

Brevard Public Schools

# Ralph M Williams Junior 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>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Ralph M Williams Junior Elementary School

1700 CLUBHOUSE DR, Rockledge, FL 32955

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

## Demographics

Principal: Susan Schroeder M

Start Date for this Principal: 10/25/2017

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	41%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: A (63%) 2014-15: A (70%)
<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>	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](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>9</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Ralph M Williams Junior Elementary School

1700 CLUBHOUSE DR, Rockledge, FL 32955

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

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-6</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Title I School</b></p> <p>No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>35%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (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> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>33%</p>

## School Grades History

<b>Year</b>	<b>2018-19</b>	<b>2017-18</b>	<b>2016-17</b>	<b>2015-16</b>
<b>Grade</b>	B	A	B	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.**

Our mission is to serve every student with excellence as the standard.

Six Conditions for a Glasser Model Quality School:

Quality develops with warm, caring, trusting relationships. Quality is always useful.  
 Quality is the best everyone can do at the time. Quality always feels good.  
 Quality is never destructive. Quality can always be improved.

Caring Habits for a Quality School:

- Listening – Try to understand the perspective of others; be aware of our perceptions and the perceptions of others.
- Supporting – uphold, value, validate; believe in the other person.
- Encouraging – See strength in others; have confidence in others.
- Respecting – Hold others in high regard; believe in the person.
- Trusting – Communicating I care; I am here to help, not to hurt you.
- Accepting – See value, work and capability in others.
- Negotiating Disagreements – Value the relationship; agree to talk it out; win/win.

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

Students at Ralph Williams Elementary discover that learning adds quality to their lives.

### 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
Back, Terrie	Assistant Principal	Curriculum Support, Testing Coordinator, Behavior Management, Observation and Feedback, and MTSS Facilitator.
Webb, Jessica	Instructional Coach	Lesson Modeling, Curriculum Design, Collaborative Planning Facilitator, Data Analysis, and Intervention Design.
Herold, Wesley	Principal	Learning Cycle Facilitation, Communicating Action Plan with Stakeholders, Collaborative Planning Facilitator, Data Analysis, Observation and Feedback, and Instructional Coaching.

### 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	67	88	78	80	77	66	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	552
Attendance below 90 percent	5	27	27	29	23	18	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	151
One or more suspensions	0	3	2	1	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	4	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

**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	2	1	1	7	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

**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	3	9	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
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)**

50

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Monday 8/26/2019

**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	35	32	30	23	34	28	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	224
One or more suspensions	1	3	1	0	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	14	9	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	1	1	1	6	7	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

## 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	62%	62%	57%	76%	63%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	65%	60%	58%	65%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	57%	53%	47%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	69%	63%	63%	71%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	64%	65%	62%	53%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	53%	51%	29%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	64%	57%	53%	75%	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	67 (0)	88 (0)	78 (0)	80 (0)	77 (0)	66 (0)	96 (0)	552 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	5 ( )	27 ( )	27 ( )	29 ( )	23 ( )	18 ( )	22 ( )	151 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ( )	3 (0)	2 (0)	1 (0)	3 (0)	3 (0)	3 (0)	15 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ( )	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (0)	3 (0)	4 (0)	11 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ( )	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (0)	6 (0)	10 (0)	20 (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	54%	64%	-10%	58%	-4%
	2018	74%	63%	11%	57%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	62%	61%	1%	58%	4%
	2018	70%	57%	13%	56%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				
05	2019	66%	60%	6%	56%	10%
	2018	64%	54%	10%	55%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
06	2019	69%	60%	9%	54%	15%
	2018	72%	63%	9%	52%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	55%	61%	-6%	62%	-7%
	2018	75%	62%	13%	62%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	83%	64%	19%	64%	19%
	2018	70%	59%	11%	62%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
05	2019	62%	60%	2%	60%	2%
	2018	72%	58%	14%	61%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
06	2019	73%	67%	6%	55%	18%
	2018	79%	68%	11%	52%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	65%	56%	9%	53%	12%
	2018	70%	57%	13%	55%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
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	24	47	45	39	58	52	33				
ELL	30										
ASN	75			67							
BLK	35	50	58	38	43	38	40				
HSP	62	64		72	71						
MUL	61	86		72	100						
WHT	66	65	55	74	63	41	69				
FRL	52	61	50	60	55	39	36				
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	25	38	39	30	54	38	29				
ASN	92	82		100	91						
BLK	46	41	33	42	64	43					
HSP	59	52		65	83						
MUL	82			64							
WHT	73	56	41	78	79	61	69				
FRL	61	55	46	61	74	59	66				
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	39	44	39	37	32	22	50				
ASN	92	73		92	73						
BLK	50	40		50	40						
HSP	68	54		62	32						
MUL	92			58							
WHT	78	67	49	74	56	35	77				
FRL	65	57	37	59	42	35	65				

## 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	61
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	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	485

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
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	71
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	43
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	67
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	80
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	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.**

ELA proficiency was the lowest performing category. This is reflected in the overall proficiency as well as subgroups. Students with Disabilities, Black/African American, and English Language Learners all performed below 36% proficiency. Whole group instruction has been a main emphasis in prior years. Data driven small groups have only occurred during RtI.

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

Math learning gains reflected the largest decline from 78% to 62%. In 2017-2018 we implemented Eureka Math curriculum after having historically low performance in math in 2016-2017. Learning gains were extremely high in 2017-2018. While we had a lower percentage of learning gains, 62% is above average from prior years performance.

**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.**

When comparing the performance of our Asian Subgroup, they were outperformed by the state in ELA (School: 75%, State 80%) and Math (School: 66%, State: 85%). English Language Learners also showed a significant gap in ELA (School: 30%, State: 39%). Our Asian Subgroup is also 50% Exceptional Education for those that were tested for FSA. Our professional development was focused

on whole group instructional delivery using learning targets. Data driven small groups based on performance on grade level standards has not been as much of a consistent practice.

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

ELA Lowest 25% Learning Gains showed the most growth in our school wide data. We increased from 43% in 2017-2018, to 60% in 2018-2019. We conducted quarterly data chats with our Lowest 25% for both ELA and Math. We discussed who was growing and who was struggling and what we could try to include to support them. We also included goal setting for our students in the lowest 25%.

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

Our students in the subgroup Free-Reduced Lunch were suspended at a higher rate than our other subgroups. We also have 20 students that received a Level 1 in either ELA or Math in 2018-2019. 75% of our students that were Free-Reduced Lunch and were suspended also earned a Level 1 in ELA or Math.

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

1. Subgroup Achievement Performance (Students with Disabilities, Black/African American, and English Language Learners).
2. Increase the delivery of data based small group instruction during core academic time.
3. Reduce the suspension rate of students in the Free-Reduced Lunch subgroup.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

<b>#1</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Subgroup Performance (ESE, Black/African American, English Language Learners)
<b>Rationale</b>	Students with Disabilities continues to be our lowest performing subgroup. 24% of our SWD's are proficient in ELA and 32% are proficient in Math.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Students with Disabilities will improve their proficiency level from 24% to 35% in ELA and 39% to 45% in Math.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Wesley Herold (herold.wesley@brevardschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Data based small group instruction
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Our focus the past few years has been centered around improving core instruction. We saw increased performance from that work, but also experienced some decreases in the past year. Our Students with Disabilities, English Language Learners, and our Black/ African American subgroups continue to perform below 40% proficiency. Students haven't responded as well to the emphasis on the core instruction. Students will benefit from using data to determine gaps and designing small group instruction to meet student needs.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Analyze data from iReady diagnostic and benchmark data</li> <li>2. Provide Professional Development to share best practices on establishing a structure to allow for small groups and for instruction at the teacher table.</li> <li>3. Conduct learning walks with grade level teams to observe and provide feedback</li> <li>4. Administer Standards Mastery Assessments</li> <li>5. Analyze data from Standards Mastery Assessments and feedback from observations</li> <li>6. Design lessons collaboratively to address student gaps.</li> <li>7. Reflect on instruction and make adjustments as needed.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Wesley Herold (herold.wesley@brevardschools.org)

<b>#2</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Achievement Proficiency in ELA and Math
<b>Rationale</b>	Overall achievement for the school decreased by 8% in ELA and 5% in Math.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Overall proficiency in ELA will increase from 62% to 72% and in Math will increase from 69% to 75%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Wesley Herold (herold.wesley@brevardschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Data based small group instruction
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Our focus the past few years has been centered around improving core instruction. We saw increased performance from that work, but also experienced some decreases in the past year. Students haven't responded as well to the emphasis on the core instruction. Students will benefit from using data to determine gaps and designing small group instruction to meet student needs.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Analyze data from iReady diagnostic and benchmark data</li> <li>2. Provide Professional Development to share best practices on establishing a structure to allow for small groups and for instruction at the teacher table.</li> <li>3. Conduct learning walks with grade level teams to observe and provide feedback</li> <li>4. Administer Standards Mastery Assessments</li> <li>5. Analyze data from Standards Mastery Assessments and feedback from observations</li> <li>6. Design lessons collaboratively to address student gaps.</li> <li>7. Reflect on instruction and make adjustments as needed.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Wesley Herold (herold.wesley@brevardschools.org)



<b>#3</b>	
<b>Title</b>	Learning Gains Achievement in ELA and Math
<b>Rationale</b>	Learning Gains for the school increased by 10% in ELA and decreased by 15% in Math. Our Lowest 25% ELA gains were higher than our overall learning gains in and we would like to see an increase for all students.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Overall learning gains in ELA will increase from 65% to 72% and in Math will increase from 64% to 70%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Wesley Herold (herold.wesley@brevardschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Data based small group instruction
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Our focus the past few years has been centered around improving core instruction. We saw increased performance from that work, but also experienced some decreases in the past year. Students haven't responded as well to the emphasis on the core instruction. Students will benefit from using data to determine gaps and designing small group instruction to meet student needs.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Analyze data from iReady diagnostic and benchmark data</li> <li>2. Provide Professional Development to share best practices on establishing a structure to allow for small groups and for instruction at the teacher table.</li> <li>3. Conduct learning walks with grade level teams to observe and provide feedback</li> <li>4. Administer Standards Mastery Assessments</li> <li>5. Analyze data from Standards Mastery Assessments and feedback from observations</li> <li>6. Design lessons collaboratively to address student gaps.</li> <li>7. Reflect on instruction and make adjustments as needed.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Wesley Herold (herold.wesley@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 address a reduction in our suspension rate for our Free-Reduced Lunch Subgroup, we will continue our focus of Community Circles on Friday's to reflect and discuss character. Students will set personal goals for the next week. Our guidance counselor is conducting a survey to connect with our 4th-6th grade classes to identify student social emotional needs. Our counselor is also discussing with our local high school the possibility of establishing a mentor program.