

Brevard Public Schools

# Jupiter Elementary School



## 2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>            | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>19</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

# Jupiter Elementary School

950 TUPELO RD SW, Palm Bay, FL 32908

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Sherie Troisi L**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/20/2019

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-6   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2018-19 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%  |
| <b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: C (51%)<br>2017-18: C (45%)<br>2016-17: C (48%)<br>2015-16: C (45%)<br>2014-15: C (42%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |

|  |      |
|--|------|
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | TS&I |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> . |      |

**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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>19</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

# Jupiter Elementary School

950 TUPELO RD SW, Palm Bay, FL 32908

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

## School Demographics

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br/>(per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School<br/>PK-6</p> | <p><b>2018-19 Title I School</b></p> <p>Yes</p> | <p><b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br/>(as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>76%</p> |
| <p><b>Primary Service Type</b><br/>(per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>              | <p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>          | <p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b><br/>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>61%</p>               |

## School Grades History

| Year  | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | C       | C       | C       | C       |

## 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.**

Reaching every child, every day. (Revised 2018)

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Jupiter Elementary School will challenge our diverse community of learners, and establish a positive and productive school culture, set high expectations for achievement, and encourage independent, self-directed learning. (Reviewed August 2019)

### 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  |
|-------------------|---------------------|--|
| Troisi, Sherie    | Principal           | As the instructional leader, Sherie Troisi provides vision and strategic focus for all stakeholders. She ensures high academic expectations for all students by holding teachers accountable through regular observations with feedback and individual teacher data chats, supervises curriculum and instruction and ensures weekly data analysis and progress monitoring is occurring. She facilitates weekly leadership team meetings to review student data (academic, behavioral and attendance) and current practices to determine professional development needs and/or additional supports for teachers and students. |
| Ouellette, Amber  | Assistant Principal | Amber Ouellette supports classroom instruction by ensuring all teachers have the appropriate curriculum and instructional resources. She conducts regular classroom observations with feedback to improve instructional practices. Mrs. Ouellette oversees the implementation of our response to intervention and our academic support programs and oversees our new teacher mentor program. She organizes and facilitates professional development and coordinates all testing.   |
| Cirino, Stacy     | Teacher, K-12       | Stacy Cirino coordinates our Title I program. She supports administration with discipline, maintains discipline records and oversees our Positive Alternative to School Suspension program (PASS). Mrs. Cirino supports classroom teachers in the areas of classroom management and math instruction utilizing the coaching model and coordinates our new teacher program. Mrs. Cirino provides Rtl instruction to students in need of academic support.   |
| Lopez, Jenifer    | Instructional Coach | As our Literacy Coach, Jenifer Lopez supports classroom teachers with all aspects of reading instruction. She utilizes the coaching model to support reading instruction, coordinates implementation of iReady Reading, mentors teachers and facilitates our weekly data chats.  |
| Daniels, Chrystal | School Counselor    | Chrystal Daniels coordinates our MTSS program. She supports classroom teachers with the creation and implementation of behavior plans and supports the social emotional needs of our students via individual and small group counseling.   |
| Brennan, Nancy    | Teacher, ESE        | Nancy Brennan is the Lead ESE Teacher. She works with the ESE team to ensure that all students with disabilities are provided rigorous instruction designed to meet their individual needs. She monitors the academic progress of our students with disabilities and ensures that classroom teachers are aware of student accommodations.  |

## 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     | 78          | 96 | 89 | 92 | 96 | 83 | 85 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 619   |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 12          | 17 | 9  | 9  | 6  | 8  | 7  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 68    |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 4  | 5  | 7  | 4  | 15 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 45    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 5  | 32 | 39 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 106   |

**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           | 1 | 0 | 3 | 6 | 12 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 31    |

**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     | 13          | 8 | 4 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 33    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |

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

55

**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 |       |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     |
| 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 | 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 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 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             | 47%    | 62%      | 57%   | 44%    | 63%      | 55%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 57%    | 60%      | 58%   | 59%    | 60%      | 57%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 66%    | 57%      | 53%   | 48%    | 52%      | 52%   |
| Math Achievement            | 48%    | 63%      | 63%   | 46%    | 64%      | 61%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 59%    | 65%      | 62%   | 55%    | 62%      | 61%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 47%    | 53%      | 51%   | 43%    | 52%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 34%    | 57%      | 53%   | 40%    | 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                   | 78 (0)                            | 96 (0) | 89 (0) | 92 (0) | 96 (0) | 83 (0) | 85 (0) | 619 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent                   | 12 ( )                            | 17 ( ) | 9 ( )  | 9 ( )  | 6 ( )  | 8 ( )  | 7 ( )  | 68 (0)  |
| One or more suspensions                       | 0 ( )                             | 4 (0)  | 5 (0)  | 7 (0)  | 4 (0)  | 15 (0) | 10 (0) | 45 (0)  |
| Course failure in ELA or Math                 | 0 ( )                             | 0 (0)  | 0 (0)  | 0 (0)  | 0 (0)  | 2 (0)  | 0 (0)  | 2 (0)   |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment               | 0 ( )                             | 0 (0)  | 0 (0)  | 5 (0)  | 32 (0) | 39 (0) | 30 (0) | 106 (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 | 49%    | 64%      | -15%                       | 58%   | -9%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 54%    | 63%      | -9%                        | 57%   | -3%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -5%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 48%    | 61%      | -13%                       | 58%   | -10%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 30%    | 57%      | -27%                       | 56%   | -26%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 18%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | -6%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 38%    | 60%      | -22%                       | 56%   | -18%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 34%    | 54%      | -20%                       | 55%   | -21%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 4%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 8%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 06                    | 2019 | 47%    | 60%      | -13%                       | 54%   | -7%                     |
|                       | 2018 | 46%    | 63%      | -17%                       | 52%   | -6%                     |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 1%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 13%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                    | 2019 | 43%    | 61%      | -18%                       | 62%   | -19%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 36%    | 62%      | -26%                       | 62%   | -26%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 7%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                    | 2019 | 40%    | 64%      | -24%                       | 64%   | -24%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 42%    | 59%      | -17%                       | 62%   | -20%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -2%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 4%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                    | 2019 | 42%    | 60%      | -18%                       | 60%   | -18%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 39%    | 58%      | -19%                       | 61%   | -22%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 3%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 06                    | 2019 | 59%    | 67%      | -8%                        | 55%   | 4%                      |
|                       | 2018 | 57%    | 68%      | -11%                       | 52%   | 5%                      |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 2%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison     |      | 20%    |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                    | 2019 | 33%    | 56%      | -23%                       | 53%   | -20%                    |
|                       | 2018 | 42%    | 57%      | -15%                       | 55%   | -13%                    |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | -9%    |          |                            |       |                         |
| 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                                       | 28       | 58     | 53          | 23        | 59      | 61           |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 25       | 55     |             | 22        | 65      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 33       | 49     | 60          | 36        | 49      | 38           | 15       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 50       | 67     | 69          | 47        | 63      | 50           | 36       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 52       | 58     |             | 67        | 72      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 53       | 57     | 81          | 53        | 61      | 53           | 48       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 42       | 57     | 65          | 43        | 57      | 46           | 27       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 18       | 30     | 26          | 22        | 48      | 42           | 26       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 29       | 65     | 67          | 33        | 46      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 33       | 41     | 22          | 32        | 44      | 37           | 19       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 46       | 50     | 43          | 54        | 61      | 45           | 36       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 37       | 56     |             | 59        | 75      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 50       | 50     | 50          | 51        | 58      | 37           | 57       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 38       | 45     | 38          | 44        | 55      | 37           | 40       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 15       | 42     | 35          | 20        | 42      | 30           | 18       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 17       | 37     |             | 31        | 62      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 30       | 53     | 48          | 28        | 38      | 41           | 30       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 49       | 62     | 50          | 46        | 60      | 47           | 50       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 42       | 64     |             | 50        | 55      |              | 40       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 51       | 59     | 46          | 55        | 62      | 50           | 40       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 38       | 55     | 46          | 40        | 52      | 42           | 36       |         |           |                   |                     |

**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  | 51   |
| 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 | 48   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 406  |

| <b>ESSA Federal Index</b>  |     |
|--|-----|
| Total Components for the Federal Index   | 8   |
| Percent Tested   | 99% |
| <b>Subgroup Data</b>   |     |
| <b>Students With Disabilities</b>  |     |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                     | 45  |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?             | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%      |     |
| <b>English Language Learners</b>   |     |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                      | 43  |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%       |     |
| <b>Native American Students</b>  |     |
| 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%        |     |
| <b>Asian Students</b>  |     |
| Federal Index - Asian Students   |     |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                         | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                  |     |
| <b>Black/African American Students</b>   |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                | 40  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% |     |
| <b>Hispanic Students</b>   |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 53  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                      | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%               |     |
| <b>Multiracial Students</b>  |     |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   | 62  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | NO  |

| Multiracial Students   |     |
|--|-----|
| 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   | 58  |
| 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                                | 48  |
| 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.**

Jupiter Elementary's lowest performing data component was in 5th grade science achievement. The contributing factors include: science instruction remaining at the surface level, students not being exposed to complex science text, and a need to increase focus on analyzing data from informational text features.

**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 the 2017-18 school year was in science achievement. Jupiter Elementary's science data showed a 10 point decline from 44 to 34 percentage points at level 3 and above. The same factors that contributed to science being our lowest performing area are the same contributing factors.

**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.**

As previously listed, Jupiter Elementary's science achievement data had the largest gap, which was at 34% compared to the state average of 53%.

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

From 2018 - 2019, Jupiter Elementary's ELA lowest 25% increased from 39% of students showing learning gains to 66%, which is an increase of 33%. This can be directly contributed to tracking lowest 25% data during data chat meetings, implementation of small group guided reading instruction, and implementing i-Ready with fidelity.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)**

Attendance continues to be an area of concern with 68 students having 18 or more absences during the 2019 school year. In addition, 25% of our students scored level one on statewide assessments.

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

1. Science Achievement
2. Level 1
3. Attendance
4. African American students meeting ESSA requirements and ELL students continue to decline on ESSA requirements.
5. Learning Environment

**Part III: Planning for Improvement**

**Areas of Focus:**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>#1</b>   |  |
| <b>Title</b>  | Standards Aligned Instruction to Increase ELA and Math Proficiency   |
| <b>Rationale</b>  | Data has shown inconsistent growth of the ELA and math standards proficiency. Jupiter scores fall 10 points below the state in ELA and 15 points below in math. Jupiter Elementary will continue to focus on standards aligned instruction through continued collaborative planning to ensure teachers are reaching the full rigor of the standard.  |
| <b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | Increase ELA proficiency from 47% to 52% and math proficiency from 48% to 53% on state assessments.  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                | Sherie Troisi (troisi.sherie@brevardschools.org)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                  | We will focus on teacher clarity which is a research based process that guides teachers as they align activities to the full intent of the standard.   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                    | During the 2018-2019 school year we noticed that student tasks were not consistently aligned to the standards. Observations indicated that students were not clear on what they were expected to learn, why they needed to learn it and what success looked like. We believe that we can overcome these barriers by increasing teacher clarity. According to John Hattie's research, teacher clarity has an effect size .75 which makes this a high impact strategy that will lead to increased student achievement.   |
| <b>Action Step</b>  |  |
| <b>Description</b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Grade levels will plan collaboratively</li> <li>2. District content specialists will support teachers with collaborative planning. Title I funds will be used to pay for substitute teachers so that teachers have additional time for planning.</li> <li>3. Initial training on standard focus boards will be provided to all teachers on November 22, 2019.</li> <li>4. Literacy Coach will provide ongoing professional development on teacher clarity. (Literacy Coach is partially funded utilizing Title I funds.)</li> <li>4. Conduct classroom observations and provide feedback on teacher clarity and to support teachers with the implementation of standards focus boards.</li> <li>5. Offer a reading and math Academic Support Program after school</li> <li>6. Utilize i-Ready curriculum, QLA, and Eureka module assessments to monitor student progress.</li> <li>7. Analyze data by subgroup with a focus on our two lowest performing groups during weekly grade level data chats and leadership team meeting.</li> <li>8. Grade level and vertical teams will analyze student tasks to ensure alignment to the standards.</li> <li>9. Offer at least one Title I Family Night each semester focused on ELA and Math standards.</li> <li>10. Utilize Title I funds to employ two Title I teachers and four instructional assistants to support ELA and Math instruction.</li> <li>11. Utilize Title I funds to purchase the following instructional materials to support ELA and</li> </ol> |



Math instruction:

\*LLI materials for use with intervention groups

\*iReady Reading and Math online instructional programs

\*Eureka Math manipulatives

12. Provide opportunities outside of the school day through the use of Myon and Summer Academic Clinic.

**Person**

**Responsible**

Sherie Troisi (troisi.sherie@brevardschools.org)

---

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>#2</b>   |  |
| <b>Title</b>  | Science Instruction  |
| <b>Rationale</b>  | Jupiter's SSA scores dropped from 44% to 34% during the 2019 school year. In comparing to the district's overall average of 57% and a state average of 53%.  |
| <b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b> | Jupiter's measurable outcome is to increase our SSA scores from 34% to 44% in 2020.  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>                | Sherie Troisi (troisi.sherie@brevardschools.org)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>                                  | We will utilize the 5E Instructional Model. The 5E instructional model will guide teachers in planning and the implementation of science inquiry lessons.  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>                    | Students at Jupiter Elementary are not demonstrating proficiency on the Florida Science Standards and are scoring below state and district averages on the SSA. The 5E Model provides a planned sequence of instruction that is considered a best practice in science instruction. The 5E Model is a proven model of guiding students from the point of engagement of science concepts and walking them through the understanding of the concept to where they are able to explain and elaborate on what they have learned. This model is proven to be effective in science instruction and helps students to retain what they've learned, resulting in increased achievement.   |
| <b>Action Step</b>  |  |
| <b>Description</b>  | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The district resource science contact will provide training in lesson planning and the 5E instructional model. Title I funds will be used to pay for substitute teachers during half day training sessions.</li> <li>2. Our Title I Science Teacher will support classroom teachers with implementation of the 5E instructional model. (Title I funds are used to employ our Title I Science Teacher.)</li> <li>3. Progress monitor district online science assessments during grade level data chats.</li> <li>4. Analyze science data by subgroups in collaborative teams.</li> <li>5. Integrate the use of science texts during the ELA block.</li> <li>6. Conduct classroom observations and provide feedback using the 5E instructional model tool.</li> <li>7. Offer a science academic support program after school.</li> <li>8. Offer a Title I Family Night focused on science standards prior to the Science Standards Assessment.</li> <li>9. Utilize Title I funds to pay for the Fourth Grade trip to Indian River Lagoon.</li> </ol> |
| <b>Person Responsible</b>                                       | Sherie Troisi (troisi.sherie@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).**

Learning environment is an additional school wide priority based on the following data:

\* Jupiter Elementary experienced an increase of 19 percent in overall office referrals from 274 in 2018 to 327 in 2019.

\* According to the 2019 EDI Insight survey only 50 percent of teachers believe there are consistent expectations and consequences for student behavior (from 72% in 2018).

\* According to the 2019 EDI Insight survey only 57 percent of teachers believe interactions between students and adults at my school are respectful (from 80% in 2018).

\* According to Jupiter Elementary's PBiS staff survey 36 percent of teachers and staff feel that the consequences for preventing future behavior problems were ineffective.

Using this data Jupiter Elementary will implement the following:

\* Second Step is proven to increase positive social behavior, reduce conduct problems, reduce emotional distress, and improve social-emotional skill performance.

\* Restorative Practices because of its ability to build and repair relationships.

\* I Can Problem Solve

\* Second Step is a program implemented daily that is rooted in social emotional learning that teaches students techniques to gain confidence, develop empathy, set and achieve positive goals, make responsible decisions, and develop positive relationships.

\* Restorative Practices is a strategy that seeks to repair relationships and encourages students to take responsibility for their actions.

\* I Can Problem Solve is a K-2 program that will reduce impulsivity, improve problem solving skills, and promote pro-social behavior

Action Steps:

1. Provide professional development on de-escalation
2. Provide professional development on restorative circles
3. Increase consistent use of Second Step curriculum
4. Implement restorative circles
5. Target grades K - 2 for additional problem solving skills by incorporating SEL skills during activity class
6. Provide mentoring for students in our underperforming subgroups.

## 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.**

Based on the feedback and input we have received from our parent surveys and Title 1 parent/family engagement nights we found that many of our parents/families would like more family fun nights. They expressed they would enjoy having these types of family events that would not just be based on academics but bringing families together in a positive atmosphere. This would be an opportunity to reach out to our partners in education to assist in being able to provide additional family fun nights. Through this we will be able to create and build more positive relationships with our parents/families and community stakeholders.

**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.**

Jupiter Elementary is implementing for the second school year a research-based curriculum "Second Step" in grades 3rd – 6th through classroom morning meetings to ensure the social-emotional needs of all students are being met. Second Step has a school-parent home connection piece that assist in reinforcing the social-emotional needs of our students and families. Grades K-2 will implement the research-based curriculum, "I Can Problem Solve" through classroom morning meetings as well. This school year we will also be implementing the research-based strategy "Restorative Practices" in not only classrooms but also school wide. We have one of our guidance counselors teaching social-emotional learning through the research-based curriculum, "Second Step" in grades K-2 on the activity wheel. Title I funds are utilized to fund our second full time school counselor so that we are able to offer additional social-emotional support for our students.

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

To assist our students with the transition from pre-school to kindergarten, Jupiter Elementary provides our parents with the opportunity to attend a kindergarten orientation in the spring of each year. Kindergarten teachers and the leadership team create a theme-based orientation that makes parents/families more comfortable with the transition process for their student. This program is designed to inform parents about our school community and the expectations of the kindergarten curriculum. Since many of our Head Start students stay at Jupiter Elementary for kindergarten, they are included in all school events and their parents are encouraged to volunteer to become even more involved in school so that the transition is easier.

To assist 6th grade students with the transition from 6th grade to 7th grade (middle school) respective middle schools visit students here at Jupiter. Each middle school sends a guidance counselor and teacher leaders to explain and help students with registering for classes. Parents are also invited to each middle school for an informational night.

**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.**

Jupiter Elementary's mission is to reach every child, every day. Our vision is that Jupiter Elementary will challenge our diverse community of learners, and establish a positive and productive school culture, set high expectations for achievement, and encourage independent, self-directed learning. It is the leadership's responsibility to ensure that continued commitment to the school's mission and vision is on the forefront of all stakeholders. Our hope is to create a school culture that embraces all stakeholders to thrive to do their best, live up to our school wide SOAR expectations not only for themselves but within the community as well. Towards the end of the school year, our Title 1 Coordinator conducts a Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) with faculty/staff and our parents/families. Then during the summer, the leadership team meets and analyzes the results of the CNA and collaborates/problem solves the areas in need. This gives the leadership team the opportunity to identify the areas in need of improvement and to develop an action plan to improve in the areas that have been identified. Federal, state, and local funds are also coordinated to support and implement the school's goals, which will have an impact on student academic achievement. Title 1 federal funds are used to employ additional instructional personnel (three intervention teachers, a literacy coach, an additional guidance counselor, and four instructional assistants). To include supporting Title 1 parent/family curriculum nights which provides resources and materials for parents/families to utilize at home with their child. To purchase additional instructional materials and resources for teachers and provide professional development for faculty/staff. Jupiter Elementary's goals, strategies, and action steps are always based on the input from our parent/families and our faculty/staff which ultimately aligns with the school's mission and vision.

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

Many Jupiter teachers implement project-based learning activities that relate to the real world, which helps students to understand the next steps in their educational career and beyond. Our teachers also implement real-world based problem solving in many of the subject areas being taught, as well as; teaching them how to be productive members in society. Jupiter Elementary has three vested local churches that provide ongoing support with our students through volunteering to read to our students, conduct character education assemblies school wide and provide resources and supplies for students, parents and families.