

Volusia County Schools

# Indian River Elementary School



## 2020-21 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>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>20</b>

# Indian River Elementary School

650 ROBERTS RD, Edgewater, FL 32141

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/indianriver/pages/default.aspx>

## Demographics

Principal: Jennifer Holmgreen L

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: B (57%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia 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](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>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>20</b>

## Indian River Elementary School

650 ROBERTS RD, Edgewater, FL 32141

<http://myvolusiaschools.org/school/indianriver/pages/default.aspx>

### 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	77%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	13%

### School Grades History

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

### School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Volusia 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, the Indian River faculty, staff, students and parents respectfully encourage each other to excel with enthusiasm, excitement and energy as we responsibly explore the world around us.

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

The vision of Indian River Elementary School is to provide our children with educational programs of the highest value, along with related services of worth, in an environment that is safe, healthy, happy and orderly. The cooperative efforts of the family, the community and the school will guarantee to every student the opportunity to develop the knowledge and values necessary to be an informed citizen.

### 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
Holmgreen, Jennifer	Principal	
Salzano, Sara	Teacher, K-12	
Turnbow, Tina	Teacher, K-12	
Stevens, Ruth	Teacher, K-12	
Hughes-Norman, Crissy	Teacher, K-12	
Graham, Tracy	Instructional Technology	
Cameron, Theresa	Teacher, K-12	
Barefield, Amanda	Teacher, ESE	
Gonzalo, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	
Baird, Christine	Instructional Coach	
Flanagan, Ann Marie	Teacher, PreK	
Slifkin, Kristy	Teacher, K-12	
Orzo, Rosemary	Teacher, K-12	
Turner, Cynthia	Teacher, K-12	

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Monday 6/1/2020, Jennifer Holmgreen L

**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.*

**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.*

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

52

### Demographic Data

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: C (50%) 2015-16: B (57%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

### 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	58	78	71	75	93	91	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	466
Attendance below 90 percent	5	7	3	3	9	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
One or more suspensions	1	2	1	3	13	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA	0	1	0	0	3	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	13	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	20	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

**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	2	17	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

**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	1	2	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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**

Friday 5/29/2020

**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	88	78	86	100	116	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	563
Attendance below 90 percent	13	14	13	21	17	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
One or more suspensions	2	3	1	5	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
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	12	16	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

**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	2	1	7	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

**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	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	88	78	86	100	116	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	563
Attendance below 90 percent	13	14	13	21	17	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	98
One or more suspensions	2	3	1	5	6	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
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	12	16	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43

**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	2	1	7	8	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

**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	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
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	63%	56%	57%	56%	55%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	60%	56%	58%	55%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	46%	53%	41%	44%	52%
Math Achievement	64%	59%	63%	57%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	57%	56%	62%	51%	58%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	43%	51%	30%	47%	51%
Science Achievement	62%	57%	53%	58%	59%	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	69%	58%	11%	58%	11%
	2018	58%	56%	2%	57%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	56%	54%	2%	58%	-2%
	2018	51%	54%	-3%	56%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	60%	54%	6%	56%	4%
	2018	54%	51%	3%	55%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	66%	60%	6%	62%	4%
	2018	60%	58%	2%	62%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	66%	59%	7%	64%	2%
	2018	73%	60%	13%	62%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
05	2019	57%	54%	3%	60%	-3%
	2018	60%	57%	3%	61%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-16%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	62%	56%	6%	53%	9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	53%	56%	-3%	55%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
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	34	55	50	37	59	52	41				
HSP	60			33							
MUL	60			65							
WHT	64	62	49	66	60	50	62				
FRL	60	59	53	61	56	45	54				
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	24	31	32	40	53	42	14				
BLK	20			40							
HSP	67	73		60	73						
MUL	39	40		56	67						
WHT	60	54	42	70	71	57	57				
FRL	52	54	50	60	65	57	49				
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	16	33	32	15	30	28	20				
BLK	25	45		31	36						
HSP	50			33							
MUL	42	54		53	46						
WHT	60	55	43	60	52	30	61				
FRL	51	49	33	49	43	28	56				

### 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	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
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	403
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	47
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	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	47
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	63
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	59
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	55
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.**

Math Lowest 25th Percentile - 44% (decrease of 12%)

A contributing factor to this low performance could be lack of rigor during small group instruction and low teacher clarity regarding standards.

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

Math learning gains - 57% (13% decline from previous year)

A contributing factor to this decline could be due to instructional staff changes. (i.e. teachers new to grade level, teachers new to curriculum, teacher clarity regarding standards)

**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.**

Indian River Elementary's scores are at or above the state.

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

Science - 62% (8% increase)

New actions contributing to this increase include: IXL, departmentalization, and supplemental resource opportunities for students, strong Collective Teacher Efficacy.

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

After reflecting on the EWS from part I, one area of concern is the number of students with failing grades (D, F). A second area of concern is the level 1's from FSA.

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

1. Increase academic achievement for students in the lowest quartile in math.
2. Increase the awareness level of SEL (social emotional learning).
3. Increase academic achievement for students in ELA.

## **Part III: Planning for Improvement**

**Areas of Focus:**

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	Students in the lowest quartile scored 44% in the area of math for learning gains. This was a decrease of 12 percentage points from the previous school year.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Indian River will increase learning gains for students in the lowest quartile in the area of Math by 14 percentage points moving from 44 points to 58 points.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Christine Baird (clbaird@volusia.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Ready Math intervention resources. IXL Math digital resource 3 Intervention teachers to support lowest quartile (tier 3) students Grade level departmentalizing for focused instruction
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	Students in the lowest quartile could be 2 or more years below grade level. Response to Intervention has an effect size of 1.29 which equates to approximately 3 years of growth according to John Hattie's research. Providing additional instruction through the use of intervention models and research based resources, students will grow academically. Response to intervention (RTI) is an educational approach that provides early, systematic assistance to children who are struggling in one or many areas of their learning. RTI seeks to prevent academic failure through early intervention and frequent progress measurement.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Provide time in master schedule for intervention. Mrs. Holmgreen will provide the additional time in our master schedule.
2. Provide research-based materials for instruction. (i.e. Ready Math, IXL Math digital resource) (Academic Coach/Intervention Teachers) Academic coach will provide face to face training in the implementation of IXL and Ready Math. Monitored with report print outs.
3. Provide certified teachers to deliver instruction. All teachers Highly Qualified.
4. Provide professional learning in the area of math (i.e. 3 Act Task Math) Canvas self paced training.
5. Provide coaching and modeling in the area of math (Academic Coach/Intervention Teachers) Monitored through coaching schedules.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Holmgreen (jlholmgr@volusia.k12.fl.us)



**#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Due to the recent pandemic and a high number of classroom referrals for low-level behaviors, the school plans to support students and staff in the area of emotional intelligence. By implementing social emotional learning strategies the school will increase appropriate classroom behavior and decrease discipline referrals.

**Measurable Outcome:** Due to a high number of classroom referrals for low-level behaviors, the school plans to support students and staff in the area of emotional intelligence. By implementing social emotional learning strategies the school will increase appropriate classroom behavior and increase classroom engagement. The goal is to decrease behaviors by 10%. We will use the EWS reports.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Jennifer Holmgreen (jlholmgr@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** RULER is an evidence-based approach for integrating social and emotional learning into schools, developed at the Yale Center for Emotional Intelligence.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** RULER applies “hard science” to the teaching of what have historically been called “soft skills.” RULER teaches the skills of emotional intelligence — those associated with recognizing, understanding, labeling, expressing, and regulating emotion. Decades of research show that these skills are essential to effective teaching and learning, sound decision making, physical and mental health, and success in school and beyond.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. School will provide additional training on RULER and restorative practice. Behavior leadership team will provide the training.
2. School will continue implement RULER campus-wide. Teachers are responsible for implementation.
3. School will continue to hold behavior expectation assemblies for grades 1-5. Mrs. Holmgreen will conduct assemblies.
4. School will continue to support teachers with restorative practices. Behavior leadership team will provide the support.
5. School will implement Breath for Change program school wide. Ann Marie Flannagan will provide the training and teachers will implement.

**Person Responsible** Amanda Barefield (abbarefi@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

<b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>	School and state data indicate that learning achievement and learning gains in ELA has increased. It is not considered a critical need however, the desire to maintain or increase for school grade is the goal.
<b>Measurable Outcome:</b>	Indian River will increase learning gains for students in the lowest quartile in the area of ELA by 9 percentage points moving from 53 points to 62 points.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b>	Jennifer Holmgreen (jlholmgr@volusia.k12.fl.us)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Intervention Teacher for each grade level.</li> <li>2. Research based resources (Ready Reading, IReady).</li> <li>3. Walk to Intervention.</li> </ol>
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>	<p>Providing additional instruction through the use of intervention models and research based resources, students will grow academically.</p> <p>Response to intervention (RTI) is an educational approach that provides early, systematic assistance to children who are struggling in one or many areas of their learning. RTI seeks to prevent academic failure through early intervention and frequent progress measurement.</p>

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Provide time in master schedule for intervention. Mrs. Holmgreen will provide additional time into our daily block schedule.
2. Provide research-based materials for instruction. (i.e. Ready Reading, IReady Instruction digital resource) (Academic Coach/Intervention Teachers) Academic coach will provide face to face training in the implementation of IReady and Ready Reading. Monitored with report print outs.
3. Provide certified teachers to deliver instruction. All teachers are highly qualified.
5. Provide coaching and modeling in the area of ELA (Academic Coach/Intervention Teachers) Monitored through their daily schedules.

**Person Responsible** Jennifer Holmgreen (jlholmgr@volusia.k12.fl.us)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**After reflecting on the EWS from part I, one area of concern is the number of students with failing grades (D, F). A second area of concern is the level 1's from FSA. These areas of focus were chosen because they mirror our focus for the SIP. If we improve these areas, our goals will be met.**

**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.

The School Advisory Council (SAC) meets every month and is responsible for the planning, review, and improvement of the Title I program. All parents, staff, and community are invited to be members of the Indian River Elementary SAC. SAC members including all stakeholders and broad stakeholders provide input on the Parent and Family Engagement Plan and the Title I budget, Parent Teacher Student Compact as well as all other plans related to school improvement. Parent surveys are also used to solicit parent input. Comments from parents are documented on SAC meeting minutes.

Workshops and meetings will be scheduled at different times to accommodate parents' varying schedules and availability. Meetings may be scheduled in the morning, afternoon, or evening. For the time being, all meetings shall be done virtually via Teams or Zoom. For example, activities such as, Meet the Teacher, Open House, SAC and school wide family activities are held in the evening. Generally, SAC meetings are held in the mornings and some evenings. Input for the School Improvement Plan and Parent and Family Engagement Plan is solicited from parents and all stakeholders; we schedule input times in the morning, afternoon, and evening to ensure that parents can participate. Teachers schedule conferences at different times to accommodate parents' varying schedules and availability. School Social Worker is utilized for home visits to provide parents without transportation access to information or documents which require signatures.

Information about programs, meetings and activities will be provided through newsletters, booklets/ brochures, and informational Power Points via electronically. The Title I Parent and Family Engagement Plan brochure and Title I booklet are distributed with students take home beginning of the year paperwork or sent electronically to Volusia Live parents. Curriculum and assessment information is shared by teachers at Open House, during parent teacher conferences, Pinnacle SRG system, and through newsletters. FSA assessment information is sent home to parents via backpack and is also available on our website. Parents may provide input to the school via SAC and PTA meetings, interim reports, conferences, and climate survey. All stakeholders can access information via the school web site, marquee, and through the Connect 5 calls/texts.

Information regarding parent/stakeholder participation is provided via school website, automated phone messages/texts, newsletters, parent/teacher conferences, student backpacks, workshops, and meetings. District information is available in English and Spanish. When requested, the District will provide a translator if school staff are not able to assist. Books and videos in Spanish are available in the Media Center. The newsletter is translated into Spanish upon request. Parents with special needs are accommodated. Indian River Elementary is handicapped accessible.

Our school has developed a SEL (social emotional learning) program. The program RULER is researched based to improve students social self. We have also incorporated a new component called Breath for Change. This teaches all the stakeholders how to stop, breath and reflect either before something would happen, or right after. It allows for mindful breathing to help centering one self for focus.

**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: Math					\$3,652.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21	
			3651 - Indian River Elem. School	Title, I Part A	614.0	\$3,652.00	
			Notes: IReady Math				
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning					\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA					\$0.00
Total:							\$3,652.00