

Brevard Public Schools

Oak Park 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	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Oak Park Elementary School

3395 DAIRY RD, Titusville, FL 32796

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

Demographics

Principal: Adrea McDonough L

Start Date for this Principal: 2/5/2018

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)	<i>[Data Not Available]</i>
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	<p>Black/African American Students</p> <p>Economically Disadvantaged Students</p> <p>English Language Learners</p> <p>Hispanic Students</p> <p>Multiracial Students</p> <p>Students With Disabilities</p> <p>White Students</p>
School Grades History	<p>2018-19: C (44%)</p> <p>2017-18: C (43%)</p> <p>2016-17: C (51%)</p> <p>2015-16: C (45%)</p>
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.

Oak Park will work together to provide all students with every opportunity to reach their full academic potential. (Revised 2014)

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Oak Park community will work as a team to foster success in our students.(Revised 2014)

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
<p>Mulchrone, Susan</p>	<p>Principal</p>	<p>Principal: Provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing the MTSS process with fidelity, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, and guarantees adequate professional development to support implementation and communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities. School administrators ensure that collaborative planning time is used productively and reflected in general and special education staff schedules and instructional plans. Leadership Team meets once per week with meeting notes and agendas. The principal also monitors standards-aligned instruction, small group instruction, and fidelity of the intervention block. The focus during walk-thrus will be to provide feedback to teachers about their small group instruction using the i-Ready toolbox lessons and also the scaffolding lessons from the Standards Focus documents.</p>
<p>Walker, Holly</p>	<p>Assistant Principal</p>	<p>Assistant Principal: Assists principal and provides a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, ensures that the school-based team is implementing the MTSS process with fidelity, conducts assessment of MTSS skills of school staff, ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation, and guarantees adequate professional development to support implementation and communicates with parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities. School administrators ensure that collaborative planning time is used productively and reflected in general and special education staff schedules and instructional plans. Leadership Team meets once per week with meeting notes and agendas. The assistant principal also monitors standards-aligned instruction, small group instruction, and fidelity of the intervention block. The focus during walk-thrus will be to provide feedback to teachers about their small group instruction using the iReady toolbox lessons and also the scaffolding lessons from the Standards Focus Documents.</p>
<p>Allen, Heather</p>	<p>Instructional Coach</p>	<p>Literacy Coach (T): Provides guidance on K-12 reading plan and best practices in literacy; facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development, modeling and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning; supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention plans. Conducts walk-thrus and uses the coaching cycle with teachers. ESSA groups are also monitored for performance levels. Leadership Team meets once per week with meeting notes and agendas.</p>
<p>Cisko, Lisa</p>	<p>Other</p>	<p>MTSS coordinator (T) Identifies systematic patterns of students' needs to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk;" assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection and data. ESSA groups are</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		monitored for growth. Leadership Team meets once per week with meeting notes and agendas.
Leaman, Maria	Instructional Coach	Math and Science coach (T): Provides guidance on K-12 math plan and best practices in math; facilitates and supports data collection activities; assists in data analysis; provides professional development, modeling and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning; supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention plans. Conducts classroom walk-thrus and uses the coaching model with teachers. Team planning and monitor assessments with science. Assist with hands-on learning to prepare for science labs. ESSA groups are also monitored for performance level. Leadership Team meets once per week with meeting notes and agendas.
Kerr, Sandra	Other	Teacher on Assignment: Identifies systematic patterns of students' needs to identify appropriate, evidence-based intervention strategies; assists with whole school screening programs that provide early intervening services for children to be considered "at risk;" assists in the design and implementation for progress monitoring, data collection and data. Leadership Team meets once per week with meeting notes and agendas.
Mayo, Tonja	Other	PBIS and Conscious Discipline Coach (T): Provides guidance and modeling on PBIS, Conscious Discipline and best practices in student discipline; facilitates and supports data collection activities: assists in data analysis; provides professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data-based instructional planning; supports the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 2/5/2018, Adrea Mcdonough L

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

61

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)	<p>Black/African American Students</p> <p>Economically Disadvantaged Students</p> <p>English Language Learners</p> <p>Hispanic Students</p> <p>Multiracial Students</p> <p>Students With Disabilities</p> <p>White Students</p>
School Grades History	<p>2018-19: C (44%)</p> <p>2017-18: C (43%)</p> <p>2016-17: C (51%)</p> <p>2015-16: C (45%)</p>
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	74	63	69	86	86	81	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	546
Attendance below 90 percent	5	9	10	6	5	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
One or more suspensions	1	12	4	13	9	7	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	63
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	4	15	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	14	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	4	2	1	6	9	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/17/2020

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	66	75	108	93	82	96	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	607
Attendance below 90 percent	2	1	27	14	14	9	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	1	5	19	9	7	17	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	23	34	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	108

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	3	8	2	9	10	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

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	1	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	66	75	108	93	82	96	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	607
Attendance below 90 percent	2	1	27	14	14	9	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	1	5	19	9	7	17	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	23	34	47	0	0	0	0	0	0	108

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	3	8	2	9	10	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	53

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	1	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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	42%	62%	57%	48%	63%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	48%	60%	58%	57%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	57%	53%	53%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	46%	63%	63%	46%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	53%	65%	62%	59%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	53%	51%	54%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	31%	57%	53%	38%	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	55%	64%	-9%	58%	-3%
	2018	47%	63%	-16%	57%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	38%	61%	-23%	58%	-20%
	2018	36%	57%	-21%	56%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
05	2019	27%	60%	-33%	56%	-29%
	2018	44%	54%	-10%	55%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				
06	2019	50%	60%	-10%	54%	-4%
	2018	42%	63%	-21%	52%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	45%	61%	-16%	62%	-17%
	2018	32%	62%	-30%	62%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	54%	64%	-10%	64%	-10%
	2018	43%	59%	-16%	62%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		22%				
05	2019	32%	60%	-28%	60%	-28%
	2018	49%	58%	-9%	61%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison		-11%				
06	2019	52%	67%	-15%	55%	-3%
	2018	48%	68%	-20%	52%	-4%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	29%	56%	-27%	53%	-24%
	2018	45%	57%	-12%	55%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		-16%				
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	25	31	29	23	48	41	20				
ELL	20	36			70						
BLK	25	46	40	23	38	33	13				
HSP	43	47		49	65						
MUL	50	55		43	60						
WHT	47	49	43	54	54	42	40				
FRL	39	46	46	47	52	41	30				
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	26	32	35	25	31	18	17				
BLK	26	32	30	30	42	21	16				
HSP	34	34		39	51	40	23				
MUL	58	52		44	50						
WHT	49	43	49	49	55	38	55				
FRL	38	35	42	39	46	30	38				
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	18	33	31	23	51	50	28				
BLK	35	59	62	27	57	56	15				
HSP	57	56	55	49	58	40	36				
MUL	44	46		50	50						
WHT	51	58	49	51	61	55	44				
FRL	41	55	54	39	55	51	31				

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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	85
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	390
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
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	53
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	31
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	57
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	52
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	47
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	48
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.

During the COVID-19 pandemic, FSA was canceled for the 2020 school year. FSA results will be compared from the 2019 to the 2018 school year. Science was the lowest performance with a decrease from 45% in 2018 to 29% in 2019. Additionally, overall ELA performance decreased from 44% in 2018 to 42% in 2019. The lowest 25% learning gains for ELA remained stagnant at 44% for 2018 and 2019. Tier 1 instruction and targeted intervention were inconsistent. Realignment of teachers was necessary based on teacher strengths and student needs. Since students did not take the final i-Ready diagnostic in 2020, diagnostic 1 from the 2019 school year will be compared to diagnostic 1 from the 2020 school year. 2020 i-Ready ELA diagnostic data revealed a decline in proficiency with 4th grade decreasing from 40% in 2019 to 23% in 5th grade in 2020. Math i-Ready

diagnostic 1 revealed a decline in proficiency with 5th grade decreasing from 36% in 2019 to 25% in 6th grade in 2020. There are multiple factors that contributed to low performance. Instructional review walk-thrus showed that only about 70% of teachers used standards-aligned instruction. Also, due to the COVID-19 pandemic the 4th quarter was distance learning which did not include face to face instruction for students. Students independently worked on i-Ready assigned grade level lessons and MyPath lessons.

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

The data component that had the greatest decline was in Science. There was a decrease from 45% in 2018 to 29% in 2019. High yield instructional practices with incorporated hands-on science were lacking. In addition, progress monitoring was lacking along with reteaching practices, and collaborative planning was also lacking. The loss of our science coach that had to be placed in the classroom in 2019 also contributed to this decline. The science coach had to be once again placed in a classroom position in 2020 for an 8 week period.

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 had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was Science in 2019. The state average for science in 2019 was 53% and Oak Park's science average was 29%. This was a difference of 24%. High yield instructional practices with incorporated hands-on science was lacking. In addition progress monitoring was lacking along with reteaching practices, and collaborative planning was also lacking. The loss of our science coach that had to be placed in the classroom in 2019 also contributed to this decline. The loss of the science coach to a classroom position also happened in the 2020 school year for a period of about 8 weeks. In addition, the ESSA subgroups for Students with Disabilities and Black/African American students were both at 31% in 2019 which was below 32% for two consecutive school years which places Oak Park at TS&I status with the state of Florida. This gap may have also widened due to lack of instructional cohesiveness caused by COVID slide 4th quarter.

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

The data components that showed the most improvement were learning gains in ELA which increased from 40% in 2018 to 48% in 2019 and also the lowest 25% learning gains in math which increased from 32% in 2018 to 41% in 2019. The new actions that were taken in ELA that contributed to the increase were the addition of a MTSS coordinator that monitored and worked with teachers to deliver research based interventions such as LLI, as well as lessons from the Teacher Toolbox from i-Ready coupled with the instructional portion of i-Ready for all students in both reading and math. Small group instruction was implemented using the instructional grouping of students from the i-Ready diagnostics in February 2020. In math, there was the addition of an extra thirty minutes that were incorporated into the master schedule for math which allowed for intervention time in math. Lessons from the Teacher Toolbox were also implemented with small groups as identified by the i-Ready diagnostics. The addition of a math coach also assisted teachers with collaborative planning to the Florida Standards. In i-Ready, the greatest areas of improvement were in Reading with an increase of 2nd grade reading of 17% on Diagnostic 1 in 2019 to 37% in 3rd grade in 2020. Also, an increase of 24% 5th grade in i-Ready reading in 2019 to 38% in 6th grade. This increase can be accounted for by small group instruction using the i-Ready Toolbox and the fidelity of interventions.

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

The area of concern from the EWS data is discipline. There were 978 discipline referrals in 2019 with seventy-three students having more than one referral. In 2020, there were 784 referrals from August through February and there were sixty three students that had more than one referral.

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

1. Increase proficiency in Science
2. Increase proficiency in the ESSA subgroup of Black/African American Students
3. Increase proficiency in the ESSA subgroup of Students with Disabilities
4. Increase proficiency and learning gains in ELA
5. Increase proficiency and learning gains in Math

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The Students with Disabilities subgroup achieved a 31% proficiency level which reflects a reading proficiency student achievement gap when compared to our White subgroup with a proficiency of 47%.

Measureable Outcome: Increase reading proficiency of Students with Disabilities to 41% proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Susan Mulchrone (mulchrone.susan@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Standards-aligned instruction, use standards focus documents to engage students with current grade level materials, tasks and assignments that meet the rigor of the standards, monitor student mastery of grade level standards, prioritize interventions strategically and efficiently.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The Learning Acceleration Guide by TNTP predicts that due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the closure of schools in March 2020 that there will be a learning loss of 30% in reading and 50% in math due to the crisis. There needs to be a new focus present instead of ramping up existing remediation practices. All students should be exposed to grade level material, scope and sequence needs to be adjusted to reflect where teachers need to focus and provide scaffolding support for students, prioritize interventions and to monitor students results.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will communicate grade level standards using standards focus boards so that students have clear expectations for their learning.
2. Students will engage with current grade level materials, tasks and assignments that meet the rigor of the standards.
3. Scaffolding strategies will be used to support all students access to grade level work.
4. Rigorous writing tasks will be used in response to reading and Write Score (T) will be given 2 times per year.
5. Standards focus documents will be used to plan for instruction while maintaining the pace of the focus standards document along with any prerequisite standards that are needed.
6. Standards Mastery will be used as a formative tool to assess student mastery of the standards.
7. Interventions will be prioritized strategically, efficiently and done with fidelity.
8. All data including subgroup data will be monitored by the leadership team and the grade level teams.

Person Responsible: Susan Mulchrone (mulchrone.susan@brevardschools.org)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The Black/African American subgroup achieved a 31% proficiency level which reflects a reading proficiency student achievement gap when compared to our White subgroup with a proficiency of 47%.

Measureable Outcome: Increase reading proficiency of Black/African American students to 41% proficiency.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Susan Mulchrone (mulchrone.susan@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Standards-aligned instruction, use standards focus documents to engage students with current grade level materials, tasks and assignments that meet the rigor of the standards, monitor student mastery of grade level standards, prioritize interventions strategically and efficiently.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The Learning Acceleration Guide by TNTP predicts that due to the COVID-19 pandemic and the closure of schools in March 2020 that there will be a learning loss of 30% in reading and 50% in math due to the crisis. There needs to be a new focus present instead of ramping up existing remediation practices. All students should be exposed to grade level material, scope and sequence needs to be adjusted to reflect where teachers need to focus and provide scaffolding support for students, prioritize interventions and to monitor students results.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will communicate grade level standards using standards focus boards so that students have clear expectations for their learning.
2. Students will engage with current grade level materials, tasks and assignments that meet the rigor of the standards.
3. Scaffolding strategies will be used to support all students access to grade level work.
4. Rigorous writing tasks will be used in response to reading and Write Score (T) will be given 2 times per year.
5. Standards focus documents will be used to plan for instruction while maintaining the pace of the focus standards document along with any prerequisite standards that are needed.
6. Standards Mastery will be used as a formative tool to assess student mastery of the standards.
7. Interventions will be prioritized strategically, efficiently and done with fidelity.
8. All data including subgroup data will be monitored by the leadership team and the grade level teams.

Person Responsible: Susan Mulchrone (mulchrone.susan@brevardschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Science proficiency in 5th grade for 2018 was 31% which is below the state (53%) and district (57%) average and has been inconsistent for the past three years.

Measureable Outcome: Increase science proficiency in 5th grade from 31% to 41%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Susan Mulchrone (mulchrone.susan@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: 5 E Model of Inquiry, Job-embedded coaching, modeling, differentiation and reteaching, and hands-on science lab activities, and writing in the content areas

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If students are doing "hands-on" science and writing about science, science proficiency scores will increase. Previously students have not been actively engaged or critically thinking about science instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will communicate grade level standards using standards focus boards so that students have clear expectations for their learning.
2. Professional development and modeling of the 5E model of teaching science will be provided for 3-6th grade teachers.
3. Clear expectations of science instruction, use of the science block, and science lab will be communicated to all teachers.
4. Support will be provided to all teachers from the instructional coach to collaboratively plan science instruction that includes science vocabulary, "hands-on" lab activities, and written science responses.
5. Teachers will receive feedback on their science instruction once per quarter by the science coach (T).
6. Teacher data chats will be conducted using science mini-assessments to determine differentiation and scaffolding that is needed for all students.
7. Lessons will be retaught based on data from the science mini-assessments.

Person Responsible Maria Leaman (leaman.maria@brevardschools.org)

No description entered

Person Responsible [no one identified]

No description entered

Person Responsible [no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

The following areas of focus are: to increase proficiency in both ELA and math. Teachers will use standards focus boards in ELA and math to ensure that students are clear on what learning goals are for each lesson. Only grade level content will be used. Teachers will plan using the standards focus documents consistently and teach any prerequisite standards that may be necessary. Students will be assessed using Standards Mastery for ELA and Eureka assessments for math to monitor mastery of the standards, and interventions will be done strategically, efficiently and completed with fidelity for ELA.

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 results of our Title 1 Parent Survey showed our strengths to be with family engagement events and making families feel welcomed. The Parent and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) is a road map for how families can be engaged in their child's education and how the school can support families with at-home learning. This is a living document reviewed and updated annually by all families, teachers and administrators. Every year, families are given the opportunity to review, revise and give input for the current year's PFEP. Our weaknesses included communication and behavior. To communicate better with parents, the staff will be aware of families with multiple contacts, update new information in AS400 and find what type of communication families prefer. To address student behavior, the staff will implement school-wide conscious discipline and attend trauma awareness and resiliency building training.

Our Youth Truth survey student responses indicate 74% of the student population feel our strength is student engagement. Students showed, 77% of their teachers want students to do their best, 54% showed their teachers ask them to keep trying even when things get hard, and 83% said their teacher always wants them to do their best. In alignment with the BPS strategic plan, Goal 1, Objective 3, this year we will be an anchor school for Conscious Discipline for grades K-6 for the 2020-2021 school year and continue with the Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support system throughout each grade level. The weakness for this survey was safety, discipline and culture at 4%. The staff will implement Conscious Discipline and ensure that strong procedures and expectations are in place.

The Insight Survey showed several strengths which include: instructional planning for student growth, evaluations, and peer culture. With instructional planning, 63% said they collaborate weekly with teachers and leaders at the school to improve their instructional plans. Evaluations showed 88% of the staff understand the criteria that will be used to evaluate their performance in the classroom. And with peer culture, 83% feel the time they spend collaborating with colleagues is productive. The weaknesses of this

survey are school operations, academic opportunity, the learning environment, and leadership. A checklist for clean classrooms will be devised and their will be strong procedures put into place to maximize learning. Students will engage in higher order thinking, teachers will use higher level questioning to guide student discussion, and maintain standard-aligned instruction with grade level material to close the achievement gap.

To ensure students and staff are productive at school we are following the strategies given through the Social and Emotional Learning Roadmap for Reopening Schools. Our counselors and social worker are taking time to build relationships with students and partnerships with the staff to cultivate a safe learning environment. Students are given support and opportunities to speak with adults to help promote safe and supportive social and emotional developmental growth.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget			
1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
			Total: \$0.00