Indialantic Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Indialantic Elementary School

1050 N PALM AVE, Indialantic, FL 32903

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

Demographics

Principal: Colleen Lord

Start Date for this Principal: 6/3/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	22%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Asian Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: A (69%)
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

Indialantic Elementary School

1050 N PALM AVE, Indialantic, FL 32903

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2019-20 Title I School**	**2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	No	21%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	16%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The Indialantic community inspires young people to cultivate a passion for learning, to reach well beyond the ordinary and to exemplify grit to meet high expectations in academics and never give up. Equally, students and teachers will ensure grace through taking responsibility for their own words and actions while exhibiting empathy, acceptance, and generosity.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To cultivate responsible and capable citizens that strive to grow and reach their academic and social emotional potential through grit & grace.

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
Braga, Lori	Principal	Cultivate a positive school culture among the students, faculty, parents, and community members. Ensure that a standards aligned curriculum drives instruction.
Donovan, Kim	Instructional Coach	Literacy coach works with teachers to determine appropriate instructional strategies for classroom core instruction and targeted interventions. Attends parent conferences, leadership team meetings, and participates in the MTSS team. Oversees i-Ready diagnostic testing. Plans with teachers and leads focus team meetings and faculty PD.
Foster, Elizabeth	Teacher, K-12	Liz is the gifted instructor and serves on our Leadership team. She provided professional development on technology, ELA, math, Social Emotional and instructional practices.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 6/3/2020, Colleen Lord

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.*
2

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

53

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	22%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Asian Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: A (65%) 2016-17: A (63%) 2015-16: A (69%)
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.	

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	88	110	99	98	101	111	102	0	0	0	0	0	0	709
Attendance below 90 percent	10	9	11	10	9	11	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	2	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	0	0	2	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	8	2	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
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

Wednesday 6/3/2020

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	90	114	106	97	102	110	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	724
Attendance below 90 percent	1	3	2	3	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	8	23	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	90	114	106	97	102	110	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	724
Attendance below 90 percent	1	3	2	3	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	8	23	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	40

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	1	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	79%	62%	57%	77%	63%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	61%	60%	58%	60%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	57%	53%	49%	52%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	78%	63%	63%	76%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	68%	65%	62%	58%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	53%	51%	46%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	87%	57%	53%	73%	56%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey								
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**							**Total**
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	
	(0)	(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	86%	64%	22%	58%	28%
	2018	83%	63%	20%	57%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	77%	61%	16%	58%	19%
	2018	91%	57%	34%	56%	35%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	88%	60%	28%	56%	32%
	2018	65%	54%	11%	55%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		23%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
06	2019	70%	60%	10%	54%	16%
	2018	73%	63%	10%	52%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	85%	61%	24%	62%	23%
	2018	83%	62%	21%	62%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	70%	64%	6%	64%	6%
	2018	90%	59%	31%	62%	28%

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
Same Grade Comparison		-20%					
Cohort Comparison		-13%					
05	2019	90%	60%	30%	60%	30%	
	2018	69%	58%	11%	61%	8%	
Same Grade Comparison		21%					
Cohort Comparison		0%					
06	2019	70%	67%	3%	55%	15%	
	2018	78%	68%	10%	52%	26%	
Same Grade Comparison		-8%					
Cohort Comparison		1%					

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

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	65	51	40	61	61	72	56				
HSP	85	62		67	67						
MUL	94	62		94	100						
WHT	78	61	52	78	66	58	85				
FRL	66	51	41	61	55	46	71				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	59	45	39	68	44	36	36				
ASN	73	70		82	50						
HSP	76	55		76	63		90				
MUL	88	55		69	45						
WHT	79	61	54	81	59	57	64				
FRL	61	48	38	72	50	59	46				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	47	49	50	57	54	52	31				

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
ELL	33	40		50	40						
ASN	67	71		73	71						
HSP	66	65		67	71						
MUL	75	50		75	60						
WHT	79	59	43	78	56	47	77				
FRL	57	46	39	62	54	57	65				

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	484
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	58
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	70
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	88
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	68
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	56
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.

Our data for our lowest 25% was our lowest performing. During the 2018-2019 school year, our lowest 25% students decreases from 53% to 51% and we made zero gains in ELA overall. Last year our ESE students were in Tier 3 groups to give them extra support in closing the learning gaps they had. Because we had a school wide Walk to Intervention all teachers had a stake in our students moving to a Tier 1. Our interventions were working and we saw many students get staffed that needed it, and many others move to a Tier 1. We began the year with 127 students receiving T2 or T3 interventions. Of those 127 students, 53 moved to Tier 1 and were no longer in need of intervention services. Due to Covid we did not take FSA and are relying on iReady diagnostic data to determine progress. Our numbers may not be a true reflection of the progress that our students made.

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

4th grade math showed the greatest decline. They went from 90% in 2017-2018 to 70% in 2018-2019. The decline may have been related to the lack of teaching experience on the team for that year as their were two new members added to the team. Not having a common math curriculum among the grade levels may have also been a factor in the decline. When students switched teachers, they may have had a different math program . Some teachers taught Eureka Math, while others utilized common core math, etc. The 2019-2020 Math diagnostic 1 data also supports the findings.

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.

ELA lowest 25% was 6% (51% School, 57% State) below the state average and 2% below the district average. 4th grade Math showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average The school state comparison was 6%. Ready Math diagnostic data also supported the need for a common curriculum. Not having a common math curriculum across all grade levels was a contributing factor for the decline. There was no consistency within the grade levels on the type of curriculum that was presented. During the 2019-2020 school year, we incorporated Ready MAFS and Ready LAFS across grades K-5 and to ensure that we had a common standards aligned curriculum that all teachers would utilize. The Ready diagnostics and common assessments help to identify strengths and weaknesses in instruction and learning in both reading and math. The teacher tool box was also utilized to differentiate and provide intervention or acceleration.

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

Utilizing the Ready diagnostic D1 and D2 data for 2019-2020, the 4th grade team showed the most growth in Math from D1 (T1=51, T2=41, T3=8) to D2 (T1=71, T2=27, T3=2). The district averages were for D1 (T1=29, T2=53, T3=18) and D2 (T1=48, T2=41, T3=11). This is a reflection of the implementation of Ready MAFS in grades K-5. Having consistency across all grades levels, utilizing common assessments, and a common math language, along with focused data meetings made it possible for us to determine strengths and weakness among the grade levels. Then we were able to target support when and where it was needed. We will continue the utilization on the Ready MAFS curriculum to provide consistency and standards aligned instruction for all stakeholders. Grades 1-6 had 82%or more of their student score in the T1 range on the iReady Math Diagnostic 1 for the

2020-2021 school year. For the previous year, grades 1-6 scored 71% and below on the iReady Math Diagnostic.

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

1. The Math learning GAP between non disabled students and students with disabilities has increased to 17% in the 18-19 school year. This is 6% points increase from the 17-18 school year. The ELA learning GAP between non disabled students and students with disabilities was 17% in the 18-19 school year. This is a 3% point decrease from the 17-18 school year.
2. The Math learning GAP between Non-economically disadvantaged students and Economically disadvantaged students has increased to 23% in the 18-19 school year. This is a 12% point increase from the 17-18 school year. The ELA learning GAP between Non-economically disadvantaged students and Economically disadvantaged students has decreased to 18% in the 18-19 school year. This is a 3% point decrease from the 17-18 school year.

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

1. ELA Lowest 25th Percentile & ELA Learning Gains
2. Math Learning Gains
3. Social Emotional Learning Gains

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Looking at our i-Ready diagnostic data from Winter 2019 the only 2 grades that were on grade level (above 72%) were grades 2 and 3. This year i-Ready diagnostic 1 shows that grades 1-6, the average for Tier 1 are above 91% in reading. In addition, with COVID in mind, we are still targeting the students that were deficient based on the 2018-2019 Statewide ELA Florida Standards Assessment. Based on this data, our ELA Proficiency for the Lowest 25th Percentile was 51% while the District was at 57% and the state was at 53%. Based on both forms of data our Lowest 25th Percentile in ELA is our critical need area that will be one of the focuses in our SIP.
Measurable Outcome:	Core Instruction: Overall ELA Proficiency will increase by 5% from Diagnostic 1 to Diagnostic 3 for the 2020-2021 school year. Intervention + Core Instruction: ELA Learning gains for the lowest 25% will show a 5% increase in learning gains. Upon completion of intervention 5% of students identified as Tier 2 or Tier 3 will move into a Tier 1 group.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lori Braga (braga.lori@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Core Instruction: Vertical and Horizontally aligned ELA instruction across grade levels utilizing Priority Standards, iReady Reading Curriculum, and assessed through iReady Standards Mastery. Intervention: Scheduled intervention times using Barton, iReady Teacher Toolbox, Phonics Lesson Library, FCRR resources, and Voyager.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Core Instruction: Last year we noticed a misalignment between the standards being taught and task complexity for students. At Data meetings during the 19-20 school year each grade level planned together using the Standards Focus Document and the iReady Curriculum. This year, we will continue these Grade-Level Data Meetings to align and orientate our instruction to allow for an increase in ELA Learning Gains. Intervention: The 19-20 school year was Indialantic's first time with a specified Walked Intervention time, grade levels met monthly with the MTSS Team and data was tracked via Google Suite. We were able to closely monitor students as they moved between tiers. For this school year, we will resume the same practice within the classroom and continue to closely monitor and track data for all students.

Action Steps to Implement

Core Instruction:
1. Leadership team will create a strategic assessment plan that monitors data to assist teachers to drive their instruction.
2. Analyze data during bi-weekly Data Chats with Literacy Coach, Administration, and grade level teams.
3. Determine domains where students are struggling based on instructional groups in iReady and provide additional support.
4. MTSS Team will track the number of students that move Tier groups to determine appropriate interventions.
5. Additional training utilizing enhanced standards focus documents to ensure pacing.

Intervention:

2. Protected-scheduled intervention time built in the schedule.. Intervention begins on 9/16/20.

3. Tier 2 & 3 students are targeted for small group instruction based on diagnostic data.

4. Tier 1 and Gifted students are provided enrichment activities to enhance standards mastery.

1. Students that are substantially deficient will be offered additional tutoring through the Florida Cares Act.

Person Responsible Kim Donovan (donovan.kimberly@brevardschools.org)

Data Analysis:

1. 2018-2019 FSA data, 2019-2020 IReady Diagnostic 2 data and 2020-2021 Diagnostic 1 data will be analyzed to determine which students are on the bubble or fall into a Tier Intervention category.

2. A L-5 IReady report for students whose data show that they are 2 or more grade levels behind was analyzed. These students fall into the Tier 3 substantially deficient category and were placed into a Tier 3 Course C class. Spreadsheet developed.

3. In grades K-6: 79 student started in a Tier 2 Reading Intervention Course A, 10 students started in Tier 3 Reading Intervention Course B and 38 student started in Reading Intervention Course C.

4. Teachers analyzed classroom data, IReady data, and FSA data when applicable to determine what students in their specific classes fell into the lowest 25% category, while paying close attention to ELL, ESE, and Socioeconomic status as additional subcategories.

Person Responsible Kim Donovan (donovan.kimberly@brevardschools.org)

Additional Intervention Service/Support

1. Cares Act Funding and Academic Support Funds will be utilized to support student intervention services outside of the school day by certified teachers and Instructional Assistants.

2. ASP will be provide after school hours to support the lowest 25%, substantially deficient, ELL, ESE, and SES categories.

Person Responsible Kim Donovan (donovan.kimberly@brevardschools.org)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	For the 2019-2020 school year Indialantic Elementary focused on teaching pro-social behavioral through the Skills Streaming Program to present students with guiding strategies and concrete techniques to help prevent more serious difficulties in later childhood, adolescense, and early adulthood. With the inaugural year with the Skills Streaming program our goal was to decrease our school-wide referral rate by 5%, we surpassed this number and decreased our referrals by 49%.

In addition to the Skills Streaming program Indialantic is adding Conscious Discipline and Trauma Informed
Classroom to enhance our pro-social emotional repertoire. This will be incorporated through faculty wide professional development sessions and follow up individualized digital lessons. |
| | For the 2020-2021, and the incorporation of Conscious Discipline and Trau |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Due to COVID impacts on our school We are aiming to again decrease the number of our school-wide office discipline referrals by 5%

Due to adding Conscious Discipline |
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lori Braga (braga.lori@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students are ill equipped to deal with real life situations such as COVID. Having to self-quarantine for such long periods of time, increasing technology time for school and social activities, and experiencing social isolation and a lack self awareness has taken a toll on our students self-esteem and coping skills.By continuing to provide Skills Streaming activities and adding in Conscious Discipline and Trauma Informed Classroom activities, students have the opportunity to engage in role playing activities, get and provide feedback, and practice new skills that enhance self-awareness and coping skills.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will utilize Conscious Discipline, Trauma Informed Classroom, Skill Streaming and Act like AKT activities to model for and discuss with students so they understand how to act/deal with uncomfortable social situations. The students will learn to deal with their social emotional issues by practicing/role playing with other students and adults.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Guidance counselor attended training during Summer of 2020 to become a school based trainer for Conscious Discipline and Trauma Informed Classroom
2. During pre-planning, all teachers completed the first three sessions of training for Conscious Discipline
3. The remaining training's for Conscious Discipline will be completed on our Early Release Friday Professional Development days.
4. Trauma Informed Classroom will be during our Tuesday faculty meetings
5. Teachers will continue to incorporate Skills Streaming activities once a week during pre-scheduled intervention time
6. Teacher leader for Act like AKT social emotional book will continue mini-lessons for teachers to take back to their classrooms during Tuesday faculty meetings.
7. Teacher leader for Act like AKT will roll-out a COVID activities through mini-lessons for teachers to take back to their classrooms during Tuesday faculty meetings.

8. SE Committee will provide ongoing meetings to reflect and continuing growing the social emotional focus.

Person Responsible   Julie Schneider (schneider.julie@brevardschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This year is our second year of the implementation of i-Ready math workbooks in grades K-5. On i-Ready math Diagnostic 2 in 2020 all students scored below 71%. This year on i-Ready Diagnostic 1 all grade levels (1-6) 82% of our students scored in a Tier 1. When looking at level 5 math data 7.9% of our students are 2 or more grade levels in math. That is the rationale for this focus on math.
Measurable Outcome:	During the 20-21 school year, the overall math learning gains will increase by 5% percent on the i-Ready math diagnostic 3.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kim Donovan (donovan.kimberly@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our school wide curriculum is horizontally and vertically aligned across the grade levels. The Florida MAFS curriculum is designed to meet the rigor of the Florida Math Standards. In addition, all grade levels will continue to use common in mathematics. These assessments will be analyzed to determine areas of strengths and weakness, and adjustments will be made to achieve content mastery.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale is to continue use of the i-Ready MAFS and Teacher Toolbox with fidelity. This provided a common math language across the grade levels. Teacher will be able to identify areas of strength and weakness and provide interventions as needed.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Purchased Ready MAFS workbooks with practice and problem solving workbooks with i-Ready instructional digital platform.

2.Professional Development will be provided by the literacy coach at this time due to Covid.

3. Teachers will set specific standards goals for growth and proficiency and monitor data.

4. Analyze data during bi-weekly Data Chats with grade levels, AP, and literacy coach.

5. Determine domains that students are struggling using the report of grouping in i-Ready. Additional support in those small intervention groups will be provided using the Teacher Toolbox.

6. School wide intervention schedule was built in advance to include math.

7. Teacher tool box training was provide last year and will be ongoing this year to support teachers needs.

8. Focus on lowest 25% by strategically grouping students in small intervention groups which began on 9/16/2020.

9. Before school, after school, and virtual tutoring available through the CAREs ACT.

Person Responsible	Elizabeth Foster (foster.elizabeth@brevardschools.org)

Data Analysis:
1. 2018-2019 FSA data, 2019-2020 IReady Diagnostic 2 data and 2020-2021 Diagnostic 1 data will be analyzed to determine which students are on the bubble or fall into a Tier Intervention category.
2. A L-5 IReady report for students whose data show that they are 2 or more grade levels behind was analyzed. These students fall into the Tier 3 substantially deficient category and will need additional support in math. (3% substantially deficient).
3. In grades 1-6 Beginning of the year Diagnostic 1: 6% of the students were identified as Tier 2 in Math and 3% of the students were identified as Tier 3 in Math.
4. Teachers analyzed classroom data, IReady data, and FSA data when applicable to determine what students in their specific classes fell into the lowest 25% category, while paying close attention to ELL, ESE, and Socioeconomic status as additional subcategories.

Person Responsible   Elizabeth Foster (foster.elizabeth@brevardschools.org)

Additional Intervention Service/Support
1. Cares Act Funding and Academic Support Funds will be utilized to support student intervention services outside of the school day by certified teachers and Instructional Assistants.
2. ASP will be provide after school hours to support the lowest 25%, Substantially Deficient, ELL, ESE, and Social Emotional Status categories.

Person Responsible   Elizabeth Foster (foster.elizabeth@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We will be utilizing CARE's Act Funding and Academic Support Funding to provide additional academic and Social Emotional Support through before school, during school, and after school tutoring.

In math we will be using i-Ready math instruction to allow students to fill in gaps in the foundation skills found on the i-Ready diagnostic testing.

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.

Indialantic Elementary builds a positive school culture and environment and ensures that all stakeholders are involved and consulted. Our stakeholders include both broad and proximal groups to address our goals and need for improvement in different areas.

Youth Truth Survey:

Last year our student population took the Youth Truth Survey. Based on the data the two lowest-scoring areas were Academic Rigor with an overall school rating of 46% and Instructional Methods with an overall rating of 46%. This information was shared with our leadership team, faculty, and SAC committee. This year we will be doing a deep dive during our meetings into what this data means in our classroom practices, planning, and goal setting for this year.

Academic Rigor- Each grade level will address this and set grade-level goals of how we will improve academic rigor in our classrooms with grade-level planning. Data from i-Ready standards mastery will be analyzed to be sure we are meeting the rigor of the standards taught. Student data clearly showed that students felt homework assignments did not help them learn. Looking closely at homework assigned as a school will also be addressed and we will address ways to rethink homework and come up with grade-level and school-wide homework expectations.

Instructional Methods-Grade levels will address the question of Does your teacher explain things in a way you can understand? This was an area of weakness, we need to look at strategies as grade levels to learn new ways to explain things to our students. This area will also be addressed at faculty meetings and during our PD by sharing research-based best practices.

School Theme
This year our faculty came up with our theme of GRIT and Grace to address all of the new challenges that we would be facing due to COVID. This school year theme will be our focus as we meet challenges each day. The meaning of GRIT and Grace is shared often in classrooms, PTO meetings, faculty meetings, and in our community. Having this positive culture at our school ensures that every stakeholder is reminded of our goal this year.

Teacher Insight Survey
Our teachers took the Insight Survey last school year. Indialantic data was above the district average in all areas, however, our school went down in 3 areas that make up our Cultural Index Score. The areas that make the index up are Academic Expectations, Career Progression, and Peer Culture. To address those areas a survey will be sent to our faculty so that teacher leaders along with our leadership team can begin to break those areas down and look closely at why those areas were lower this past year. Our team will set goals for each area to address ways we can improve this school year. Open lines of communication and detailed solutions will ensure all stakeholders can address problems and make improvements for all stakeholders.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.