Brevard Public Schools

Apollo Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics 3

Purpose and Outline of the SIP 4

School Information 7

Needs Assessment 8

Planning for Improvement 14

Title I Requirements 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: Aimee Dilago M

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)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (58%) 2014-15: B (61%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP 4

School Information 7

Needs Assessment 8

Planning for Improvement 14

Title I Requirements 18

Budget to Support Goals 0

Apollo Elementary School

3085 KNOX MCRAE DR, Titusville, FL 32780

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	Yes	69%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	48%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	B	B	B	B

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 school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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 and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
O'Leary, Frank	Principal	The Leadership Team members serve as instructional leaders, engage stakeholder, and collaborate in the school's decision making process.
Cochran, Cheree	Assistant Principal	
Wise, Trelawney	Assistant Principal	

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	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
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

63

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 6/20/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

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	
Attendance below 90 percent	28	52	46	44	42	52	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	290
One or more suspensions	3	5	2	4	1	8	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
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	0	2	42	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	62

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	2	2	3	23	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

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

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
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%

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
	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%
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				
ELL											
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				

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
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	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	436
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	37
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

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%	

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%	

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%	

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%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	55
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	62
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	50
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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 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? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

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

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

1. Science instruction
2. ELA/Math instruction
3. Subgroups instruction and monitoring

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Learning Gains for Lowest 25 Percent
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%.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	For the 19-20 school year, the ELA learning gains for the lowest 25% will increase from 53% to 60%; the math learning gains for our lowest 25% will increase from 50% to 60%. The Federal Index score for our SWD sub-group will increase from 36% to 41%.
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 Step	
Description	1. The Literacy Coach and the Math Coach will support classroom 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. Parent sessions will be held at Title I Night and our Saturday Learning Jamboree to explore and explain Eureka Math and reading comprehension strategies and provide information and resources on how parents can help at home. 3. Grade level groups will be given one planning day per 9 weeks in order to collaboratively plan effective lessons, supported by Title I funds. 4. Ensure all Title I assets are utilized to their fullest for students with greatest needs. 5. Professional development on ELA/Math differentiation will be offered for teachers based on teacher and student needs. 6. ESE teachers will work collaboratively with the grade level teachers of the grade(s) they serve. 7. Schedule instructional monitoring, feedback, coaching and follow-up based on student data trends and observational data. 8. Data team meetings will occur on a monthly basis to review data (including i-Ready data) and decide on next steps. 9. Provide our students with rich experiences such as virtual and real-world field trips to increase background knowledge, student engagement and student achievement.
Person Responsible	Cheree Cochran (cochran.cheree@brevardschools.org)

#2	
Title	Science 3+ Proficiency
Rationale	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.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	65% of our students will score a level 3 or higher on the 2020 Florida State Science Assessment. On the 2019 assessment only demonstrated 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 2020 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 Step	
Description	1. Grades 3-5 teachers will do a data dive to see what were the three highest and lowest areas of the 2019 Big Idea assessments. 2. 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. 3. We will provide half day subs for planning collaboration as needed. At least one per nine weeks which will be paid for using Title I funds. 4. Ensure all Title I assistants are utilized to assist our students with greatest needs. 5. Grades K-5 will do 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. A STEM Lab has been created and will be ran by a Title I Science Coach. The lab will allow teachers to go in to do a hands-on lab at least one day a week. 8. Schedule instructional monitoring, feedback, coaching and follow-up based on student

	data trends and observational data. The Science Coach, Administration and Michelle Ferro will monitor this monthly. 9. Provide our students with rich experiences such as virtual and real-world field trips to increase background knowledge, student engagement and student achievement.
Person Responsible	Trelawney Wise (wise.trelawney@brevardschools.org)

#3	
Title	ELA/Math 3+ Proficiency and Learning Gains
Rationale	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.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	ELA 3+ proficiency will increase from 59% to 62%, and ELA learning gains will increase from 59% to 62% Math 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 Step	
Description	1. Provide teachers with substitutes one day every nine weeks to plan standards-aligned lessons and tasks, supported by Title I funds. These planning days will be facilitated by content area specialists on staff or from the district. 2. Ensure all Title I assets are utilized to their fullest for students with greatest needs. 3. Data team meetings will occur on a monthly basis to review data (including i-Ready data) and decide on next steps. 4. Team meetings will be used to discuss writing exemplars and complexity of standards-aligned tasks. 5. Schedule instructional monitoring, feedback, coaching and follow-up based on student data trends and observational data. 6. Provide our students with rich experiences such as virtual and real-world field trips to increase background knowledge, student engagement and student achievement.
Person Responsible	Frank O'Leary (oleary.frank@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

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

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

Seventy-nine percent of parents said they were Quite Well or Extremely Well kept informed and that their preferred methods of communication were email (78%) and text messages (64%). Only 26% of parents who responded liked automated calls. We will continue these preferred means of communication through our use of Blackboard Connect; and PeachJar. Seventy-five percent of our parents indicated that they are aware of what their children are expected to master. We will continue to have Title 1-sponsored curriculum nights, 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 parent survey comments related to lack of communication, bullying, issues in the lunchroom, and Saturday/evening events and meetings of PTO and SAC. We will also address items from the 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.

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Administration assigns a team which includes Guidance, School Psychologist, ESE Support Specialist, Literacy Coach, Classroom Teachers, and Title I Teachers to align all available resources in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes.
The process begins with the Teacher Data Team, which meets once a month. Data is presented by teachers and/or the Literacy Coach about the needs of struggling (academic or behavioral) students. Classroom teachers gather data, such as i-Ready diagnostic reports, running records, on-going progress monitoring assessments, district required assessments, behavioral reports and anecdotal notes. The team then develops interventions to meet those needs based on the data. If the student is not making progress, a meeting is requested with the IPST.
The PBIS Team has developed a school-wide S.O.A.R. (Safety First, Own your behavior, Active Learner, Respectful Always) Expectations Matrix to decrease behavior concerns, and continues to refine the plan. Our intervention plan includes a school-wide use of Sanford Harmony Program, to help with social and emotional corrective strategies. One of our guidance counselors, is on the wheel and provides this program to students in 3rd and 6th grade. We have recently received the full-time services of a Lifetime counselor who provides needed counseling and mentoring services on an emergency basis. Lifetime counseling also provides us with a weekly counselor for our students who need regular counseling.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

Kindergarten round-up occurs twice in April for prospective kindergartners, once in the morning and once in the evening. Flyers are distributed to all local day care providers announcing the events. Students in grade 6 visit perspective middle schools. Counselors and other middle school personnel from the middle schools come and visit with 6th grade students to talk about different programs. Students are tested for advanced middle school programs and advanced math placement.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

The leadership team meets annually to ensure that all students' educational needs are met by an appropriate number of personnel with the curriculum tools they need. The number of Title I staff is dependent on the percentage of Free and Reduced Lunch students we have in the previous year.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

The school plans to develop a close relationship with the Kennedy Space Center through a grant received through the KSC Foundation. Fifth grade students will participate in Space School going on field trips to KSC, and virtual field trips at school, learning about all aspects of the space industry. Sixth grade spend a day at the Center learning about space history and the space industry.