

School District of Indian River County

Sebastian Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 6 |
| Needs Assessment | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 13 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Sebastian Elementary School

400 SEBASTIAN BLVD, Sebastian, FL 32958

www.indianriverschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Letitia Whitfield

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2009

| | |
|--|--|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School KG-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2021-22 Title I School | Yes |
| 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 73% |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2021-22: B (55%) 2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (61%) |
| 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 | ATSI |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Indian River County School Board on 10/24/2022.

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 | 6 |
| Needs Assessment | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 13 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Sebastian Elementary School

400 SEBASTIAN BLVD, Sebastian, FL 32958

www.indianriverschools.org

School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2021-22 Title I School | 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School KG-5 | Yes | 73% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 46% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | B | | C | C |

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Indian River County School Board on 10/24/2022.

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.

Sebastian Elementary School of the Arts, where we aim to develop students academically, artistically, and socially so that they leave our school as independent, cooperative, responsible, and creative young adults with a lifelong interest and ability in learning and the arts.

Provide the school's vision statement.

NEST: Nurturing and Educating Students for Tomorrow through the Arts

Within a nurturing, safe environment, Sebastian Elementary staff members will actively engage all students in the learning process and teach students to become critical thinkers, problem-solvers, and life-long learners.

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|--------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Whitfield, Letitia | Principal | |
| Kohlstedt, Ashley | Assistant Principal | |
| Hoyt, Cheryl | Reading Coach | |
| Bangert, Ashley | Math Coach | |
| Adkins, Tony | School Counselor | |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2009, Letitia Whitfield

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

1

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

35

Total number of students enrolled at the school

325

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

7

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

2

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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 | 49 | 66 | 47 | 57 | 48 | 60 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 327 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 4 | 13 | 9 | 15 | 15 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 66 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 3 | 11 | 12 | 12 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 55 |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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 | 1 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 |

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 3 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 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

Friday 10/21/2022

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 | 68 | 46 | 58 | 50 | 49 | 78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 349 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 14 | 15 | 1 | 15 | 7 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 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 | 3 | 8 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 1 | 6 | 15 | 12 | 8 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 |

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 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |

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 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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 | 68 | 46 | 58 | 50 | 49 | 78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 349 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 14 | 15 | 1 | 15 | 7 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 76 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 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 | 3 | 8 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 9 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 1 | 6 | 15 | 12 | 8 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 |

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 | 0 | 4 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |

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 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| 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 | 2022 | | | 2021 | | | 2019 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 42% | 58% | 56% | | | | 53% | 58% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 65% | | | | | | 57% | 57% | 58% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 65% | | | | | | 49% | 54% | 53% |
| Math Achievement | 49% | 55% | 50% | | | | 58% | 63% | 63% |
| Math Learning Gains | 56% | | | | | | 55% | 60% | 62% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 58% | | | | | | 49% | 48% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 51% | 60% | 59% | | | | 53% | 54% | 53% |

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 |
| 01 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 02 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 03 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 43% | 60% | -17% | 58% | -15% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 53% | 61% | -8% | 58% | -5% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -43% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| | 2019 | 58% | 54% | 4% | 56% | 2% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -53% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 01 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 02 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 03 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 59% | 64% | -5% | 62% | -3% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 46% | 64% | -18% | 64% | -18% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -59% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 64% | 57% | 7% | 60% | 4% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -46% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 51% | 53% | -2% | 53% | -2% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Subgroup Data Review

| 2022 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 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 |
| SWD | 30 | 67 | | 31 | 45 | | 33 | | | | |
| BLK | 33 | 65 | 40 | 33 | 47 | 47 | 39 | | | | |
| HSP | 50 | | | 40 | 58 | | | | | | |
| MUL | | | | 40 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 47 | 63 | | 63 | 58 | | 57 | | | | |
| FRL | 35 | 69 | 73 | 44 | 56 | 58 | 41 | | | | |

| 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 | 24 | 17 | | 29 | 23 | | 33 | | | | |
| BLK | 14 | 21 | | 18 | 19 | | 7 | | | | |
| HSP | 50 | | | 43 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 56 | 46 | | 48 | 25 | | 36 | | | | |
| FRL | 40 | 39 | | 35 | 22 | 18 | 24 | | | | |
| 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 | 22 | 30 | | 33 | 44 | 46 | 29 | | | | |
| BLK | 34 | 46 | 38 | 41 | 46 | 50 | 29 | | | | |
| HSP | 58 | 50 | | 63 | 50 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 38 | 55 | | 33 | 45 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 60 | 61 | 56 | 64 | 59 | 44 | 61 | | | | |
| FRL | 50 | 52 | 35 | 58 | 53 | 44 | 56 | | | | |

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 55 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 386 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 41 |
| 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 |

| English Language Learners | |
|--|-----|
| 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 | 43 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 49 |
| 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 | 40 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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 | 58 |
| 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 | 54 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

When reflecting on available data, Sebastian Elementary's learning gains increased in both reading and math. In 2022, ELA learning gains increased from 37% in 2021 to 65% in 2022. Math learning gains increased from 22% in 2021 to 56% in 2022. 65% of our bottom quartile made learning gains in ELA and 56% of our bottom quartile made learning gains in math.

Sebastian Elementary's reading proficiency decreased from 44% in 2021 to 42% in 2022 while math proficiency increased from 40% in 2021 to 49% in 2022. Both ELA and math proficiency falls below the district and state average. The 2022 ELA student performance data among Students with Disabilities and Black subgroups indicates an increase in student proficiency. 2022 math data indicates student performance increased among Students with Disabilities, Black, White, and Free and Reduced lunch subgroups. The greatest decline in ELA proficiency was among students in the White subgroup, 56%(2021) to 47%(2022).

The Science proficiency level of Sebastian Elementary's Grade 5 students improved from 25% in 2021 to 51% in 2022. The Science proficiency amongst Student with Disabilities maintained at 33% and the subgroup proficiency levels of Black, White, and Free/reduced lunch increased.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

When considering progress monitoring data, the proficiency level of students in 3rd-5th continues to lag behind that of the district and state in both ELA and Mathematics. As evidenced by the FSA assessment data, math achievement continues to be the lowest area of performance schoolwide despite an increase in student proficiency levels in 2022. According to subgroup data, the Students with Disabilities, Black and Free and Reduced Lunch subgroups fell below the 50% proficiency threshold in ELA achievement while the Students with Disabilities and Black subgroups fell below the 50% proficiency in Math. Science proficiency amongst the Student with Disabilities (33%) and Black (39%) subgroups shows a need of improvement. Continued focus on high yield strategies to support effective Tier 1 ELA, Math, and Science instruction is the greatest current need for improvement at Sebastian Elementary.

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

Contributing factors continued to be the multitude of COVID effects on student learning such as inconsistent attendance and gaps in skill mastery and concept understanding. As a result, Sebastian Elementary put a large emphasis into planning tier 2 and tier 3 intervention groups to close the achievement gap. While SES has structures in place for monitoring student learning across tiers,

inconsistency in tier 1 implementation and stakeholders navigating through a new reading curriculum contributed to student achievement falling below 50% proficiency in both ELA and Math. As a result, new actions are required to address improving ELA and Math proficiency. These actions include: the implementation of a collaborative planning structure across grade levels, developing quality formative assessments to improve student monitoring and improved practices when planning and implementing small group instruction.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Analysis of school-wide data from 2022 state assessments indicated students in the bottom quartile showed the greatest improvement in Math Learning gains (17% in 2021 to 58% in 2022). Student learning gains as indicated on the 2022 FSA ELA assessment improved from 37% (2021) to 65% (2022) and the learning gains of students in our lowest 25% improved on the FSA ELA assessment from 36% (2021) to 65% (2022). Achievement on the Statewide Science assessment also improved from 25% (2021) to 51% (2022).

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

We attribute our 2022 success in learning gains to the adherence of a collaborative planning structure that emphasized standards-aligned instruction. Consistent student data discussions amongst grade levels determined effective interventions and appropriate resources and programs

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

Instructional coaches will continue to focus on formative assessments and monitoring strategies during weekly collaborative planning

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.

Sebastian Elementary will continue to participate in professional development activities that foster a deeper understanding of standards-based instruction, engagement strategies, differentiation and formative assessments. All strategies will focus on improving the quality of collaborative planning, instructional delivery, monitoring student learning and data analysis to increase student proficiency in ELA, Math, and Science.

Specific focus will be spent implementing tier II and tier III strategies for students in the bottom quartile, students with multiple early warning factors, and students in underperforming ESSA subgroups.

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

Academic supports will be provided for the lowest 35% in ELA, Math, and Science. This will be provided during an intervention block during school hours as well as during after school programs. Regular leadership meetings will occur to ensure building capacity of standards-based instruction and social emotional learning. During meetings, team will focus on academic content pertaining to all subject areas, professional development updates, analysis of schoolwide data and problem solving. Sebastian Elementary team will implement a schoolwide PBIS structure to cultivate a positive environment and to motivate students throughout grade levels.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning**Area of Focus Description and****Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

Sebastian Elementary made substantial learning gains in both reading and math. This increase indicates that scheduled Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention groups were impactful. However, Sebastian Elementary scored below the district level in both ELA and math proficiency which indicates the need to focus on high yield strategies to support effective Tier 1 instruction.

Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

75% of classrooms will use collaborative planning with an emphasis on monitoring and formative assessments.

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

The instructional practice of collaborative planning will be monitored through the use of weekly walkthroughs, an in depth analysis of student achievement data as well as observation of collaborative planning sessions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Letitia Whitfield (letitia.whitfield@indianriverschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being

In order to increase proficiency in math, ELA , and science we will develop a structure in collaborative planning to identify possible formative assessments and monitoring strategies that teachers can use to help drive their instruction and differentiation needs.

**implemented
for this Area
of Focus.**

**Rationale for
Evidence-
based
Strategy:
Explain the
rationale for
selecting
this specific
strategy.
Describe the
resources/
criteria used
for selecting
this
strategy.**

Last year we established collaborative planning schedules and during the collaborative planning sessions we spent more of our time discussing what we would be teaching as opposed to how we would be teaching and monitoring the instruction given. According to our district Impact walkthrough data by the end of the year, 44 percent of our teachers were utilizing effective monitoring strategies. Because our teachers were not consistently monitoring strategies our data also reflected a lack of differentiation in our classrooms. Implementing a structure for collaborative planning that focuses on formative assessments and monitoring strategies when paired with administration walkthroughs, coach walkthroughs, the coaching cycle, immediate feedback, and data driven lessons will increase student achievement in the area of ELA, Math, and Science.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Teachers, coaches, administration, and interventionists will construct and implement weekly collaborative planning schedule. Coaches will establish roles, norms, and expectations for planning sessions and share with teachers. Planning specifically for formative assessments and monitoring will be an established norm.

Person Responsible Letitia Whitfield (letitia.whitfield@indianriverschools.org)

Leadership team will create and implement a walk-through tool that identifies specific monitoring and formative assessment practices as well as feedback for the teacher. This tool will be shared to instructional staff prior to the first walkthrough.

Person Responsible Letitia Whitfield (letitia.whitfield@indianriverschools.org)

Teachers will plan lessons that engage students in the complexity level intended for each standard. During weekly coach facilitated meetings, instructional staff and school leadership will create lesson plans that all teachers are accountable to uphold and follow. Questions will be developed and/or identified for student monitoring. Weekly walkthroughs will be conducted to observe the execution of the planning session and teachers will receive informal feedback related to instruction.

Person Responsible Letitia Whitfield (letitia.whitfield@indianriverschools.org)

General education and exceptional education teachers will attend professional development on Power BI (data analysis tool) to track student progress and deepen understanding of the ESSA subgroups. (specifically African American and ESE) During collaborative planning sessions, coaches and instructional staff will use student performance data from formative and summative assessments to drive daily instruction and determine the need for differentiation to meet the needs of all students.

Person Responsible Letitia Whitfield (letitia.whitfield@indianriverschools.org)

Using Title One funds, academic supports will be provided for specifically identified 3rd-5th grade students through our A2 After School Camp. The intention of this program is to close achievement gaps across multiple subject areas.

Person Responsible Letitia Whitfield (letitia.whitfield@indianriverschools.org)

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Student Conduct**Area of Focus****Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

After analyzing discipline data, it was discovered 50% of Sebastian Elementary referrals involve verbal and physical conflict on the bus. These referrals often result to a suspension from the bus for multiple days, which directly impacts attendance for these particular students. Furthermore, the behavior carries over into the school. In order to decrease transportation referrals and increase attendance, Sebastian Elementary will focus on the high yield strategies of building a positive bus culture through relationship building.

Measurable**Outcome:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Sebastian Elementary will decrease the amount of peer conflict related discipline referrals to 25% of all referrals.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

This area will be monitored by analyzing discipline referral data, bus observations, and feedback from transportation professionals and student support department.

Person

responsible for monitoring outcome:

Letitia Whitfield (letitia.whitfield@indianriverschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Sebastian Elementary will cultivate a positive environment on the buses, common areas, and classrooms by focusing on building authentic staff-student relationships and focusing on student restorative practices using the PBIS framework.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Authoritative and relational discipline frameworks such as restorative justice provide educators with opportunities to build authentic relationships that allow them to see past stereotypes associated with students' race, ethnicity, or gender (Gregory, Clawson, Davis, & Gerewitz, 2016) Research shows that building students' restorative practices and forming authentic, genuine relationships with students creates a supportive environment for all stakeholders.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Grade level teams will create common grade level classroom procedures, expectations, rewards, and consequences. Teachers will review their classroom management and expectations with their students.

Person Responsible Letitia Whitfield (letitia.whitfield@indianriverschools.org)

Teachers and staff will be trained on tiered interventions using the SDIRC Behavior tool kit with an emphasis on peer conflict.

Person Responsible Letitia Whitfield (letitia.whitfield@indianriverschools.org)

Leadership team will conduct weekly data analysis of classroom referrals, transportation referrals, and office referrals with leadership team and share data with teachers and staff.

Person Responsible Tony Adkins (tony.adkins@indianriverschools.org)

Student Services will collaborate with the Director of Transportation and SES staff and administration to create and implement positive referrals for students using PBIS strategies.

Person Responsible Ashley Kohlstedt (ashley.kohlstedt@indianriverschools.org)

School Counselor will provide Social Skills Classes with Peer Mediation Strategies and Restorative practices with all kindergarten classes for specific classes and students on an as needed basis. School Counselor and student support department will model practices and coach transportation professionals and SES staff.

Person Responsible Ashley Kohlstedt (ashley.kohlstedt@indianriverschools.org)

No description entered

Person Responsible [no one identified]

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

At the end of the 21-22 school year, the current first graders had 17% of the students score one grade level below on the end-of-year iReady diagnostic. The current second graders had 2% at two grade levels below with 50% scoring one year below grade level. Sebastian Elementary implemented collaborative planning with an emphasis on standards-based instruction, and frequent monitoring with formative assessment. Teachers are trained in the science behind the instruction of foundational skills as presented in their Amplify curriculum. When teachers are able to monitor student understanding throughout the lesson and provide targeted feedback, this leads to higher student achievement.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

The data showed 49% of our 3rd - 5th graders were proficient on the 21-22 FSA statewide assessment. This year Sebastian Elementary implemented focused collaborative planning with an emphasis on standards-based instruction, and frequent monitoring with formative assessment. Also, standards mastery assessment practice, and increased data analysis. Frequent classroom walkthroughs look for a strong adherence to the reading curriculum with monitoring.

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

Based on the data from the Star Early Literacy assessment, 37% of the kindergarten students are on or above grade level. 63% are below grade level. Within the below grade level, 12 % are on watch, 31% are on yellow intervention, and 20% are on red needing urgent intervention.

48% of first graders are at or above grade level with 52% scoring below grade level. Within the below

grade level, 18% are on watch in blue, 26% are in the yellow intervention, with 8% in the red needing urgent intervention.

On the Star Reading Assessment, 39% of second graders are at or above grade level with 61% are below. Within the below grade level, 4% are on watch, 22% are in the yellow with 35% in the red needing urgent intervention.

The goals for the 22-23 school year using the Star Early Literacy and Reading assessments include the following:

Kindergarten: 70% will score at or above level.

First grade: 75% will score at or above grade level.

Second grade: 75% will score at or above grade level.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Based on the FAST beginning of the year data, 84% of third graders scored below a level 3. 76% of fourth graders scored below a level 3, and 70% of fifth graders scored below level 3.

The goals for the 22-23 school year using the FAST data include the following:

3rd grade: 60% will score at or above a level 3

4th grade: 65% will score at or above a level 3

5th grade: 65% will score at or above a level 3

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Student progress is monitored through frequent class walkthroughs utilizing observation tools to gather data on implementation of instructional practices. Student formative assessment data, progress monitoring data, as well as state and district assessment data will be analyzed to guide tier 1 and tier 2 instruction to ensure student growth.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Whitfield, Letitia, letitia.whitfield@indianriverschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Teachers are utilizing the Amplify Core Knowledge Language Arts Program (CKLA) as their core reading program. We are using the Amplify Assessment and Remediation Guide as well as the iReady Magnetic Reading program for additional support in Tier 2. These programs are strongly identified with Florida's definition of evidence-based and align with our district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidenced-based Reading

Plan. These programs are aligned with the B.E.S.T standards. These programs are monitored through frequent classroom walkthroughs using observation tools to gather data on implementation.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Amplify CKLA is the district chosen core reading program due to its proven record for effectiveness. IReady Magnetic reading is a district approved program that addressed the identified needs and has shown to be effective.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

| Action Step | Person Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|
| Create Literacy Leadership Team. The team will be made up of classroom teachers, administrators, literacy coach, reading interventionist, and reading resource teacher. Leadership team of administrators and Literacy Coach will meet weekly to discuss classroom walkthrough data. | Whitfield, Letitia, letitia.whitfield@indianriverschools.org |
| Literacy Leadership team will meet quarterly to review data collected as it pertains to program implementation, student progress and instructional practices. | Whitfield, Letitia, letitia.whitfield@indianriverschools.org |
| Literacy Coach will meet frequently with district support team to monitor effectiveness and implementation of collaborative planning. | Whitfield, Letitia, letitia.whitfield@indianriverschools.org |
| Literacy Coach will conduct classroom walkthroughs with district and/or school leadership to review data and provide targeted teacher feedback. | Whitfield, Letitia, letitia.whitfield@indianriverschools.org |
| Literacy Coach and literacy leaders will review progress monitoring, unit assessments, and standards mastery data to monitor students progress. | Whitfield, Letitia, letitia.whitfield@indianriverschools.org |
| Assistant Principal and literacy coach will participate in the State RAISE webinars to increase knowledge on instructional strategies. | Whitfield, Letitia, letitia.whitfield@indianriverschools.org |
| Literacy Coach will train and monitor teacher effectiveness in instructional strategies through collaborative planning and class walkthroughs. | Whitfield, Letitia, letitia.whitfield@indianriverschools.org |

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Data Finding:

- 50% of our ODRs and classroom minor level referrals at SES were peer conflict related.

Rationale for Selection of Data:

- Because 50% of our referrals involved conflict on the bus, the behavior would continue into our classrooms and common areas.

High Yield Strategy:

- 1) Building relationships skills to develop encouragement and support.
- 2) Building a “positive” school environment that values positive relationships.

Goal: During the first nine weeks of the 2022-2023 school year, Sebastian Elementary will decrease the amount of peer conflict related discipline referrals to 25% of all referrals.

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

(Classroom Teachers)

- Grade level teams will create common grade level classroom procedures, expectations, rewards, and consequences.
- Teachers will review their classroom management and expectations with their students.
- Teachers and staff will be trained on implementing tiered interventions using the SDIRC Behavior Tool Kit with an emphasis on peer conflict.

(Guidance Counselor)

- Data analysis of classroom referrals, transportation referrals, and ODRs with leadership team. Share data with teachers and staff.