

Brevard Public Schools

Robert L. Stevenson Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Robert L. Stevenson Elementary School

1450 MARTIN BLVD, Merritt Island, FL 32952

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

Demographics

Principal: Tiffiny Fleeeger A

Start Date for this Principal: 7/15/2019

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)	23%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (84%) 2017-18: A (84%) 2016-17: A (89%) 2015-16: A (86%) 2014-15: A (93%)
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	9
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Robert L. Stevenson Elementary School

1450 MARTIN BLVD, Merritt Island, FL 32952

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School KG-6</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>17%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>23%</p>

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 prepare teachers with the pedagogical knowledge, teacher practice, skills, and core content knowledge in and by "working enthusiastically and in concert" so that every child will experience academic, social, and emotional success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To give students at Robert Louis Stevenson Elementary School of the Arts every opportunity to live and lead a quality and rewarding life in the 21st Century by offering many ways "to explore matters of the mind and also of the heart."

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
Fleeger, Tiffany	Principal	Mrs. Fleeger is the lead learner of Stevenson Elementary. She provides leadership that allows teachers to grow in the MTSS process. She believes that all students can learn and that all learners deserve enrichment opportunities. Mrs. Fleeger also has a strong interest in technology and how it can affect learning in the classroom when integrated into instruction. Mrs. Fleeger is dedicated to excellence, community, and the growth of all individuals.
Vanderpool, Cindy	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Vanderpool's duties and responsibilities are to support teachers in curriculum and instruction. She is the liaison between district initiatives and directives and classroom teachers.
Schoon, Angela	Instructional Coach	Ms. Schoon provides the direct connection between theory and practice through the modeling and coaching process. She is our MTSS coordinator and manages data through a variety of sources such as IReady, FSA, and Write Score.
Silva, Zaida	School Counselor	Mrs. Silva is also a manager of the MTSS process. She and Ms. Schoon work together facilitating Student Success Teams. She is also the manager and monitor of Social Emotional Learning at Stevenson making herself available to students that need support and also provides lessons for classes in SEL. She handles all IPST meetings as well.

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	69	71	72	74	72	75	60	0	0	0	0	0	0	493
Attendance below 90 percent	18	20	19	14	11	14	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	116
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	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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)

35

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 7/15/2019

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	0	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	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	90%	62%	57%	95%	63%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	69%	60%	58%	78%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	77%	57%	53%	85%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	95%	63%	63%	99%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	86%	65%	62%	82%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	87%	53%	51%	90%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	85%	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	69 (0)	71 (0)	72 (0)	74 (0)	72 (0)	75 (0)	60 (0)	493 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	18 ()	20 ()	19 ()	14 ()	11 ()	14 ()	20 ()	116 (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)	4 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (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	88%	64%	24%	58%	30%
	2018	92%	63%	29%	57%	35%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	85%	61%	24%	58%	27%
	2018	85%	57%	28%	56%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
05	2019	93%	60%	33%	56%	37%
	2018	85%	54%	31%	55%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
06	2019	93%	60%	33%	54%	39%
	2018	94%	63%	31%	52%	42%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	93%	61%	32%	62%	31%
	2018	96%	62%	34%	62%	34%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	93%	64%	29%	64%	29%
	2018	95%	59%	36%	62%	33%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	95%	60%	35%	60%	35%
	2018	97%	58%	39%	61%	36%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	97%	67%	30%	55%	42%
	2018	98%	68%	30%	52%	46%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	85%	56%	29%	53%	32%
	2018	88%	57%	31%	55%	33%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
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	89	75		100	88						
ASN	92			100							
HSP	97	66		94	86	90	70				
MUL	79	50		79	77						
WHT	90	71	81	97	87	95	86				
FRL	89	64	82	89	85	70	92				
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	85	92		95	83						
ASN	90			100							
HSP	92	54		92	77		91				
MUL	85	59		93	88						
WHT	90	73	76	98	83	88	91				
FRL	85	77	83	98	82	80	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	94	64		100	67						
ASN	100			100							
HSP	95	76		95	84						
MUL	100	88		100	94						
WHT	94	77	85	99	80	89	94				
FRL	92	81	86	98	84	85					

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	589
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	88
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	96
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	84
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	71
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	82
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.

Lowest Performance is as follows:
4th grade ELA at 85% (Decline of 7% -Cohort Score)

We believe that contributing factors to low performance are due to several areas of concern.

- 1.) There continues to be a learning curve regarding the alignment of the level of the standard and task complexity. Curriculum based discussions regarding alignment did not occur on a regular basis. That along with a schedule that did not honor time for teachers to regularly work together created very limited time to plan together to ensure standards alignment.
- 2.) For the 2018-2019 School Year there were fewer MTSS data team meetings and intervention discussions. When meetings did occur data was discussed, however, interventions were not discussed or planned for as a grade level. In addition to these areas of concern monitoring of student intervention data did not occur as frequently as necessary.
- 3.) In addition to the above stated concerns, Stevenson's 4th grade data may have been impacted by the resignation of a fourth grade teacher and the inability to find a certificated individual to teach the class until later in the school year (January). Until a certified educator was hired a variety of substitutes managed the classroom.

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

Greatest decline from the prior year:
3rd grade ELA down 4% from the 2018 school year.

We believe that contributing factors to low performance are due to several areas of concern.

- 1.) There continues to be a learning curve regarding the alignment of the level of the standard and task complexity. Curriculum based discussions regarding alignment did not occur on a regular basis. That along with a schedule that did not honor time for teachers to regularly work together created very limited time to plan together to ensure standards alignment.
- 2.) For the 2018-2019 School Year there were fewer MTSS data team meetings and intervention discussions. When meetings did occur data was discussed, however, interventions were not discussed or planned for as a grade level. In addition to these areas of concern monitoring of student intervention data did not occur as frequently as necessary.
- 3.) Early Literacy skill foundations need to be strengthened to ensure that incoming third graders are prepared to reach higher levels of text complexity, vocabulary, and comprehension.

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.

Stevenson typically scores higher than district and state scores as indicated in the 2018/2019 scores. This is due to our commitment to our district's "Vision for Excellent Instruction." Lessons are focused on complex text, high level thinking, welcoming learning environments, high quality instructional materials and instructional strategies, the monitoring of data, collaboration among students and learning using authentic contexts.

With that being said, we did find an area that we may describe as a "gap."

State averages for 2017 FSA data are all below Stevenson's collected data.

4th grade ELA-District data indicates an improvement of 4% in district data and 2% in state data whereas Stevenson remained flat from one year to the next-85%.

- 1.) There continues to be a learning curve regarding the alignment of the level of the standard and task complexity. Curriculum based discussions regarding alignment and the examination of student work did not occur on a regular basis. That along with a schedule that did not honor time for teachers to regularly work together created very limited time to plan together to ensure standards alignment.
- 2.) For the 2018-2019 School Year there were fewer MTSS data team meetings and intervention discussions. When meetings did occur data was discussed, however, interventions were not discussed or planned for as a grade level. In addition to these areas of concern monitoring of student intervention data did not occur as frequently as necessary.

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

The most improvement was shown in 5th Grade ELA . 5th grade ELA increased by 8%.

Actions that may have impacted this increase are as follows:

- 1.) Due to the nature of class arrangements (students were placed in homogeneous groups) it was evident (FSA Data, IReady Data, District Data) that one of the classes had a high number of struggling students in ELA. Because of this high need, administration worked with teachers to determine interventions and provide support through multiple meetings regarding student data and providing the assistance of our ESE support person. This was a concentrated effort to move these students forward in their areas of need.
- 2.) The grade level had a class made up of GSP students (and some non-GSP) that had the push-in services of our GSP teacher. One day a week she would spend the day in this classroom working in a co-teaching model with the classroom teacher. Multiple enrichment opportunities were provided to students in this class.
- 3.) Our media specialist and former literacy coach assisted one of the fifth grade teacher by disaggregating classroom data and assisting with interventions.

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

Stevenson's EWS data from an outsiders perspective may seem satisfactory, however, we have many students that go on vacation during the school year which impacts student performance.

1.) There are times that students go on vacation and can handle the necessary make-up of instruction and assignments and fall right back into the routine of school. There are others, struggling learners, that take vacations that can not afford to miss classroom instruction. Teachers are responsible for providing instruction to absent students, however, the time spent for the gradual release model of learning (I do, We do, You do) is not there. Typically the coaching piece (We do) is not available to those students simply due to time.

2.) There are other struggling learners that miss school due to illness, yet not seeing a doctor, therefore having unexcused absences. Some greater than ten school days. Unfortunately, we have had 3 students that could not proceed with the IPST process due to absences being an exclusionary factor.

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

Data Informed Instructional Decision Making

Data Informed Instructional Decision Making is truly the umbrella of our entire school improvement priorities. Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) and Standards-aligned instruction all fall under our highest of priorities. Proper training of our staff is critical to our success in identifying student needs. Identification of struggling learners through data, creation and implementation of intervention strategies, progress monitoring the effectiveness of said strategies, and providing professional development in areas of need-Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3, standards alignment, and SEL are all critical to the process. With that being said, it is also important to provide enrichment strategies for those that need more challenging instruction and tasks.

A Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) is a term used to describe an evidence based model of schooling that uses data-based problem-solving to integrate academic and behavioral instruction and intervention. The integrated instruction and intervention is delivered to students in varying intensities (multiple tiers) based on student need. "Need driven" decision-making seeks to ensure that district resources reach the appropriate students (schools) at the appropriate levels to accelerate the performance of ALL students to achieve and/or exceed proficiency. It has been a challenge for Stevenson to maintain a consistent focus on the MTSS process from year to year. This year, with planned weekly Student Success Team meetings, the examination of data for the purpose of intervention determination will be the focus. This is also one of our "School Priority Indicators" from our most recent BPIE School Level Self-Assessment-"# 14 "Administrators Analyze data to identify staff professional development and technical assistance needs related to inclusion"

As noted in earlier data reflections, there continues to be a learning curve regarding the alignment of the level of the standard and task complexity. Previously, curriculum based discussions regarding alignment did not occur on a regular basis. That, along with a schedule that did not honor time for teachers to regularly work together, created very limited time for teacher collaboration to ensure standards alignment. Answering the question, "How do we "stretch" our students?" is equally important to the overall student performance of our school. As our "Vision for Excellent Instruction" states, quality instruction occurs when there are teachers who are intentionally planning and facilitating the learning through the use of high quality, standards-aligned materials, monitoring data, and collaborating with their school community.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Data Informed Instructional Decision Making
Rationale	<p>Through this process we will examine the Tier 1 data to determine if there are any overall needs to address. Beyond Tier 1 we will look at specific sub-groups of students and individual students during Student Success Teams to create intervention plans to assist struggling learners. We will provide Tier 2 and Tier 3 support to students through small group targeted instruction.</p> <p>Our focus will also provide enrichment to high achieving students and provide behavioral supports to students in need. In order to ensure students are receiving equitable, relevant instruction that is standard-aligned, analyzing student work/assessments will be conducted through Student Success Team meetings. Ensuring that standards are interpreted and understood by grade level teams is an important component to ensure that instructional decisions are being made in alignment with the full intent of the standards.</p>
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>Measurable outcome will be 2020 FSA ELA scores: Improve 3rd grade by 5%. 88% to 93% (2018-3rd grade ELA down 4% from the 2018 school year.) Improve 4th grade by 5%. 85% to 90% (2018-4th grade ELA at 85% (Decline of 7%)) (4th grade ELA-District data indicates an improvement of 4% in district data and 2% in state data whereas Stevenson remained flat from one year to the next-85%.) Improve 6th grade by 1%. 93% to 94%.</p> <p>Evaluate behavioral plans by measuring a reduction in referrals of students with an active behavior plan.</p> <p>Evaluate Level 4 and 5 students by asking: Did they maintain or improve a level? Did 90% of Levels 4 or 5 show a learning gain on the 2020 FSA ELA?</p> <p>75% of students in grades K- 2 will reach their goal by the end of the 2019-2020 school year on the EOY iReady Diagnostic.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Tiffany Fleeger (fleeger.tiffany@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Student Success Teams meet regularly Training teachers in MTSS process Monitoring of FSA, IReady, Write Score Writing, and district assessments (School wide data) Monitoring of classroom data Monitoring of intervention process and data-Grade Level MTSS plans, student tier movement from one level to another Coach teachers in the progress monitoring process (Form 7) Spalding Phonics Instruction 95% Group Phonemic Awareness Lessons Teacher monitoring IReady lessons and reteaching of standards in small groups Ready book instruction with IReady correlation School wide writing using Write Score Share item analysis and student work samples to determine understanding or misconceptions of a standard/skill and determine if instruction was to the full intent of the standard Collaborative planning to ensure that there is an understanding of the intent of the standard</p>

and equitable instruction is provided to students

Professional Development

Modeling lessons, observing instruction, and providing feedback to teachers

**Rationale
for
Evidence-
based
Strategy**

To maintain a thorough and clear understanding of our learners is important to the Data Informed Instructional Decision Making process. Ensuring that we meet the needs of our struggling learners requires us to continuously monitor progress to ensure that interventions are making a positive effect OR change the interventions as needed. It is equally important to understand the need to enrich students. All learners must move forward academically and behaviorally from their current status. Through professional development and supplemental instruction we can achieve positive outcomes for our students. As each team reviews student work, discussions will center around the intent of the standard and how it was taught. This strategy was selected because our teachers have spent a great deal of time analyzing the standards, but need to determine instructional next steps based on the analysis. This allows us to provide an equitable, relevant curriculum to our students.

Action Step

Focus Strategy: Planning

Leadership Team Responsibilities

*Arrange a schedule where common planning time is available on a regular basis

*Schedule and lead collaborative planning sessions each semester

Teacher Responsibilities

*Meet as a grade level team weekly to plan for instruction

*Attend collaborative planning sessions focused on priority standards and Tier 1 needs as identified through data analysis

Focus Strategy: Professional Development

Leadership Team Responsibilities

*Arrange professional development opportunities throughout the course of the school year focused on data analysis and standards-aligned instruction & intervention during:

- PDD, ERPDs, Vertical Team Meetings, and Faculty Meetings
- VORP Opportunities
- Model Classroom Observations
- Model Video Demonstrations

Description

- Instructional Coach Model Lessons

- District Resource Teacher Support

- Standard Aligned Task Analysis

- I-Ready Data Training sessions

- Instructional Rounds

Teacher Responsibilities

*Participate in professional development opportunities throughout the course of the school year focused on data analysis and standards-aligned instruction & intervention during:

- PDD

- Ongoing PD on ERPDs, Vertical Team Meetings, and Faculty Meetings

- VORP Opportunities

- Model Classroom Observations

- Model Video Demonstrations

- Instructional Coach Support

- District Resource Teacher Support

- Standard Aligned Task Analysis

- I-Ready Data Training sessions

- Instructional Rounds

Focus Strategy: Standards-aligned Instruction

Leadership Team Responsibilities

*Model, observe, and provide feedback on: standards-aligned lessons, standards-aligned small group tasks, intervention and enrichment lessons, and student data chats

Teacher Responsibilities

*Implement standards-aligned lessons

- ATUs
- Standard-Focus Documents
- Math Resources
- Social Studies Pacing Document/DBQ
- CSI Lessons
- Science Priority Units
- Text Sets
- Project Based Learning opportunities
- Ready Book Lessons
- Engage NY Units of Study
- LDC Modules
- Spalding Phonics Instruction
- 95% Group Phonics/Phonemic Awareness Lessons
- Heggerty Lessons
- Write Score Lessons

*Implement i-Ready Data Chats with students

Focus Strategy: MTSS Process

Leadership Team Responsibilities

*Provide PD on the MTSS process

*Arrange weekly Student Success Team Meetings

*Guide Teachers through identifying students in the bottom quartile

*Guide Teachers through identifying students in Stevenson's lowest performing subgroups

*Arrange team members to support teachers in analyzing student performance/behavioral data, identifying student areas of need, prescribing interventions/enrichment, and monitoring students' progress in response to targeted instruction

*Monitor attendance data and meet with families and teachers as necessary to provide interventions to support attendance

*Provide a master schedule that has protected intervention time

Teacher Responsibilities

*Attend trainings on the MTSS process

*Attend weekly Student Success Team Meetings

*Identify students in the bottom quartile

*Identify students in lowest performing subgroups

*Analyze student performance data at grade, class, and student level

*Collaborate to identify strategies that support student needs

*Deliver tiered interventions/enrichment opportunities with fidelity

*Monitor and report student progress

*Involve families in the process of supporting student success through parent conferences and school/grade level informational events

Focus Strategy: Funding

Leadership Team Responsibilities

*Research funding avenues for:

- Professional Development

- Selections for Professional Library
 - Materials to support intervention, enrichment, data-analysis
- Teacher Responsibilities
- *Complete grants for individual PD/resource needs/desires
 - *Deliver rationale and request funding from SAC to support implementation

Person Responsible Tiffiny Fleeger (fleeger.tiffiny@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).

Stevenson's students are from diverse social and economic backgrounds. Educators and community agencies serve students with different motivation for engaging in learning, behaving positively, and performing academically. Social and emotional learning (SEL) provides a foundation for safe and positive learning, and enhances students' ability to succeed in school, careers, and life. Research shows that SEL not only improves achievement by an average of 11 percentile points, but it also increases pro-social behaviors (such as kindness, sharing, and empathy), improves student attitudes toward school, and reduces depression and stress among students (Durlak et al., 2011). This is year 2 of Stevenson's incorporation of SEL into the focus of what is done to assist positive student achievement across the tiered instructional levels. Last year we utilized the Mind-up program. It was taught by our guidance counselor. This year we will be using the Sanford Harmony resources as well as continuing to recognizing positive character traits through the Stevenson Character Campaign. Sanford Harmony is a program designed to teach Pre-K to elementary school children about cooperative, empathy, and effective conversation. The implementation of this program will be through classroom Morning Meetings. The Character Campaign will be implemented through our CCTV focusing on the description of each character trait.