our planning and teaching will be through formatives and unit assessments. We will adjust Science instruction after data analysis.	
Person Responsible	Meaghan Robertson (meaghan.morales@indianriverschools.org)
Observations of this practice will be made by instructional coaches and administration through walk-throughs and feedback will be given to the teachers.	
Person Responsible	Jennifer Justice (jennifer.justice@indianriverschools.org)

No description entered

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We have identified a need for increasing student attendance, based off of our attendance data and trends from previous years. We have families that need support and encouragement to not take extending time off during the school year, and some families who need support on day to day attendance.
Measurable Outcome:	Through focus on attendance, and supporting our families in variety of ways, we will see in increase in student attendance, virtually or in person. We will measure attendance through Power BI -specifically looking at Early Warning Indicators (students fallen below 90% attendance).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ramon Echeverria (ramon.echeverria@indianriverschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Chronic early absence matters because it adversely affects academic successes and affects large numbers of children, especially in some communities and schools. NCCP's national data analysis found that chronic absence in kindergarten is associated with lower academic performance in first grade for all children regardless of gender, ethnicity or socioeconomic status. The relationship is especially strong for Latino children, who had much lower first grade readings scores if they were chronically absent in kindergarten. Source: Romero, M. & Lee, Y. 2008. A National Portrait of Chronic Absenteeism in the Early Grades: Technical Report. New York: National Center for Children in Poverty
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Attendance and truancy issues, both predictors of dropping out of school, are community problems, not just school problems. Therefore, improving student attendance is a goal for our school.

Action Steps to Implement	
Provide online work through Canvas for families that are experiencing need to be at home	
Person Responsible	Jennifer Justice (jennifer.justice@indianriverschools.org)
Contact families by phone, class DOJO or email to support daily attendance	
Person Responsible	Ramon Echeverria (ramon.echeverria@indianriverschools.org)
Implement a mentoring program for students in need, with IB students from Sebastian River High School, to encourage attendance, and value of time spent on task at school.	
Person Responsible	Annie Arce (annie.arce@indianriverschools.org)
Home visits will be made when possible by administration, to support our families and make the focus on attendance possible.	
Person Responsible	Ramon Echeverria (ramon.echeverria@indianriverschools.org)
Celebrate attendance with awards, weekly classroom recognition for students, and incentives- post COVID 19.	

Person Responsible Annie Arce (annie.arce@indianriverschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

The school leadership team will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities by continuing to have positive growth mindset.

Part IV: 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 to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. 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.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

We will be working to empower our teachers to be leaders on the campus in a variety of times and places. We will be working on teacher, through our goals of constant, consistent communication.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**				**$19,000.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	750-Other Personal Services	0101 - Fellsmere Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$9,000.00
			Notes: Each teacher(29) having a full day of data chats to drive the formative assessments in Oct., Jan., March			
	6400	120-Classroom Teachers	0101 - Fellsmere Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$2,000.00
			Notes: Workshop training for formative assessments - extra for staff attending outside contractual hours			

	6400	310-Professional and Technical Services	0101 - Fellsmere Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$3,000.00
			Notes: Workshop training for formative assessments - trainer			
	5100	510-Supplies	0101 - Fellsmere Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$5,000.00
			Notes: supplies for classroom instruction based on the formative assessments			
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Other: School Theme Dual Language**				**$19,000.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6400	330-Travel	0101 - Fellsmere Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$9,000.00
			Notes: Training and developing new teachers in dual language			
	6400	750-Other Personal Services	0101 - Fellsmere Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$3,000.00
			Notes: Subs to cover during training for dual language			
	5100	510-Supplies	0101 - Fellsmere Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$5,000.00
			Notes: Supplies and supplemental materials			
	6400	310-Professional and Technical Services	0101 - Fellsmere Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$2,000.00
			Notes: Dual Language consultant for training/workshop school wide development			
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science**				**$10,000.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	510-Supplies	0101 - Fellsmere Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$10,000.00
			Notes: Science instructional supplies including mini ipads for the robotics gadgets			
4	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance**				**$1,500.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	6110	510-Supplies	0101 - Fellsmere Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$1,500.00
			Notes: Supplies for increasing students attendance			
					Total:	**$49,500.00**