

Brevard Public Schools

Freedom 7 Elementary School Of International



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Freedom 7 Elementary School Of International Studies

400 S 4TH ST, Cocoa Beach, FL 32931

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

Demographics

Principal: Kathryn Lott C

Start Date for this Principal: 1/7/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	12%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Asian Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (84%) 2017-18: A (90%) 2016-17: A (88%) 2015-16: A (89%) 2014-15: A (95%)
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	N/A

* 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	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Freedom 7 Elementary School Of International Studies

400 S 4TH ST, Cocoa Beach, FL 32931

<http://www.freedom.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 KG-6	No	11%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	33%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	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 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 continue the International Baccalaureate Primary Years Programme, a concept based curriculum that empowers students to become inquirers who are responsible, globally-minded citizens and reflective lifelong learners.

(Revised 8/2018)

(Reviewed 9/2019)

Provide the school's vision statement.

Freedom 7 Elementary School of International Studies, an International Baccalaureate Primary Years Programme School, provides a quality public education with a rigorous and relevant transdisciplinary curriculum. Students are encouraged to become critical and open-minded thinkers, lifelong learners and compassionate world citizens who respect cultural diversity and take action to better our world.

(Revised 8/2018)

(Reviewed 9/2019)

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
Lott, Kathryn	Principal	The pedagogical leadership team meets weekly to discuss, reflect and plan for student instruction within the school. Data is used from multiple sources to determine instructional supports which may include ongoing professional development, pedagogical discourse within the 80 minute weekly PLC with grade levels, grouping strategies, programming needs and more. The Principal oversees instructional decision making at all levels. She collaborates with all classroom teachers through PLCs and MTSS meetings to support all learners.
Haddock, Lucy	Assistant Principal	The pedagogical leadership team meets weekly to discuss, reflect and plan for student instruction within the school. Data is used from multiple sources to determine instructional supports which may include ongoing professional development, pedagogical discourse within the 80 minute weekly PLC with grade levels, grouping strategies, programming needs and more. The Assistant Principal assists teachers with instructional support and coordinates the mentor program throughout the school.
Noe, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	The pedagogical leadership team meets weekly to discuss, reflect and plan for student instruction within the school. Data is used from multiple sources to determine instructional supports which may include ongoing professional development, pedagogical discourse within the 80 minute weekly PLC with grade levels, grouping strategies, programming needs and more. The Instructional coach supports teachers through co-teaching and a collaborative teaching model. She works with teachers to implement instructional goals throughout the school. As the lead mentor, the instructional coach supports both teacher mentors and mentees.
Enrique, Lisa	Instructional Media	The pedagogical leadership team meets weekly to discuss, reflect and plan for student instruction within the school. Data is used from multiple sources to determine instructional supports which may include ongoing professional development, pedagogical discourse within the 80 minute weekly PLC with grade levels, grouping strategies, programming needs and more. The Instructional Media specialist supports new teachers as a mentor as well as helps to model lessons in the classroom. She is instrumental in curating information and resources to support conceptual learning within the classroom.

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	51	54	54	55	67	59	67	0	0	0	0	0	0	407
Attendance below 90 percent	0	1	0	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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

30

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/24/2019

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	14	9	13	4	11	12	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	69
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	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	95%	62%	57%	97%	63%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	83%	60%	58%	73%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	80%	57%	53%	82%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	94%	63%	63%	98%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	77%	65%	62%	83%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	68%	53%	51%	89%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	89%	57%	53%	94%	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	51 (0)	54 (0)	54 (0)	55 (0)	67 (0)	59 (0)	67 (0)	407 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	1 ()	0 ()	0 ()	0 ()	2 ()	2 ()	5 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (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)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	3 (0)	2 (0)	6 (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	96%	64%	32%	58%	38%
	2018	93%	63%	30%	57%	36%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	98%	61%	37%	58%	40%
	2018	97%	57%	40%	56%	41%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
05	2019	95%	60%	35%	56%	39%
	2018	98%	54%	44%	55%	43%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
06	2019	93%	60%	33%	54%	39%
	2018	98%	63%	35%	52%	46%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	94%	61%	33%	62%	32%
	2018	93%	62%	31%	62%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	90%	64%	26%	64%	26%
	2018	95%	59%	36%	62%	33%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	94%	60%	34%	60%	34%
	2018	97%	58%	39%	61%	36%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
06	2019	97%	67%	30%	55%	42%
	2018	100%	68%	32%	52%	48%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	89%	56%	33%	53%	36%
	2018	91%	57%	34%	55%	36%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
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	90	93		95	86						
ASN	96	73		96	80						
BLK	100	100		91	80						
HSP	95	77		95	85						
MUL	89	82		83	76						
WHT	96	83	89	95	76	78	91				
FRL	86	65		86	59		67				
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	90	58		85	75						
ASN	95	88		95	100						
HSP	100	92		100	69						
MUL	96	90		96	80						
WHT	97	78	88	96	82	89	85				
FRL	94	69		91	79	80					
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	88			100							
ASN	100	69		100	92						
HSP	100	74		95	83						
MUL	96	73		96	86						
WHT	96	73	76	99	81	86	95				
FRL	97	76		100	76						

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	84
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	586
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	91
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	86
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	93
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	88
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	83
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	
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	87
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	73
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.

In both Math and Reading, the lowest 25% dropped significantly from 91% in both areas in 2018, to 68% (math) and 80% (ELA) in 2019. The possible lack of differentiated instruction and small group instruction will have effected this drop. In addition, the lack of a standards based curriculum to support mathematics instruction, might have contributed to this drop.

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

Students in the lowest 25% for mathematics showed the most significant drop from 91% to 68%. Lack of small group instruction and standards aligned curriculum are considered to be the primary factors in this decline.

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.

Thankfully, all of our data shows a large gap, placing us above the state average. All stakeholders have accountability for the performance of the students at Freedom 7 Elementary. Teachers are dedicated to the pedagogical philosophy that is espoused with the International Baccalaureate framework, which allows for concept-based teaching of the standards through an inquiry approach. Parent Involvement, Community Support, triangular communication between parent, teacher and student are what makes this school excel. The culture at Freedom 7 supports the idea that all students can learn and deserve the opportunity to grow in a safe environment.

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

Students earning a level 5 in both domains showed learning gains. The continued conversations in PLCs addressing enrichment needs for students have helped support this growth. In addition, small group support was provided by the gifted student program teacher to grade 4 level 5 students throughout the year, specifically in mathematics enrichment.

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

Students who have attendance concerns are an area of growth. While not displaying below grade level or poor proficiency on FSA, these students may not be reaching their potential. A deeper dive into the learning gains with these students will help identify ways of supporting these students further. In addition, further communication about the importance of attending school with families will help support greater growth.

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

1. Increase the lowest 25% in mathematics for learning gains
2. Increase Learning gains in mathematics for all students
3. Increase learning gains for the free and reduced lunch population
4. Increase vocabulary development for all students across all disciplines
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Math Learning Gains of Lowest 25%
Rationale	Learning gains for the lowest 25% in mathematics were much lower than the overall learning gains for the school. (Grade 4, 40%; Grade 5, 43%; Grade 6, 67%)
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Learning gains for the lowest 25% in mathematics will increase in all grades. (Grade 4 from 40% to 80%; Grade 5 from 43% to 80%, Grade 6 from 67% to 80%)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kathryn Lott (lott.kathryn@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Small group instruction in all classrooms to support the lowest 25% in mathematics, using researched based and standards based aligned curriculum and practices
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We believe the problem is occurring due to lack of small group instruction across all grade levels consistently, through differentiated instruction. In addition, the previous curriculum was not standards aligned.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Establish small group supports with additional pull out opportunities using faculty not assigned to children at all times. 2. Administration will conduct walk throughs to measure the frequency of small group instruction. 3. At least one teacher from each grade will attend professional development in Eureka Math and will share during pre-planning. 4. The school will adopt Eureka, a standards aligned curriculum resource to support all learners. 5. Administration will dedicate time in PLCs for Eureka Math planning and reflection. 6. Vignettes from Eureka Math will be discussed in PLCs to support new learning for teachers in the processes of evidence based mathematics instruction. 7. Standards Mastery, through iReady will be utilized by teachers to support ongoing progress monitoring for small group instruction and to support differentiation. 8. Formal observations will include small group instruction delineation and Eureka instruction with fidelity. 9. Classroom walk throughs by the the leadership team will monitor small group instruction and provide feedback for necessary instructional supports. 10. Ongoing research as to what resources are best to support tier 2 and 3 mathematics students will occur in collaboration with the instructional coach, administration and classroom teachers. 11. A group of teacher leaders will conduct a Parent night to engage parents in the Eureka way of learning mathematics. 12. The teachers will support Eureka instruction at home through newsletters and with homework parent helpers. 13. Teachers will use the Eureka exit-tickets to gather instructional decision making data and reteach as necessary for differentiated support.
Person Responsible	Kathryn Lott (lott.kathryn@brevardschools.org)

#2	
Title	Increase learning gains in mathematics
Rationale	Our math learning gains are not representative of the achievement percentage of all learners. 73% learning gains in 4th, 77% learning gains in 5th and 83% learning gains in 6th.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Learning gains in mathematics will increase by 2 points in each grade level; 75% in grade 4, 79% in grade 5 and 85% in grade 6.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kathryn Lott (lott.kathryn@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Use of a standards aligned mathematics curriculum will support greater depth of the mathematics standards. In addition, increased differentiation strategies in the classroom will support all learners at their level.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Through a better aligned mathematics curriculum, that supports the depth of the standards better, students will be able to meet the demands of the standard. Differentiated instruction for both the lower and upper 25% will help to support gains in mathematics.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At least one teacher from each grade will attend professional development in Eureka Math. 2. Administration will dedicate time in PLCs for Eureka Math planning and reflection. 3. Vignettes from Eureka Math will be discussed in PLCs to support new learning for teachers in the processes of evidence based mathematics instruction. 4. Standards Mastery, through iReady will be utilized by teachers to determine small group needs for reteaching based on two power standards at a time to support instructional needs. 5. Formal observations will include small group instruction delineation and Eureka instruction with fidelity. 6. Ongoing research as to what resources are best to support tier 2 and 3 mathematics students will occur in collaboration with the instructional coach, administration and classroom teachers. 7. Additional supports will be provided by non-classroom teachers to support enrichment small group instruction for the highest 25%. 8. Additional supports will be provided by non-classroom teachers to support students on PMPs, tier 2 and tier 3 instruction.
Person Responsible	Jennifer Noe (noe.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

#3	
Title	Increase learning gains for free and reduced lunch students in both ELA and Math
Rationale	Learning gains for the 11% of students classified as Free and Reduced Lunch were lower than the previous year; 91% in 2018 to 65% for ELA and 91% in 2018 to 59% in mathematics.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Learning gains for FRL population will increase from 65% to 70% in ELA and 59%-80% in mathematics.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Kathryn Lott (lott.kathryn@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	The adoption of Eureka Math as an standards based aligned curriculum will support growth in this area. In addition, differentiated instruction, through small group instruction in both ELA and mathematics, will support all learners.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We believe the lack of small group instruction supporting struggling learners in mathematics and reading, consistently, across all grades is a factor. Increased differentiated instruction will support these learners with greater gains.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At least one teacher from each grade will attend professional development in Eureka Math. 2. Administration will dedicate time in PLCs for Eureka Math planning and reflection. 3. Vignettes from Eureka Math will be discussed in PLCs to support new learning for teachers in the processes of evidence based mathematics instruction. 4. Standards Mastery, through iReady will be utilized by teachers to determine small group needs for reteaching. 5. Professional development will be held, school-wide on the instructional component of iReady to support the students who are in the lowest 25% and on PMPs. 6. Students with PMPs will use the iReady instructional component to support growth in the standards. 7. Formal observations will include small group instruction delineation. 8. Ongoing research as to what resources are best to support tier 2 and 3 mathematics students will occur in collaboration with the instructional coach, administration and classroom teachers. 9. Ongoing discourse in PLCs regarding student growth using triangulation of data to include, iReady, STAR, RI, classroom grades and district assessments where applicable. 10. Students will engage in data chats with identified teacher mentors which will include administration. 11. Administration will monitor student growth through data chats, MTSS meetings and PLCs to support student growth. 12. IReady instructional suite will be used to support learners in their growth in both mathematics and English Language Arts.
Person Responsible	Lucy Haddock (haddock.lucy@brevardschools.org)

#4	
Title	Increase Vocabulary development for all students
Rationale	The results of the iReady data indicate a low proficiency in vocabulary, across all grades. Last year's School Improvement Plan included a need to support growth in this area and we saw growth from the beginning of last year to the beginning of this year. We would like to continue to see growth in this area.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	The percentage of students in each grade will increase by 5% proficiency on iReady in vocabulary by the end of the year. 6th Grade 75% to 80% 5th Grade 71% to 76% 4th Grade 70% to 75% 3rd Grade 78% to 83% 2nd Grade 57% to 62% 1st Grade 43% to 48%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Jennifer Noe (noe.jennifer@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	School-wide support with explicit vocabulary instruction across all subject areas using a variety of complex texts will support continued vocabulary growth for all students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Having explicit conversations in PLCs regarding vocabulary development, along with supported professional development and vertical conversations, has supported growth in this area from last year to this year. We would like to continue to support learners with broadening our knowledge in teaching and learning of best strategies in vocabulary to continue to make gains.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Purposeful conversations regarding explicit vocabulary teaching during PLCs and vertical team conversations during faculty meetings 2. Collaborate and learn from other schools such as Stevenson and Columbia in regards to their vocabulary instruction and implement within our curriculum 3. Research additional supports that may be beneficial to support increased vocabulary instruction 4. Dive into the LAFs vocabulary standards to understand better how to create learning engagements that support the depth of the standard 5. IReady Standards mastery will be used to monitor vocabulary development across grade levels. 6.. Code learning engagements within the units of inquiry that have explicit opportunities for vocabulary development and monitor an increase in the need for and the growth of these engagements 7. Provide professional development in AIM (Accessible Instructional Materials) such as Learning Ally to support all students with access to rich vocabulary. 8. Students on PMPs will use iReady instructional weekly, to support growth in vocabulary acquisition and development. 9. Data will be analyzed after each diagnostic through the MTSS process to foster vertical and horizontal discourse among teachers.
Person Responsible	Lucy Haddock (haddock.lucy@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).