**School District of Indian River County**

# IR PREP School



**2023-24**

**Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)**

## Table of Contents

# IR PREP

1426 18TH ST, Vero Beach, FL 32960

www.indianriverschools.org

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Indian River County School Board on 9/25/2023.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

| Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI) |
|---|
| A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%. |

| Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI) |
|---|
| A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years. |

| Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI) |
|---|
| A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:<br><br>1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;<br>2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;<br>3. Have a school grade of D or F; or<br>4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years. |

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

| SIP Sections | Title I Schoolwide Program | Charter Schools |
|---|---|---|
| I-A: School Mission/Vision | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1) |
| I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(2-3) | |
| I-E: Early Warning System | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-A-C: Data Review | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-F: Progress Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(3) | |
| III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection | ESSA 1114(b)(6) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4) |
| III-B: Area(s) of Focus | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii) | |
| III-C: Other SI Priorities | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9) |
| VI: Title I Requirements | ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g) | |

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

**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 Department 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.

# I. School Information

## School Mission and Vision

### Provide the school's mission statement.

The IR (Indian River) PREP (Positive Rigorous Engaging Programs): Center for Transformational Excellence, formerly known as the Alternative Center for Education, is dedicated to fostering a safe and positive environment that models growth, respect, and responsibility.

### Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of the IR PREP is to enhance student achievement through teacher growth and development to support the success of all students. We Accept, Restore and Return with Care!

## School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

### School Leadership Team
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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---|---|---|
| Brown, Dariyall | Principal | |
| Bennett-Campbell, Dawn | Assistant Principal | |

### Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The SIP was developed with district leadership and the IR Prep Leadership team in collaboration and coordination with the School Advisory Council. The SIP will be reviewed and presented during the first SAC meeting scheduled in August for approval by all stakeholders. The IR Prep SAC team includes all required stakeholders identified in ESSA 1114(b)(2).

### SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The IR Prep school leadership team will meet weekly to review student data to ensure that we will meet quarterly SIP goals to close the achievement gap. After each quarterly report, the leadership team will identify and revise any deficient areas to meet academic improvement.

## Demographic Data
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

| | |
|---|---|
| **2023-24 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | High School<br>5-12 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | Alternative Education |
| **2022-23 Title I School Status** | Yes |
| **2022-23 Minority Rate** | 71% |
| **2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** | 81% |
| **Charter School** | No |
| **RAISE School** | No |
| **ESSA Identification**<br>*updated as of 3/11/2024 | CSI |
| **Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)** | Yes |
| **2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | |
| **School Grades History**<br>*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline. | |
| **School Improvement Rating History** | 2021-22: I<br><br>2018-19: UNSATISFACTORY<br><br>2017-18: MAINTAINING<br><br>2016-17: UNSATISFACTORY |
| **DJJ Accountability Rating History** | |

## Early Warning Systems

**Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:**

| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 22 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 16 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 10 | 13 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 10 | 12 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 10 | 20 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 4 | 12 | 20 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 10 | 20 |

**Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 5 | 13 | 19 |

**Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:**

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

## Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

**The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 54 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 36 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 34 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 12 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 25 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 18 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 25 |

**The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 12 | 55 |

**The number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 14 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

## Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

**The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 11 | 16 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 14 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 8 | 11 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 5 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 7 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 9 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 4 | 7 |

**The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 12 | 17 |

**The number of students identified retained:**

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

## II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

**On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.**

| Accountability Component | 2023 | | | 2022 | | | 2021 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement* | 20 | 50 | 50 | 0 | 51 | 51 | | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | | | | | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | | | | | |
| Math Achievement* | 5 | 33 | 38 | 6 | 41 | 38 | | | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | | | | | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | | | | | | |

| Accountability Component | 2023 | | | 2022 | | | 2021 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Science Achievement* | | 71 | 64 | 0 | 28 | 40 | | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | 67 | 66 | | 33 | 48 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 38 | 44 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | 0 | 96 | 89 | 0 | 57 | 61 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | 59 | 65 | | 62 | 67 | | | |
| ELP Progress | | 50 | 45 | | | | | | |

*In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.*

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

**ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)**

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | CSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 8 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | Yes |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 25 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 3 |
| Percent Tested | 71 |
| Graduation Rate | 0 |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | CSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 2 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | Yes |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 6 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 4 |
| Percent Tested | |
| Graduation Rate | 0 |

**ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**

| 2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD | | | | |
| ELL | | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | | | | |
| HSP | | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | | | | |
| FRL | 18 | Yes | 3 | 3 |

| 2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD | | | | |
| ELL | | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | | | | |
| HSP | | | | |
| MUL | | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | | | | |
| FRL | 0 | Yes | 2 | 2 |

**Accountability Components by Subgroup**
Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

| 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 20 | | | 5 | | | | | | 0 | | |
| SWD | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | 36 | | | | | | | | | | 2 | |

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 0 | | | 6 | | | 0 | | | 0 | | |
| SWD | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | | | | | | | | | | 0 | | |

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SWD | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| MUL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| FRL | | | | | | | | | | | | |

**Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)**
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

| ELA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 10 | 2023 - Spring | 7% | 52% | -45% | 50% | -43% |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | * | 43% | * | 47% | * |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 13% | 45% | -32% | 47% | -34% |
| 09 | 2023 - Spring | * | 48% | * | 48% | * |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | * | 45% | * | 47% | * |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | * | 58% | * | 54% | * |
| 07 | 2023 - Spring | * | 49% | * | 48% | * |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 13% | 51% | -38% | 55% | -42% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 08 | 2023 - Spring | 0% | 51% | -51% | 44% | -44% |

| ALGEBRA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | 14% | 52% | -38% | 50% | -36% |

| GEOMETRY | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | * | 47% | * | 48% | * |

| BIOLOGY | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | * | 69% | * | 63% | * |

| CIVICS | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | * | 66% | * | 66% | * |

| HISTORY | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| N/A | 2023 - Spring | * | 65% | * | 63% | * |

## III. Planning for Improvement

**Data Analysis/Reflection**
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

**Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.**

After reviewing the data, we found that 71% our students in grades 6th-8th earned low achieving scores in Math. There are three FAST Math Progress Monitoring scores introduced for the year 2022-2023. The

following are the monitoring scores for ELA: PM 1 - Level 1 (100% of our 7th & 8th students scored a level 1); PM 2 - Level1 (81% of our 6th, 7th & 8th students scored a level 1) , PM 3 - Level 1 (71% of our 6th, 7th, & 8th) students scored a level 1). Other contributing factors including or can be attributed to poor student attendance, lack of family involvement, and increased student homelessness. `In addition to our high teacher attrition rate in Math & ELA, which may have caused some lapses in instructional time and building a more positive school environment through our PBIS program.

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

After reviewing the data, we found that 71% of our students in grades 6th-8th earned a level 1 on FAST Math PM 3. This can be attributed to poor student attendance, lack of family involvement, and increased student homelessness. Other contributing factors was our teacher attrition rate in Math & ELA, which may have caused some lapses in instructional time and building a more positive school environment through our PBIS program.

**Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.**

Additionally, the greatest gap when compared to state average was on our FAST Math PM 3 for 6-8. This can be attributed to poor student attendance, lack of family involvement, and increased student homelessness. Other contributing factors was our teacher attrition rate in Math & ELA, which may have caused some lapses in instructional time and building a more positive school environment through our PBIS program.

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

After reviewing schoolwide data the greatest improvement occurred with reading. To increase student capacity related to reading comprehension, a reward system was developed which provided incentives for improved I-ready scores. Other contributing factors was our teacher attrition rate in Math & ELA, which may have caused some lapses in instructional time and building a more positive school environment through our PBIS program.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.**

Of concern is the following for IR Prep:
1. 4 of the 8th grade students had been retained 2 or more times already putting them at higher risk of being a HS drop out.
2. Our 8th grade students showed the highest percentage of daily absences.

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

1. Increasing daily student attendance
2. Improving behavioral intervention programs
3. Improving climate and culture
4. Improving instructional quality
5. Increase student achievement

**Area of Focus**
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

## #1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

According to the early warning indicators, it was discovered that 84% of all Economically Disadvantaged students fell below 41% threshold as a result of low attendance at 72%. 50% of our Economically Disadvantaged students served an out of school suspension. 37% of our Economically Disadvantaged scored a level 1 on the ELA and 40% scored a level 1 on the Math FAST state exam. 50% failed ELA and 46% had a course failure in Math. Positive Culture and Environment was identified as a crucial need to engage Economically Disadvantaged students.

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

All 84% of our Economically Disadvantaged students will progressively make a 15% learning gain on PM1, PM2 and PM 3 ELA and Math FAST exam
All 84% of our Economically Disadvantaged students will significantly increase their attendance rate by 10%
All 84% of our Economically Disadvantaged students will decrease suspension rates 20%
All 84% of our Economically Disadvantaged students will earn a C grade or higher for the per semester
All 84% of our Economically Disadvantaged students will show an increase on the FAST test

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

1. With the use of SDIRC's Power BI, the MTSS team will use Early Warning Intervention and Monitoring Systems (EWIMS) and other data points to identify all ED students who were deficient in key areas (Math & ELA) of achievement and target specific students for extended learning opportunities after school.
2. The SLT will create and adjust class schedules that address the academic and behavioral needs of all ED students each enrollment.
3. The SLT will conduct weekly walkthroughs to ensure that all ED students are receiving high quality instruction by analyzing IMPACT walkthrough data and utilizing data to drive decision making and problem solving.
4. The IR Prep SLT and instructional staff will use collaborative planning on reoccurring Wednesdays to address and intentionally plan for ED student's academic deficiencies from 2:00 PM-3:00 PM.
5. The SLT will check lesson plans with fidelity via Canvas on a weekly basis.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dariyall Brown (dariyall.brown@indianriverschools.org)

### Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

1.Collaborative planning time for teachers
Teacher collaboration happens when educators work together to create innovative lesson plans, discuss concerns about student achievement or behavior, determine student progress and challenges, share evidence-based best practices, and offer collegial support in a structured environment. Teachers will use EWIMS and other data to target student areas of need to focus their collaborative planning time.

2.Extended learning opportunities for targeted students
Targeted students will receive high-quality instruction from certified teachers after school to support their individual acceleration in ELA, Math, Science, and Social Studies.

3.Cooperative learning and student engagement strategies, such as Kagan Structures.
Cooperative Learning is small, heterogeneous groups of students working together to achieve a common goal. Students work together to learn and are responsible for their teammates' learning as well as their own. The basic elements are positive interdependence, individual accountability, equal participation, and multiple interactions within a class period.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

1.Collaborative planning:
Research indicates when effective collaboration occurs, instruction is enhanced. Teachers with various levels of experience that collectively focus on improving student learning are most effective in increasing student achievement. Emphasizing the MTSS process and EWIMS, teachers will share best practices related to identified needs, developing their practices relating to targeted areas. EWIMS has a "Strong" ESSA Rating on EvidenceforESSA.com

2.Extended Learning:
USDOE's Institute of Education Sciences states high-quality tutoring is one evidence-based strategy that can accelerate student learning. Further, they encourage programs offered outside of school hours as an evidence-based strategy to catch students up academically. (Fong, Pamela. REL West)

3.Cooperative learning:
Cooperative Learning has an effect size of 0.4, which is equal to 1 year of growth. According to his research, when students work together on tasks or projects, they develop critical thinking, problem-solving, and communication abilities, ultimately improving achievement. (Hattie, John. Visible Learning)

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

Yes

**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.

Professional Development: Teachers will attend professional development to learn about cooperative learning strategies, specifically Kagan Structures, their benefit for students both academically and socially, as well as how to select the most effective strategies for different content and learning to target student needs.

**Person Responsible:** Dawn Bennett-Campbell (dawn.bennett-campbell@indianriverschools.org)

**By When:** August and January

Coaching: Teachers will be observed by a Kagan coach and SLT to receive feedback on their use of cooperative learning strategies aligned to standards-based instruction, areas for improvement, and next steps for implementation.

**Person Responsible:** Dawn Bennett-Campbell (dawn.bennett-campbell@indianriverschools.org)

**By When:** October

Walkthroughs: The SLT will use the SDIRC IMPACT walkthrough tool to collect data on the use and effectiveness of Kagan structures within the learning environment. Actionable feedback will be shared with teachers. Modeling and coaching from the SLT and identified teachers who are excelling with implementation will occur as needed.

**Person Responsible:** Dariyall Brown (dariyall.brown@indianriverschools.org)

**By When:** Weekly throughout the school year

Collaborative Planning: Teachers, content coaches, and the SLT will lesson plan together to focus on teacher clarity, instructional models, Kagan Structures, and questioning that align to the Benchmarks and will support the intended learning and maximizing student engagement. EWIMS, Power BI data, and other data gathered through the MTSS process will be used to determine areas of focus and need.

**Person Responsible:** Dariyall Brown (dariyall.brown@indianriverschools.org)

**By When:** Weekly

Extended Learning Opportunities (High-Quality Tutoring): EWIMS, Power BI data, and the MTSS process will be used to target students in need of additional support to accelerate their academic achievement in ELA, Math, Science, and/or Social Studies. The SLT will coordinate with teachers, staff, students, and families to establish a tutoring plan. Tutoring will occur with progress monitoring through the MTSS process.

**Person Responsible:** Dariyall Brown (dariyall.brown@indianriverschools.org)

**By When:** Students will be identified and plans made by October 1st. Monitoring and adjusting will occur as needed throughout the school year. Tutoring will be provided afterschool 2 times per week.

| #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math |
|---|

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our area of Focus will target our economically disadvantaged who earned a level 1 on the FAST Math and Algebra 1 state assessment. According to the data analysis 13% of our 8th grade students scored a 3 or higher on the Math state assessment. 14% of our 9th & 10th grade students scored a 3 or higher on Algebra 1 state assessment.

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

The growth target will show that 100% of our teachers will demonstrate Kagan strategies via documented weekly walkthrough data board.
The anticipated gains will show that 50% of our high school students will an increase their score to a level 3 on the Algebra 1 state assessment.
The anticipated gains will show that 60% of our middle school students will increase their score to a level 3 on the Math state assessment.

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

1. Use power Bi to identify our L25 students and create an academic plan for After School Tutoring.
2. SLT and teachers will track our L25 student's progress on a quarterly basis using PM1, PM2 & PM 3 data tool.
3. SLT and Instructional Coach will monitor i-Ready data for middle school L25 students on a weekly basis.
4. SLT will conduct routine classroom walkthroughs on 2 times a week.
5. Teachers will use Kagan strategies to support differentiation of instruction with all students.
6. Standards based lesson plans will be checked with fidelity on weekly basis.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**
Dariyall Brown (dariyall.brown@indianriverschools.org)

**Evidence-based Intervention:**
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

The evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus will be the effective use of Kagan strategies in our Math classes.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The rationale for selecting this specific strategy is to influence change in how we increase student engagement by organizing our classroom structures into small student-center groups. The Kagan design will also validate our need to re-establish differentiation and monitoring in our middle and high school math classes. Formative assessment tools will be the end results to help increase student achievement on the math and Algebra state assessment. The main three Kagan strategies trainings will help to improve our overall instructional practices and student learning on a daily basis.

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

Yes

**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.

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*

## CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Indian River County uses an in depth root cause analysis model to evaluate prior year data when implementing the school improvement plan. PowerBi is utilized to take an in depth look at each student's achievement based on attendance, behavior, assessment and grades which allows us to triangulate the data to ensure students' success. Funds are then allocated based on the school improvement plan and need.

Utilizing the District's strategic plan, on-going progress monitoring and assessment data, SDIRC identifies and aligns all District resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular, policy) to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. District resources are supplemented with many other programs including Title I, Title II, Title III- Immigrant, Title III-ESOL, Title IV, Title IX- Homeless Education, community resources, and other funds to address the differing needs of our schools. SDIRC intentionally braids together services, programs, and resources to best meet the needs of students. Decisions regarding personnel, instructional materials, and policy are made with stakeholder input and considers both qualitative and quantitative data.

The methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state, and local funds, services, and programs to align to interventions in CSI schools is highly dependent on the use of assessment data, stakeholder feedback data, and District and school leadership team collaboration. This is supported, in part, with the utilization of the District's digital Instructional Leadership HUB which allows stakeholders to share data, resources, School Improvement Plans, and other information that drives student achievement.

SDIRC's structures and systems, including the development and implementation of the School Improvement Plan drives the allocation and utilization of all federal, state, and local funds, services, and programs to ensure they are maximized to drive student achievement. The Data and Systems Review process will enable the SLTs to thoroughly analyze data results and identify the area most necessary for school improvement. The Data and Systems Review process includes Impact Walks in which the Superintendent's Cabinet, District staff, Principals, and school leadership teams make observations across the campus to identify strengths and weaknesses in the implementation of the SIP strategies. The Marzano learning map supports this process as a coaching tool throughout the school year. The DataCom chats involve the same stakeholders and use student achievement data and Impact Walk data to provide feedback to the school administration as the District works collaboratively to make data-driven decisions to make necessary adjustments to the SIP that will accelerate student achievement.

## Budget to Support Areas of Focus

### Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

| 1 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System | | | | $45,574.57 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Function | Object | Budget Focus | Funding Source | FTE | 2023-24 |
| | 6400 | 130 | 0033 - IR PREP | UniSIG | | $14,300.00 |
| | | Notes: Salaries - Extra Compensation/Stipend for 12 teachers assigned to IR Prep and 10 other district mentor teachers, instructional leaders, content specialists, and instructional coaches to implement additional collaborative planning time beyond contracted hours in support of using data to inform instruction and aligning practices to SIP goals. (22 employees at $25/hr rate for 26 hours) | | | | |
| | 6400 | 210 | 0033 - IR PREP | UniSIG | | $1,940.51 |
| | | Notes: Retirement | | | | |
| | 6400 | 220 | 0033 - IR PREP | UniSIG | | $1,093.95 |
| | | Notes: FICA | | | | |
| | 6400 | 240 | 0033 - IR PREP | UniSIG | | $268.84 |
| | | Notes: Worker's Compensation | | | | |
| | 5100 | 510 | 0033 - IR PREP | UniSIG | | $5,086.36 |
| | | Notes: Instructional Supplies supplemental instructional materials to support student instruction during the regular school day, tutoring targeted students afterschool, and implementation of SIP activities to improve student achievement (iReady books average $11/unit x 30= $330, Gateway American Civics and Government books $208.45 per set of 10, Gateway US History books $208.45 per set of 10, Kagan instructional materials and resources average cost $250 per 12 teachers =$3000 , Math classroom sets manipulatives and games average cost $150/unit x4= $600, Science hands on materials for labs average cost $205/lab x 3= approx. $615, supplemental subject area posters and teaching aids average cost $20.92 x 6 =$125.52) =$5,086.36 | | | | |
| | 5100 | 120 | 0033 - IR PREP | UniSIG | | $7,830.00 |
| | | Notes: Salaries- Extra Compensation/Stipend for Extended Learning Opportunities beyond the contractual day - for instructional staff to provide after school tutoring in ELA, Math, Science, and Social Studies to targeted students (2 days/week for 29 weeks for 3 teachers with an average salary of $45/hr.) =$7830 | | | | |
| | 5100 | 210 | 0033 - IR PREP | UniSIG | | $1,062.54 |
| | | Notes: Retirement | | | | |
| | 5100 | 220 | 0033 - IR PREP | UniSIG | | $599.00 |
| | | Notes: FICA | | | | |
| | 5100 | 240 | 0033 - IR PREP | UniSIG | | $147.21 |
| | | Notes: Worker's Compensation | | | | |
| | 7800 | 790 | 0033 - IR PREP | UniSIG | | $6,960.00 |
| | | Notes: Student Transportation - to support the after school tutoring for targeted students. (1 bus with 1 driver and 1 assistant @ approximately $60/hr, 2hr per day, 2 days/week, 29 weeks) =$6960 | | | | |
| | 5100 | 644 | 0033 - IR PREP | UniSIG | | $5,000.00 |
| | | Notes: Technology- 10 Chromebooks to support small group centers to increase student engagement in core subject areas (10 Chromebooks @ $500/computer=$5,000) | | | | |
| | 5100 | 510 | 0033 - IR PREP | UniSIG | | $1,286.16 |
| | | Notes: Supplies- Office supplies such as paper, post-its, markers, that directly impact student achievement (Total= $1,286.16- Maximum of 5%= $2,500 per RFA) | | | | |

| 2 | III.B. | Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | $0.00 |
|---|--------|---------------------------------------------|-------|
| | | Total: | $45,574.57 |

## Budget Approval

**Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.**

No