

Brevard Public Schools

Indialantic Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	25
Budget to Support Goals	0

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: 6/1/2015

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
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	22%
2020-21 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%)
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	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

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)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	No	24%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	19%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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	Position 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 that supports students academic and social emotional needs.
Donovan, Kim	Reading 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.
Roddenberry, Zach	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal- Assist with building the culture of the school, analyzing data to support SIP goals, provide professional development, and support social emotional needs of students and teachers.
Spiker, Kathy	School Counselor	Mrs. Spiker is our guidance counselor- she heads our Conscious Discipline and Trauma Informed Classroom training. She support students academic, behavioral, and social emotional needs. She works on the IPST team to ensure our students needs are being met.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/1/2015, 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

48

Total number of students enrolled at the school

669

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

2

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

2

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	89	106	76	108	91	101	94	0	0	0	0	0	0	665
Attendance below 90 percent	0	2	1	1	3	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	7	2	6	5	10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA ELA	0	0	0	0	5	12	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA MATH	0	0	0	0	7	16	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

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	2	1	2	3	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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 6/15/2021

2020-21 - 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	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	

2020-21 - 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	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	

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				79%	62%	57%	79%	60%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				61%	60%	58%	61%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51%	57%	53%	53%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				78%	63%	63%	80%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				68%	65%	62%	58%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				60%	53%	51%	56%	49%	47%
Science Achievement				87%	57%	53%	67%	57%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	86%	64%	22%	58%	28%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	77%	61%	16%	58%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-86%				
05	2021					
	2019	88%	60%	28%	56%	32%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				
06	2021					
	2019	70%	60%	10%	54%	16%
Cohort Comparison		-88%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	85%	61%	24%	62%	23%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	70%	64%	6%	64%	6%
Cohort Comparison		-85%				
05	2021					
	2019	90%	60%	30%	60%	30%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				
06	2021					
	2019	70%	67%	3%	55%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-90%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	89%	56%	33%	53%	36%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

The i-Ready Reading and Math Diagnostic which helps to determine each students on-grade level proficiency based on state and national standards will be utilized as our progress monitoring tool.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	37	62	89
	Economically Disadvantaged	38	48	67
	Students With Disabilities	40	60	100
	English Language Learners	0	0	100
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	28	50	76
	Economically Disadvantaged	18	17	45
	Students With Disabilities	0	80	100
	English Language Learners	0	50	100
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	54	74	87
	Economically Disadvantaged	35	32	80
	Students With Disabilities	41	59	71
	English Language Learners	0	50	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	26	45	70
	Economically Disadvantaged	19	21	38
	Students With Disabilities	38	41	35
	English Language Learners	0	0	50

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	81	88	97
	Economically Disadvantaged	73	66	80
	Students With Disabilities	63	63	83
	English Language Learners	0	100	100
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	25	51	80
	Economically Disadvantaged	6	20	60
	Students With Disabilities	21	42	71
	English Language Learners	0	100	100
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	67	76	80
	Economically Disadvantaged	57	64	76
	Students With Disabilities	33	39	44
	English Language Learners	0	0	100
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	31	57	76
	Economically Disadvantaged	32	38	59
	Students With Disabilities	5	16	44
	English Language Learners	0	0	100

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	64	79	81
	Economically Disadvantaged	71	84	80
	Students With Disabilities	50	56	72
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	46	65	71
	Economically Disadvantaged	33	60	67
	Students With Disabilities	27	44	56
	English Language Learners	0	100	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
Science	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	0	0	0
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	0	0
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	63	66	69
	Economically Disadvantaged	65	53	65
	Students With Disabilities	23	32	36
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	54	65	81
	Economically Disadvantaged	44	53	82
	Students With Disabilities	27	45	59
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	54	65	81
	Economically Disadvantaged	44	53	82
	Students With Disabilities	27	45	59
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	63	82	71	59	68	55	57				
HSP	74	55		59	73						
MUL	80			60							
WHT	83	75	65	81	68	60	76				
FRL	68	64	36	58	56	50	68				
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				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	72
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	505
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	95%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	65
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	65
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	70
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	73
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	57
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Despite operating with eLearning and in person learning, Indialantic was able to increase our overall total points from 484 points to 505 points, which is a total of 21 points. Under all ESSA Categories, no areas fall below the overall Federal Index of 41%. Our economically disadvantaged and students with disabilities typically score lower than the other categories. 21% percent of our student population falls under the economically disadvantaged category and 13% falls under the students with disabilities category.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Data shows that students that fall under the lowest 25% group demonstrate the greatest need for improvement. Data from the 2020/2021 ELA FSA shows that 42% of the students identified in the lowest 25% group fall under the ESE category, 10% have 504's, 3% are ESOL, and 35% are economically disadvantaged. Data from the 2020/2021 Math FSA shows that 36% of the students identified under the lowest 25% group fall under the ESE category, 10% have 504's, 3% are ESOL, 42% are economically disadvantaged. We began the 2020/2021 school year with 144 students receiving T2 or T3 interventions. Of those 144 students, 46 students moved to Tier 1 and were no longer in need of intervention services. Thirty-nine percent of the 144 students were identified as ESE.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The COVID pandemic was one contributing factor, as our students were not able to Walk to Intervention as in the past year. Intervention services were provided by their classroom teacher during the scheduled intervention time. In the past, students were able to travel to a selected teacher based on the intervention services needed, for a more targeted type of intervention. We also had hybrid instruction taking place in the classrooms, so teachers were teaching student in-person, at the same time they were teaching to a group of students online. This made it difficult for the direct targeted interventions. ESE services were provided both on-line and in-person based on individual IEP's. It was not the most effective way to gauge student comprehension. This year all learning will be taking place in-person, so the opportunity for targeted interventions that meet each students

individual needs can be accomplished more effectively through, scheduled intervention time, academic tutoring and support programs, and i-Ready instruction- intervention.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Based on the 2020/2021 i-Ready data, our Tier 1 processes our meeting the needs of most of our students. Out of the 537 students who began the school year in Tier 1 (D1) , 522 remained in T1 (D3). Data from the 2020/2021 ELA, Math, & Science FSA shows that IE is above the district average in all grade levels. Grades 6 showed the most overall growth in ELA and Math from the previous FSA test.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

One contributing factor to the improvement is the continued use of the i-Ready instructional and diagnostic program. It has allowed us to progress monitor students with fidelity. We will continue to utilize the i-Ready instructional and diagnostic program along with our new standards based ELA program. Grades K-5 are all utilizing the same curriculum that is vertically and horizontally aligned to the Florida State Standards. Sixth grade will be utilizing a different program that is designed to build into the secondary school curriculum.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

During the scheduled Walk to Intervention time, students should have target acceleration strategies based on their i-Ready D1 diagnostic and weekly data. Data driven chats must be purposeful and accomplished with fidelity. Correlation of Benchmark Advanced/SAAVAS assessments with i-Ready data to determine the specific areas to target for acceleration. Grade levels will need to plan purposely to ensure the new ELA program is taught with fidelity. Administrative walk throughs for consistent and school wide coherence.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

All faculty members will be offered the opportunity to attend online professional development on the MTSS process through the district. The topics included are: An Overview of 4-Step Problem Solving, An Overview of Intervention and Instructional Fidelity, RtI and SLD Eligibility- Essential Components, Tier 1 Problem Solving, Multi-Tiered System of Support-An Introduction, Integrating Standards Aligned Instruction Across Tiers, Leading with MTSS, Positive Behavioral Intervention Support, Social Emotional Learning, and Benchmark Scaffolds. . At the school level, teachers will be provided professional development opportunities during faculty meetings and on early release Friday PD days that incorporate standards aligned instruction-meshing with the new curriculum Benchmark Advanced and SAAVAS Realize. Resources from the TNTP Learning Acceleration Guide will also be utilized.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

We will continue to enhance our Academic Support Program so that all identified students will have the opportunity to participate. Continue to secure funding for the i-Ready workbooks that correlate with the student texts. Enlist our PTO and SAC for tutoring and financial support. Ensure that all students have access to print and electronic materials that are required for their grade level. Provide teachers with on going targeted professional development to support student learning.

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 the end on 2021/2022 school year, there was only one grade (6th) that was not on grade level (above 72%). All other grades averaged 80% or higher on the last diagnostic. This year i-Ready diagnostic 1 shows that 67% of 6th grade were on grade level. On the 2020/2021 ELA FSA, 78% of the current 6th grade class scored a level 3 or higher. The district average was 62%. All other grade levels had 77% or higher of the students score a level 3 or higher on the 2020/2021 Statewide ELA Florida Standards Assessment. The overall i-Ready 2021/2022 diagnostic 1 score for the school was T1=59%, T2=35%, and T3=7%.

On the 20/21 ELA FSA, 85% of 3rd grade scored a level 3 or higher (2018/2019-86%), 77% of 4th grade scored a level 3 or higher (2018/2019-77%), 85% of 5th grade scored a level 3 or higher (2018-2019-88%), and 78% of 6th grade scored a level 3 or higher (2018/2019-70%).

Our ELA standard assessment scores continue to fluctuate from year to year. Our lowest 25% continues to be a critical need area that will be one of the focuses in our SIP.

Measurable Outcome:

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.

On the 2020/2021 ELA FSA, 15% of 3rd grade, 23% of 4th grade, 15% of 5th grade, and 22 percent of 6th grade students scored below grade level, therefore these learning gains will increase to 85% for 3rd, 82% for 4th, 90% for 5th, and 83% for 6th on the 2021/2022 ELA FSA .

Monitoring:

i-Ready weekly and diagnostic data will be utilized to monitor student progress toward goals. Teachers will meet bi-weekly in data meetings to discuss intervention and acceleration strategies towards student success.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lori Braga (braga.lori@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Core Instruction: Vertical and Horizontally aligned ELA instruction across all grade levels utilizing Priority Standards, Bench Mark Universe K-5, SAAVAS Realize 6th, i-Ready instructional and assessed through i-Ready diagnostic and standards mastery.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Intervention: Scheduled intervention times utilizing Barton, i-Ready teacher tool box, Phonics Lesson Library, FCRR resources. Grade levels will meet bi-weekly to monitor data as student move between tiers. All data will be tracked on spreadsheets/google forms so that they are easy to share and manipulate.

Core Instruction: Utilization of Standards Focus Documents and i-Ready instruction, along with the new ELA curriculum- Bench Mark Universe K-5, SAAVAS Realize 6th will address the misalignment issues from last year.

Grade level data meetings will be utilized to analyze data, align materials, and coordinate our instruction to allow for an increase in ELA Learning Gains.

Action Steps to Implement

1. The Leadership team will monitor the implementation of the New ELA Curriculum to assist teachers and drive standards based instruction.

Person Responsible

Zach Roddenberry (roddenberry.zachary@brevardschools.org)

2. Bi-Weekly data chats with the Literacy Coach, Administration, and grade level teams will be utilized to analyze data.

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

3. i-Ready data reports will be analyzed to determine what domain students are struggling with and base their instructional groups on that data for additional support.

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

4. MTSS Team will track the number of students that move within the Tier groups to determine the appropriate intervention strategies.

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

5. Continued training on the new ELA curriculum to ensure standards and pacing are appropriate.

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

6. Protect built in intervention schedule.

Person Responsible Lori Braga (braga.lori@brevardschools.org)

7. Diagnostic data will be utilized to target small group instruction for Tier 2 & Tier 3 students.

Person Responsible Lori Braga (braga.lori@brevardschools.org)

8. Tier 1 and Gifted students will be provided enrichment activities to enhance standards mastery.

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

9. Students who are identified as substantially deficient will be offered additional tutoring services through Academic Support Programs.

Person Responsible Zach Roddenberry (roddenberry.zachary@brevardschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

This is our third year of the implementation of i-Ready Math instruction workbooks in grades K-5.

On the end of the year 2020/2021 diagnostic 3 our overall math scores where T1=76%, T2=24% and T3=1%. At the beginning of the 2021/2022 school year our diagnostic 1 overall math scores were T1=38%, T2=54% and T3=8%. On the 2020/2021 Math FSA, all grade levels had 72% or more of the students score a level 3 or higher. On the 2020/2021 FSA Math, 83% of 3rd grade scored a level 3 or higher (2018/2019-85%), 72% of 4th grade scored a level 3 or higher (2018/2019-70%), 72% of 5th grade scored a level 3 or higher (2018/2019-90%), and 83% of 6th grade scored a level 3 or higher (2018/2019-70%). Of all the grades, our 5th grade students scores decreased the most on the FSA Math from the prior FSA assessment.

Our students who fall in lowest 25% our an area of concern that we will be focusing on this year.

Measurable Outcome:

During the 2021/2022 school year, the overall math learning gains will increase by 5% on the 2021/2022 i-Ready diagnostic 3 and on the 2021/2022 Math FSA and our lowest 25% will increase by 5%.

On the 2020/2021 Math FSA, 17% of 3rd grade, 28% of 4th grade, 28% of 5th grade, and 17 percent of 6th grade students scored below grade level, therefore these learning gains will increase to 87% for 3rd, 77% for 4th, 77% for 5th, and 88% for 6th on the 2021/2022 Math FSA .

Monitoring:

i-Ready weekly and diagnostic data will be utilized to monitor student progress toward goals. Teachers will meet bi-weekly in data meetings to discuss intervention and acceleration strategies towards student success. Common grade level assessments will be analyzed for fidelity.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kim Donovan (donovan.kimberly@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

The i-Ready Florida MAFS curriculum is designed to meet the rigor of the Florida math Standards. All grade levels will continue to utilize common assessments and analyze the data from these assessments to identify areas weakness and strengths to determine what interventions or acceleration are needed.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Continue the use of the i-ready MAFS and teacher toolbox with fidelity. This helps to provide a common math language across grade levels. Teachers will identify areas of strengths and weaknesses and provide intervention or acceleration at the time of need.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Purchase i-Ready MAFS workbooks with practice and problem solving workbooks. These go along with the i-Ready Instructional platform provided by the district.

Person Responsible

Elizabeth Foster (foster.elizabeth@brevardschools.org)

2. Professional development will be provided by Mrs. Foster(Gifted) and Mrs. Donovan (Literacy Coach) on utilizing the digital platform that accompanies i-Ready MAFS.

Person Responsible

Elizabeth Foster (foster.elizabeth@brevardschools.org)

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

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

4. Data will be analyzed at the bi-weekly data chats with each grade level, A.P., Principal, and Literacy Coach.

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

5. Utilize the i-Ready instructional grouping reports to determine the domains that students are struggling with.

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

6. Intervention groups will be designated by the data and support from the teacher tool box will be utilized to fill gaps.

Person Responsible Lori Braga (braga.lori@brevardschools.org)

7. Focus on the lowest 25% by strategically grouping students in small intervention groups.

Person Responsible Lori Braga (braga.lori@brevardschools.org)

8. Before school, after school, and during school tutoring available through Academic Support Programs.

Person Responsible Zach Roddenberry (roddenberry.zachary@brevardschools.org)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: For the 2020-2021 school year Indialantic focused on teaching pro-social behavior skills through Skills Streaming, Conscious Discipline, and Trauma Informed Classroom practices. The students are presented with strategies and concrete techniques to help prevent more serious difficulties in later childhood, adolescence, and early adulthood. During the first year of the program 2019-2020, we decreased our school wide referral rate by 49%. During the 2020-2021 school year we decrease our school wide referral rate by an additional 44%.

Measurable Outcome: Due to the continued impacts of COVOD on our school, we are aiming to again decrease the number of school-wide office referrals by 10% from 73 to 65.

Monitoring: The area of focus will be monitored through school wide office referrals. Each 9 weeks a report will be generated from the student data system to compare office referral counts to look for patterns among the student population.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Lori Braga (braga.lori@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Students are not equipped to deal with real life situations such as COVID, quarantining, divorce, death, homelessness. The COVID pandemic has exasperated an overwhelming additional stress on our students. A lack of self-esteem and coping skills have hindered student success. By providing students activities based on Skill Streaming, Conscious Discipline, Trauma Informed Classroom, and Life Skills, we have the opportunity to engage students in role playing activities that enhance self-awareness and coping skills.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will continue to utilize Conscious Discipline, Trauma Informed Classrooms, Skill Streaming, and Act like Act activities to model for and discuss with students so they understand how to act/deal with unconformable social situations, The student 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 trained the faculty through professional development on Trauma Informed Classroom practices.

Person Responsible Kathy Spiker (spiker.katherine@brevardschools.org)

2. Principal and guidance counselor provided professional development to all faculty on Conscious Discipline.

Person Responsible Lori Braga (braga.lori@brevardschools.org)

3. Teachers continue to utilize Skills Streaming activities once a week during pre-scheduled intervention time.

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

4. Teacher leader of Act like ACT social emotional book will continue the development of mini lessons for teachers to utilize in their classrooms.

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

5. The Social Emotional committee will provide ongoing meetings to reflect and continue supporting the social emotional focus for our school.

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

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

For the 2019-2020 school year, Indialantic Elementary School reported 0.1 incidents per 100 students. This rate is lower than the statewide elementary school rate of 1.0 incidents per 100 students. It falls into the very low category. Indialantic is ranked #192 out of 1395 elementary schools statewide. Out of the 56 elementary schools in the district, Indialantic is ranked #15 (violent incidents)-0.14 per 100 students,, #1 (property incidents)-0 per 100 students, #1 (drug/public order incidents)-0 per 100 students. The total suspension statewide rate: #753/1395, County rank: #14/126, suspensions per 100 students:2.7. Indialantic reported suspension rate (*less than 10) per 100. Indialantic had 20 in school suspensions for the 2019-2020 school year. Brevard Elementary Schools combined reported incidents per 100 students was 0.7. The statewide combined reported incidents per 100 students was 1.0.

The school culture and environment will be monitored through office discipline referral counts. Every month a report of ODR's will be generated to determine which area students are struggling with behaviorally. During Data meetings, interventions/strategies will be discussed to help students cope with their behavioral struggles.

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.

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

highest rated themes were Culture and Engagement, and the two lowest-scoring areas were Academic Challenge with an overall school rating of 38% and Belonging with an overall rating of 58%. 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 Challenge-The degree to which students perceive high expectations and feel engaged with their school and their education. Each grade level will address this and set grade-level goals of how we will improve academic challenge 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 while challenging our students intellectually. Student data clearly showed that students felt that what they learned in class, did not help them outside of school. Stakeholders will develop activities that peek students interest in learning and challenge them to think critically.

Belonging-The degree to which students feel welcome at their school. Grade levels will address creating a sense of belonging for students, so they feel free to be themselves. We will continue to work on providing all students with to opportunities to be part of the school community.

School Theme

This year our faculty came up with our theme of Don't Worry, Be Happy to build on our theme from last year of "Grit & Grace". The school community continues to deal with the challenges due to COVID. This school year theme will be our focus as we meet challenges each day. The meaning of "Don't Worry, Be Happy" is shared often in classrooms, PTO meetings, faculty meetings, and in our community. All stakeholders have T-Shirts with our school theme identified on it. 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 all areas. The areas of concern are Professional Development, School Operations, Instructional Planning for Student Growth, Evaluation, and Leadership. To address those areas a survey was 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. Grades K-2 analyzed the Insight Survey Data and highlighted 2 areas of weaknesses and 2 areas of strength in each of the 10 categories. Grade 3-6 analyzed their grade level Youth Truth Survey data and identified 3 areas of weaknesses and 3 areas of strength. Our team has been meeting to 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.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Dr, Lori Braga- Principal- Works with all stakeholders to ensure that the vision and mission of the school is at the forefront of all activities. Ensures that all students are provided a quality education, and a safe, positive culture in which to thrive.

Kimberly Donovan- Literacy Coach- Ensures that all students are provide a safe, positive climate in which to thrive academically, through adventures in literature.

Rebecca Talaia- DOE teacher Leader- Social chair, provides PD on conscious Discipline, Responsive Classrooms, and supports students with positive life skills.

Rachel McCullough-DOE Teacher Leader- Provided life skills training to teachers, Conscious Discipline , supports students on a daily basis with positive classroom routines.

Amanda McCaughin- Media Specialist- Ensures that student receive positive messages on a daily basis through the morning announcements. She includes life skills, social emotional topics, promotes positive self worth, etc.

PTO/Dad's Club-Provide teachers and students with financial support, project enhancement, and development of life skills, school spirit, campus beautification, and build community.

SAC- Support all stakeholders in improving the education experience for our students. They are the driving force behind the school improvement process.