Dr. W.J. Creel Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Dr. W.J. Creel Elementary School

2000 GLENWOOD DR, Melbourne, FL 32935

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

Demographics

Principal: Nicole Gaumond

Start Date for this Principal: 8/15/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	*[Data Not Available]*
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

As a school family, Dr W.J. Creel's mission is to empower each other to S.O.A.R. to greatness!

Provide the school's vision statement.

Together We Will Achieve Greatness!

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Gaumond, Nicole	Principal	Mrs. Gaumond oversees and monitors schoolwide data. She meets with teachers bi-weekly using MTSS and Data chats to increase learning gains for all students. She participates in classroom "learning walks" with the admin team and Title One coaches utilizing the four T's as look-fors (Target, Text, Task, Talk). Additionally, she meets with SAC once per month to gain stakeholder input and promotes student/family engagement activities.
Chance, Sean	Assistant Principal	Mr. Chance oversees and monitors schoolwide data and curriculum. He meets with teachers bi-weekly using MTSS and Data chats to increase learning gains for all students. He participates in classroom "learning walks" with admin team and Title One coaches utilizing the four T's as look-fors (Target, Text, Task, Talk). Additionally, he monitors math, science, and social emotional strategies schoolwide. He also develops professional developments for teachers specific to their needs.
Back, Erica	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Back oversees and monitors schoolwide data and curriculum. She meets with teachers bi-weekly using MTSS and Data chats to increase learning gains for all students. She participates in classroom "learning walks" with admin team and Title One coaches utilizing the four T's as look-fors (Target, Text, Task, Talk). Additionally, she monitors ELA, Social Studies, and social emotional strategies schoolwide. She also attends monthly SAC meetings to gain stakeholder input. Lastly, she ensures new teachers receive support from trained mentors.
Pepin , Nicole	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. Pepin works closely with teachers to assess student progress and determine the need for additional reinforcement or adjustments to instructional techniques. She is also our Title One coordinator. She ensures that our school is in compliance with all Title One mandates and organizes all associated events. Additionally, Mrs. Pepin is our School Outreach Business Partner.
Dias, Kimberly	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Dias will support all K-6 staff in the implementation of the ELA curriculum that supports the Florida Standards. She will work directly with teachers providing classroom-based coaching cycles, collaborative one-on-one support, and facilitating teacher professional development (Writing Cadre). A focus will be placed on enhancing the teachers' ability to provide instruction that builds students' sense of engagement. Mrs. Dias will also work with administration to collect, analyze, interpret, and use data to guide instructional decisions.
Herold, Kristi	Teacher, ESE	Mrs. Herold works with teachers, administration, coaches, and parents to facilitate implementation of the Multi-Tiered System of Supports and ensure the MTSS process, protocols, timelines, and implementation plans are implemented with fidelity and meet the needs of our students. Mrs. Herold provides training on the MTSS process at grade level meetings and sits in on student data chats bi-weekly. She schedules and runs all MTSS meetings

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		with teachers, administrators, and coaches. She also serves as the LEA for all IPST meetings.
Bernard, Carmen	Attendance/ Social Work	Mrs. Bernard is responsible for social emotional curriculum. She provides SEL/Conscious Discipline supports to our teachers, students, and families. Mrs. Bernard oversees our "Positive Referral" incentive as a proactive measure to showcase positive behaviors on campus.
Droll, Courtney	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Droll is responsible for ensuring the Eureka program is followed with fidelity in the classroom as outlined by district pacing guides. She will review data and monitor mid and end of module assessments. She will provide professional development opportunities that address instructional needs based on the data that is collected and analyzed.
Shoff, Mary	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Shoff will support all K-6 staff in the implementation of the Science curriculum that supports the standards. She will work directly with teachers providing classroom-based coaching cycles, collaborative one-on-one support, and facilitating teacher professional development (Google Classroom/Generation Genius). A focus will be placed on enhancing the teachers' ability to provide instruction that builds students' sense of engagement. She will work closely with the district resource teacher to ensure teachers are utilizing the 5E model of instruction. Mrs. Shoff will also work with administration to collect, analyze, interpret, and use data to guide instructional decisions. Additionally, she serves on the SAC committee as chairperson and is responsible for all meetings and agendas.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 8/15/2018, Nicole Gaumond

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
71

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	*[Data Not Available]*
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: B (54%) 2015-16: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	81	94	110	95	100	78	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	663
Attendance below 90 percent	7	6	6	13	7	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
One or more suspensions	0	6	5	4	4	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	10	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	17	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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	6	12	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	2	3	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/4/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	99	109	106	96	90	99	116	0	0	0	0	0	0	715
Attendance below 90 percent	15	14	18	12	13	7	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	2	1	2	0	3	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	26	33	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	120

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	1	1	6	5	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	99	109	106	96	90	99	116	0	0	0	0	0	0	715
Attendance below 90 percent	15	14	18	12	13	7	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	2	1	2	0	3	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	26	33	56	0	0	0	0	0	0	120

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	1	1	6	5	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	29

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	51%	62%	57%	63%	63%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	48%	60%	58%	64%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	34%	57%	53%	54%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	44%	63%	63%	51%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	57%	65%	62%	51%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	53%	51%	42%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	29%	57%	53%	56%	56%	51%

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Grade Level Data
NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	58%	64%	-6%	58%	0%
	2018	63%	63%	0%	57%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	54%	61%	-7%	58%	-4%
	2018	36%	57%	-21%	56%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
05	2019	41%	60%	-19%	56%	-15%
	2018	46%	54%	-8%	55%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
06	2019	52%	60%	-8%	54%	-2%
	2018	69%	63%	6%	52%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	38%	61%	-23%	62%	-24%
	2018	52%	62%	-10%	62%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	64%	-12%	64%	-12%
	2018	33%	59%	-26%	62%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		19%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	27%	60%	-33%	60%	-33%
	2018	32%	58%	-26%	61%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
06	2019	55%	67%	-12%	55%	0%
	2018	68%	68%	0%	52%	16%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		23%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	30%	56%	-26%	53%	-23%
	2018	42%	57%	-15%	55%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	16	28	26	10	33	37	8				
ELL	35	34	29	41	56	27					
BLK	39	48	30	29	46	30	13				
HSP	44	41	30	36	49	27	25				
MUL	47	37		35	50						
WHT	58	52	41	52	64	41	37				
FRL	46	44	34	37	52	35	22				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	13	24	26	13	32	28					
ELL	32	38	36	32	38	40					
BLK	36	30	18	28	30	14	13				
HSP	50	44	38	41	43	40	41				
MUL	51	34		38	27	27	55				
WHT	56	43	24	52	52	29	47				
FRL	44	38	27	37	41	24	34				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	20	32	29	11	30	27	16				
ELL	60	70		44	52	50					
ASN	73	70		91	80						
BLK	39	52	54	25	33	32	31				
HSP	67	72	69	58	63	58	73				
MUL	61	66	50	43	48	33					

2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
WHT	68	65	48	56	52	43	60				
FRL	55	61	51	44	48	42	49				

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	44
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	54
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	352
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	39
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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	34
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

Black/African American Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	38
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	42
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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

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	49
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	40
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

In 2019 the lowest performing data area was our lowest 25% subgroup for both ELA and Mathematics. In 2019, 34% of students in the lowest 25% category scored proficient within ELA which was an increase from the 26% proficiency in this category in 2018 school year. Likewise, 35% of students in the lowest 25% category scored proficient within mathematics which was an increase from the 27% in the subgroup for the 2018 school year. Although both of these areas are performing below district and state average's as a school we did see a positive trend for growth within this subgroup data. The positive trend in this data can be attributed to the addition of target intervention for some grade levels, increase in small group instruction, and the addition of monthly data team meeting discussions for all students. Although, we are seeing an increase in this data point there is still a huge need for growth within this area.

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

In 2018, 46% of students in grades 3rd-6th scored proficient in overall math achievement. However, in 2019 students in 3rd - 6th scoring proficiency dropped to 44% of students which was a decrease of 2%. In addition students in grade 5 dropped from 43% proficient in 2018 to only 29% of students being proficient in 2019 for the State Science assessment, this shows a decrease of 14%. The lack of standards based planning and instruction in the area of mathematics and science led to this decrease in overall proficiency for each assessment.

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.

In 2018, 46% of students in grades 3-6 scored proficient in mathematics at Creel. In 2019, 44% scored proficient in math, indicating a 2% decrease in proficiency from 2018-2019 at Creel. The state average for proficiency was 62% in 2018 and 63% in 2019 for grades 3-6, showing a 1% increase of proficiency. Compared to Dr. W.J. Creel, the sate average score in 2019 was 63% while the school score was 44%. This indicates a gap of 19% points between the school and state average in math proficiency scores for 2019. In 2018, the gap between the school and state was 16% points, showing an increased growth in the gap between school and state from 2018-2019.

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

In 2019, Dr. W.J. Creel showed improvements within the learning gains categories for both ELA and Mathematics. In 2018, 41% of students showed a learning gain in ELA and in 2019 this increased to 48% of students showing learning gains for ELA. Likewise, in 2018 45% of students showed learning gains within mathematics and in 2019 this increased to 57% of students making learning gains. In addition the lowest 25% student population showed growth in ELA from 26% in 2018 to 34% proficiency in 2019 as well growth in mathematics from 27% proficiency in 2018 to 35% proficiency in 2019. The overall growth in these areas is attributed to an increased awareness of student academic data and standards driven instruction planned for student specific needs. A school wide increase in small group intervention and standards aligned resources also attributed to the increases in these areas.

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

The number one concerning area within our EWS data is the number of students performing at a Level 1 on state assessments. This data indicates 120 students out of the overall 750 performing at level 1 on the state assessment.

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

1. Social Emotional Learning for all students
2. Learning gains increase in all subcategories
3. Increase percentage of students showing proficiency within math achievement
4. Increase percentage of students showing proficiency within science achievement
5. Increase percentage of students showing proficiency within ELA

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teacher learning and growth are dependent upon frequent interaction, dialogue, and reflection between themselves, instructional coaches, and administration.

Measureable Outcome:	School-wide ELA scores will increase as a result of teacher collaboratively planning and the implementation of standards based instruction in all classrooms for all students. In 2019 48% of students scored a learning gain and 51% of students in grades 3-6 were proficient on the ELA FSA. We did not take ELS FSA in 2020, so there is no data to review. The goal for 2021 is to increase students showing a learning gain to 51% and students meeting proficiency to 56% on the ELA FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Erica Back (back.erica@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilization of collaborative planning with standards aligned quality resources
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidence supports that teaching strategies increase when teachers are given time to collaborate with peers and build their skills utilizing quality materials. This strategy when paired with administration walk throughs, immediate feedback, and common assessments can yield great results for all learners.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will collaboratively plan with district and school based-coaches (T) quarterly to map out ELA standards aligned curriculum including complex text, tasks, questions, and exit ticket for understanding.
2. Teachers will collaboratively work with Writing Cadre team (T) to increase understanding and implementation of best practice writing strategies for instruction. The Write Score online platform will be used as a progress monitoring tool for writing in grades 3-6.
3. Teachers will use frequent feedback from coaches and administration observations to improve instruction.
4. A data room will be utilized by the Title One team and admin to monitor ongoing progress of iReady, standards mastery, PASI, and PSI assessments school wide. (T)

Person Responsible	Kimberly Dias (dias.kimberly@brevardschools.org)

5. Teachers will monitor student progress through i-Ready, Standards Mastery, PASI, PSI, KLS, Running Records, and Oral Reading Fluency to guide and plan for standards based instruction.
6. School wide intervention will continue by utilizing i-Ready targeted data to focus on individual student needs facilitated by additional teachers, interventionists, and IA's. (T)
7. Monthly data and MTSS meetings with teachers will continue and will focus on the lowest 25% population as well as ESSA sub-categories identified under 41%.
8. iReady Growth Monitoring in grades 1-6.
9. School-wide learning walks for all teachers looking at effective teaching strategies and standard alignment across the grade levels. The IPG tool will be utilized as well as noticing's and wonderings to drive professional conversations.
10. Purchase laptops and laptop carts to support the implementation of iReady and other digital resources. (T)

Person Responsible	Kimberly Dias (dias.kimberly@brevardschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teacher learning and growth are dependent upon frequent interaction, dialogue, and reflection between themselves, instructional coaches, and administrators.
Measureable Outcome:	School-wide math scores will increase as a result of teachers collaboratively planning and the implementation of standards based instruction in all classrooms for all students with the utilization of the Eureka math program. In 2019, 57% of students scored a learning gain and 44% of students were proficient on the Math FSA. We did not take Math FSA in 2020, so there is no data to review. The goal for 2021 is to increase students showing a learning gain to 60% and students meeting proficiency to 49%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sean Chance (chance.sean@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilization of collaborative planning with standards aligned quality resources
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidence supports that teaching strategies increase when teachers are given time to collaborate with peers and build their skills utilizing quality materials. The strategy when paired with administration walk-throughs, immediate feedback, and common assessments can yield great results for all learners.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Continue to implement Eureka program in classrooms K-5 to increase student depth of knowledge on standards.
2. Math coach (T) will work with teachers on pacing and planning so that grade levels can stay on pace with the district and collaboratively plan utilizing the Eureka resources in order to increase the standards based instruction and move to the next level of deeper mathematical knowledge for all students.
3. Teachers will plan with their teams so that they can support each other and work together to plan ahead and prep materials for lessons.
4. Teachers will use frequent feedback from coaches and administration to improve instruction.
5. Math coach (T) will work with teachers to model/co-teach lessons and provide support when needed.
6. Implement school-wide learning walks to identify effective teaching strategies and standard alignment across the grade levels. The IPG tool will be utilized as well as noticing's and wonderings to drive professional conversations.

Person Responsible	Courtney Droll (droll.courtney@brevardschools.org)

1. Math coach will facilitate PD opportunities for teachers including, but not limited to, school wide PD, grade level PD, and voluntary math book studies.
2. Math coach will work with grade level teams to track exit ticket data (formative assessment) and use that data to look at student successes and areas to grow before mid and end of module assessments and to make decisions about students to work with during small group time and continue to target students who need extra support.
3. Monthly data and MTSS meetings with teachers will continue and will focus on the lowest 25% student population as well as ESSA categories identified under 41%.
4. Math coach will have math materials and manipulatives available for teacher check out and support

grade level teams in gathering materials for lessons ahead of time (Title One).
5.Teachers will utilize mid and end of module assessment scores for common assessment data tracking.

Person Responsible Courtney Droll (droll.courtney@brevardschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teacher learning and growth are dependent upon frequent interaction, dialogue, and reflection between themselves, instructional coaches, and administrators.
Measureable Outcome:	Schoolwide Science scores will increase as a result of teachers collaboratively planning and the implementation of standards based instruction in all classrooms with the district created Science resources aligned to standards based instruction. In 2019, 28% of 5th grade students were proficient on the SSA. The goal for the 2020-2021 school year is to increase the percentage of students proficient on the SSA to 38%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sean Chance (chance.sean@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Collaborative planning with the utilization of the Five E model for hands on science instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidence supports that teaching strategies increase when teachers are given time to collaborate with peers and build their skills utilizing quality materials. This strategy when paired with administration walkthroughs, immediate feedback, and common assessments can yield great results for all learners.

Action Steps to Implement

1.A Science coach (T) will be added to the Title One team as a school-based resource for teachers and students.
2.Teachers will plan collaboratively with grade-level team and Science coach (T) using the standards aligned science resources created by the district. This collaboration will aid in increasing standards-based instruction and a deeper science knowledge for all students.
3.Teachers will use consistent feedback from coaches and administrative observations to improving classroom instruction.
4.3rd, 4th, & 5th grade students will attend an additional science instruction during activity rotation. This additional activity will be purposed for gaining a deeper understanding and review of 3rd, 4th, & 5th grade science skills.
5. Addition of Generation Genius (schoolwide) and PENDA for science interactive instruction grades 3rd - 5th. (T)
6. Science coach will model and coach teachers on standards aligned science instruction and provide feedback for teacher growth.

Person Responsible Mary Shoff (shoff.mary@brevardschools.org)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The 2019 school grade components report determined that we did not meet the 41% target in the areas of students with disabilities, English language learners, Black/African American students, Hispanic students, and economically disadvantaged students.
Measureable Outcome:	Students With Disabilities - Increase from 26% to 31% English Language Learners - Increase from 39% to 41% Black/African American - Increase from 34% to 39% Hispanic - Increase from 38% to 41% Economically Disadvantaged - Increase from 40% to 41%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nicole Gaumond (gaumond.nicole@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Conscious Discipline has achieved CASEL's SELect Program designation, recognizing Conscious Discipline as a leader in impactful social and emotional learning (SEL). Conscious Discipline meets CASEL's SELect Program designation, the highest designation for evidence-based programs. Conscious Discipline is an evidence-based, trauma-informed approach. The Harvard study's authors say, "Conscious Discipline provides an array of behavior management strategies and classroom structures that teachers can use to turn everyday situations into learning opportunities."
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	A collaborative problem planning approach will be utilized to make data driven instructional decisions to ensure that the needs of all students are being addressed. Additionally, school-based collaborative teams will focus on identified groups of under-performing students in an effort to provide unified and accelerated support. Additionally, Conscious Discipline can play a central role in our school's approach to promoting student social and emotional learning to close learning gaps.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Increase inclusion opportunities to include all core content areas.
2. Instructional Leader(s) will lead the MTSS/Data bi-weekly meetings as the key person(s) responsible for the oversight and coordination of goals and action steps related to inclusive best practices.
3. All data will be inclusive of reviewing all ESSA sub-categories.
4. Extended common planning for teachers to have in-depth collaboration on standards-aligned instruction.
5. iReady (Title One) data will determine schoolwide intervention groups for targeted specific instruction with ongoing progress monitoring utilizing district common assessments.

Person Responsible	Kristi Herold (herold.kristi@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

1. We will continue to review and analyze feedback from teacher, student, and parent surveys to provide insight on how we can improve as a school.
2. Attendance will be routinely monitored and tracked and reported to truancy as needed.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

During pre-planning, all instructional staff were trained by a Conscious Discipline liason on best practices in a trauma sensitive classroom. Data has displayed the need to continue the development of social and emotional skills within our students to help them navigate through difficult traumatic times in their lives in an effort to
be successful in school. Although rigorous academic preparation is necessary, ensuring Creel students are thriving socially is becoming increasingly important. During the 2020-2021 school year, we aim to support children in acquiring the knowledge, attitudes, and skills necessary to recognize and manage their emotions, demonstrate caring and concern for others, establish positive relationships with peers and adults, make responsible decisions, and positively navigate challenging social situations through utilization of: Caring School Community, Morning Meetings, MindUp Curriculum, and calming strategies taught by instructional staff. A school counselor has been added to the activity wheel for grades K-2. Positive Behavior Intervention Support (PBIS) will address all tiers of students. Utlization of state website (Rti Database) to track data and areas of need.

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