

Brevard Public Schools

Apollo Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	0

Apollo Elementary School

3085 KNOX MCRAE DR, Titusville, FL 32780

<http://www.apollo.brevard.k12.fl.us/>

Demographics

Principal: Frank O'leary A

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	<i>[Data Not Available]</i>
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: B (54%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (58%)
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.

To educate all students with excellence as the standard, working together in a safe professional learning community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To inspire all children to learn at their highest potential, preparing them for tomorrow's global expectations.

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
O'Leary, Frank	Principal	Frank O'Leary is the primary instructional leader of the school. He ensures that all stakeholders are engaged in the vision and mission of the school. He organizes and delivers professional development, facilitates the structure and management of the school's Leadership Team and oversees and implements the budget as it relates to instructional materials and PD. Mr. O'Leary oversees the shared decision-making team and works collaboratively with the group to ensure a strong focus on student achievement.
Cochran, Cheree	Assistant Principal	Cheree Cochran is a secondary instructional leader. Her role supports the principal and his vision for the school. Mrs. Cochran oversees student data and collaboration with teachers to help improve student achievement, especially in the primary grades.
Wise, Trelawney	Assistant Principal	Trelawney Wise is a secondary instructional leader. Her role supports the principal and his vision for the school. Ms. Wise oversees student data and collaboration with teachers to help improve student achievement, especially in the area of science.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2015, Frank O'leary A

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.*

5

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

66

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)	<i>[Data Not Available]</i>
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: B (54%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (58%)
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	110	116	99	100	116	114	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	759
Attendance below 90 percent	39	30	30	18	29	19	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	194
One or more suspensions	1	6	9	5	3	7	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
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	7	15	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	20	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

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	1	1	1	3	9	17	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

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	6	9	0	3	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/10/2020

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	117	119	110	120	126	107	134	0	0	0	0	0	0	833
Attendance below 90 percent	18	10	13	18	9	14	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
One or more suspensions	5	2	2	1	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	27	26	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	118

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	2	4	3	4	3	23	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	70

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	9	4	5	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	117	119	110	120	126	107	134	0	0	0	0	0	0	833
Attendance below 90 percent	18	10	13	18	9	14	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
One or more suspensions	5	2	2	1	1	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	27	26	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	118

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	2	4	3	4	3	23	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	70

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	9	4	5	6	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	59%	62%	57%	65%	63%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	59%	60%	58%	66%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	57%	53%	57%	52%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	59%	63%	63%	66%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	62%	65%	62%	64%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	53%	51%	53%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	34%	57%	53%	54%	56%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey								
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	65%	64%	1%	58%	7%
	2018	54%	63%	-9%	57%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	63%	61%	2%	58%	5%
	2018	55%	57%	-2%	56%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	40%	60%	-20%	56%	-16%
	2018	52%	54%	-2%	55%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-15%				
06	2019	66%	60%	6%	54%	12%
	2018	62%	63%	-1%	52%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	59%	61%	-2%	62%	-3%
	2018	52%	62%	-10%	62%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	66%	64%	2%	64%	2%
	2018	57%	59%	-2%	62%	-5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
05	2019	39%	60%	-21%	60%	-21%
	2018	56%	58%	-2%	61%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison		-18%				
06	2019	70%	67%	3%	55%	15%
	2018	66%	68%	-2%	52%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	33%	56%	-23%	53%	-20%
	2018	53%	57%	-4%	55%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
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	30	49	47	32	47	38	16				
BLK	43	52	38	37	54	45	23				
HSP	55	64	62	51	67	64	25				
MUL	57	54		52	58						
WHT	68	62	68	73	66	48	46				
FRL	51	58	52	50	58	53	25				

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	31	45	43	26	44	28	19				
BLK	35	44	48	36	59	50	27				
HSP	53	60	62	49	62	67	73				
MUL	61	70		60	70						
WHT	67	55	37	70	63	43	61				
FRL	49	49	43	53	62	55	47				

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	25	47	50	28	43	43	24				
BLK	48	63	60	44	54	48	23				
HSP	58	68		60	68		33				
MUL	58	61		63	68						
WHT	74	67	53	75	69	55	69				
FRL	57	63	58	58	59	55	45				

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	54
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	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	433
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	36
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	60
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	42
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	55
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	45
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	61
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	49
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

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

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

The data component that showed the lowest performance was Science.
A lack of teaching the depth and rigor of all of the science standards in grades K-5.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from 2018 was Science, by twenty points.
The decline of doing quality hands-on science lessons and allowing students to collaborate. Also the decrease in time spent on science academic vocabulary.

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.

The data component that showed the greatest decline when compared with the state average was Science.
We need to provide more hands - on experiences for our students. Also allowing them to collaborate with each other about what they learned. We need to also ensure that the students understand what each standard is asking them to do.

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

The data component that showed the greatest improvement was for Learning Gains for the Lowest 25% in ELA, which improved by 9 points. We instituted a school-wide Walk To Invention time as a regular part of our school day. We used the i-Ready online instructional program for at least 45 minutes per week, and also used the Ready LAFS workbook to focus on the standards. Our Title I teachers and instructional assistants also focused on assisting our lowest 25% in their areas of deficit.

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

Looking at the Early Warning System data, areas of concern are those students whose attendance was less than or equal to 90%, students who had one or more suspension, and our students who scored a Level 1 in either FSA English/Language Arts or FSA Mathematics. We need to provide support for these students.

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

1. Standards-based instruction
2. Science instruction
3. ESSA Subgroups' instruction and monitoring, specifically Students with Disabilities

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: ELA & Math Proficiency and Learning Gains in FSA will increase as a result of a focus on standards-aligned instruction through collaborative planning. For the past three years, Apollo Elementary has been an average of 3 points below the district for students who scored Level 3 or above and at least 1 point below the district for students who showed learning gains.

Measureable Outcome: FSA ELA Level 3+ proficiency will increase from 59% to 62%, and ELA learning gains will increase from 59% to 62%. FSA Math Level 3+ proficiency will increase from 59% to 62%, and Math Learning gains will increase from 62% to 65%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Frank O'Leary (oleary.frank@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: School-wide writing across content areas and text-based writing with complex text. Collaborative planning with grade level teams to design and implement standards-aligned lessons.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We believe that the tasks and the standards are not aligned. If tasks are aligned with the standard and more writing across the content areas are incorporated into lessons, we believe that learning gains will increase.

Action Steps to Implement

1. (T) Ensure all Title I teachers and assistants are utilized to their fullest for all students with greatest needs.
2. Data team meetings will occur on a monthly basis to review data (including Standards Mastery data) and decide on next steps. Particular attention will be paid to our subgroups.
3. Team meetings will be used to discuss writing exemplars and complexity of standards-aligned tasks including a focus on science instruction best practices.
4. Schedule instructional monitoring, feedback, coaching and follow-up based on student data trends and observational data.
5. Teachers will provide scaffolding for students using the i-Ready Toolbox.
6. (T) Utilize Write Score in grades 4-6 three times during the year to monitor and improve student writing.
7. Use Reading and Math ASP to supplement instruction for our lowest 25% of students in grades 2-6.
8. Teachers will provide Tier II and Tier III students with intervention time.

Person Responsible Frank O'Leary (oleary.frank@brevardschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Science 3+ proficiency in FSSA will increase if collaborative planning takes place. Our Science Level 3 and above proficiency decreased by 20 points from 2018. At 34%, Apollo is 23 points below the district and 19 points below the state. The trend shows more opportunity to improve teacher instruction to increase student achievement in the area of 5th grade science, with all other grades providing key instruction so that the students are ready for the 5th grade curriculum. The results of the 2018-2019 Florida State Science Assessment declined with 34% of students scoring level 3 or above. It clearly shows that science instruction need to be more rigorous, with a focus on more hands-on opportunities for our students. Our sub-groups (African American students, Students with Disabilities, and Economically Disadvantaged students) continued to under perform at an average proficiency rate of 36%. This data, also indicates that the Life Science Content Area should be Apollo’s primary focus. An examination of the 5th Grade 2019-2020 Science District Benchmark Assessments data revealed the following: 53% of students achieved a 70% or higher on Comparing Structures, 90% of students achieved a 70% or higher on Precipitation, 36% of students achieved a 70% or higher on The Water Cycle, 41% of students achieved a 70% or higher on the Solar System. Our ESSA subgroup areas of concern reveal that: 27% of students in the African American subgroup and 36% of Students with Disabilities scored a 70% or higher on Comparing Structures assessment. 68% of students in the African American subgroup and the Students with Disabilities subgroup scored a 70% or higher on the Precipitation assessment. Only five percent of the students in the African American subgroup and 16% of students in the Students with Disabilities subgroup scored a 70% or higher on the Water Cycle assessment.

Measureable Outcome:

Sixty-five percent of our students will score a level 3 or higher on the 2021 Florida State Science Assessment. On the 2019 assessment only 29% of our students demonstrated mastery in the area of Life Science. We will increase to 54% of our students demonstrating mastery of this standard on the 2021 assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Trelawney Wise (wise.trelawney@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

The 5E Instructional Model
Hands-on STEM Lab Activities
Coaching

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

The 5E Instructional Model is used to design science units, that can be based upon cognitive psychology, constructivist-learning theory, and best practices in science teaching. The 5E cycle consists of cognitive stages of learning that comprise engage, explore, explain, elaborate, and evaluate. Research states that “using this approach, students redefine, reorganize, elaborate, and change their initial concepts through self-reflection and interaction with their peers and their environment. Learners interpret objects and phenomena, and internalize those interpretations in terms of their current conceptual understanding”.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Designate and monitor Science time for each grade level.
2. (T) Purchase and utilize Penda Science and Discovery Ed to expand and monitor science knowledge.
2. Data team meetings will occur on a monthly basis to review data (including Penda Science data) and decide on next steps. Particular attention will be paid to our subgroups.
3. Grades 3-5 will be working with Michelle Ferro or admin monthly to create lesson plans and tasks that are engaging and that meet the depth of the standards using the 5 E Instructional Model.

4. (T) Ensure all Title I teachers and assistants are utilized to their fullest for all students with greatest needs.
5. Grades K-5 will complete selected District Online Summative and Formative assessments.
6. Harris Super Saturday and Science ASP will be offered to our 5th grade students during the second semester.
7. Schedule instructional monitoring, feedback, coaching and follow-up based on student data trends and observational data. Data for our subgroups will be monitored closely.

Person Responsible Trelawney Wise (wise.trelawney@brevardschools.org)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: While our Lowest 25th Percent gains in ELA did increase from 45% in 2018 to 53% in 2019, Math learning gains increased by one point. Our school achieved 50% as compared to the district with 53% and state with 51%. Our SWD sub-group is an area of focus under ESSA. Their Federal Index score was 36%.

Measureable Outcome: For the 2020-2021 school year, the Federal Index score for our Students with Disabilities (SWD) sub-group will increase from 36% to 41%.
The iReady data that shows progress toward annual typical growth for students grades 3-6 for Reading was 54% of students and for Math was 47% of students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Cheree Cochran (cochran.cheree@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Team Planning
Scaffolding Instruction
Differentiation

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The root cause of poor performance with this subgroup has to do with teacher expectations and student knowledge of strategies to be successful when working through complex math problems and complex text. Differentiation and scaffolding instruction to meet students where they are should help to change this. Teachers will focus on providing students a toolbox of strategies that students are required to recall and use to help them solve math problems and understand complex text.

Action Steps to Implement

1. (T) The Literacy Coach and the Math Coach will support teachers with planning and modeling lessons and tasks to ensure students have the tools they need to solve complex problems and understand complex text.
2. (T) Ensure all Title I teachers and assistants are utilized to their fullest for all students with greatest needs.
3. Professional development on ELA/Math differentiation will be offered for teachers based on teacher and student needs.
4. Teachers will provide intervention time for Tier II and Tier III students.
5. Schedule instructional monitoring, feedback, coaching and follow-up based on student data trends and observational data.
6. Data team meetings will occur on a monthly basis to review all data and decide on next steps.
7. Administration will endeavor to provide opportunities to family members of students with disabilities to be members of school decision-making groups. (BPIE recommendation).
8. Use Reading and Math ASP to supplement instruction for our lowest 25% of students in grades 2-6.

Person Responsible Cheree Cochran (cochran.cheree@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

(T) To augment the much-needed Social Emotional Learning (SEL) of our students we will add a 0.5 guidance counselor funded through Title I. This guidance counselor will provide SEL support through a combination of being on the activity wheel and working with individual students and groups of students.

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.

The YouthTruth survey provided us with valuable insight from our 3rd through 6th grade students. Many were concerned about the behavior of some of their fellow students who disrupted class and were disrespectful to their teachers. This will be addressed this year when we refocus our PBIS program to being more positive and less punitive.

The BPS Parent Survey provided us with valuable information. Eighty-eight percent of parents who responded to the survey said they felt welcome at Apollo. Parents stated their preferred methods of communication were via text messages (74%) and via email (71%). Only 27% of parents who responded liked automated calls. We will continue these preferred means of communication through our use of Blackboard Connect; and PeachJar. Seventy-six percent of our parents indicated that the school or teacher provided them with helpful information to support their children at home either often or sometimes. Eighty-four percent of respondents said they preferred attending school events during the evening, Monday through Friday. We hope to continue to have Title 1-sponsored curriculum nights, whether virtual or not, and address student academic standards in our communications home to parents. Sixty-three percent of parents indicated that changing the times would assist them in attending parent meetings and school activities. We will investigate the possibility of providing childcare assistance. We will address individual parent survey comments related to lack of communication, bullying, issues in the lunchroom, and Saturday/evening events and meetings of PTO and SAC by communicating on this issues through our newsletter, website and by using Blackboard Connect.

The Insight Survey provided teachers with an opportunity to give their opinions on various school processes and initiatives. Many comments included satisfaction about been given the time to collaborate more with the their peers. We will continue this initiative next school year.

We will also address items from the 2018/2019 BPIE survey by ensuring that our families are contributing members of school decision-making groups, and that they are kept informed about our progress toward implementing inclusion through our newsletter, website and by using Blackboard Connect.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.