

Brevard Public Schools

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

Westside Elementary School

2175 DEGROODT RD SW, Palm Bay, FL 32908

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

Demographics

Principal: Stephanie Woodbury M

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	83%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (62%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (57%) 2014-15: A (67%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

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

Westside Elementary School

2175 DEGROODT RD SW, Palm Bay, FL 32908

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	Yes	60%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	44%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Through collaboration,
high expectations, and compassion,
WE inspire students to explore
their greatest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Together WE will achieve greatness!

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
Rogers, Darlene	Principal	Westside's leadership team meets weekly to discuss events, major behavior issues, academic data and instructional observations. We problem solve together and analyze data in order to drive coaching and Professional Development. Oversees the process and makes all final decisions.
Tison, Brianne	Instructional Coach	Westside's leadership team meets weekly to discuss events, major behavior issues, academic data and instructional observations. We problem solve together and analyze data in order to drive coaching and Professional Development. Meets weekly with teams for standards-based lesson planning, leads the MTSS process and IPST Meetings, models and mentors teachers using the coaching cycle.
Berry, Holly	Teacher, ESE	Westside's leadership team meets weekly to discuss events, major behavior issues, academic data and instructional observations. We problem solve together and analyze data in order to drive coaching and Professional Development. Provides enrichment for GSP students as well as high-achieving students in grade levels K-6.
Kraynik, Leslie	Teacher, K-12	Westside's leadership team meets weekly to discuss events, major behavior issues, academic data and instructional observations. We problem solve together and analyze data in order to drive coaching and Professional Development. Meets weekly with teams for standards-based lesson planning, models and mentors teachers using the coaching cycle.
Smith, Kayla	School Counselor	Westside's leadership team meets weekly to discuss events, major behavior issues, academic data and instructional observations. We problem solve together and analyze data in order to drive coaching and Professional Development. Participates in the MTSS and IPST processes, oversees IEP, 504 and EP meetings, provides small group instruction in social-emotional curriculum, supports classroom teachers in social-emotional classroom lessons and strategies.
Williams, Mallory	Assistant Principal	Westside's leadership team meets weekly to discuss events, major behavior issues, academic data and instructional observations. We problem solve together and analyze data in order to drive coaching and Professional Development. Participate in MTSS and IPST processes, supports coaches and attends content meetings as necessary, oversees SIP implementation.

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	111	83	102	90	122	133	127	0	0	0	0	0	0	768	
Attendance below 90 percent	69	42	45	37	57	62	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	353	
One or more suspensions	5	4	7	4	11	9	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	55	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	13	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	22	17	21	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	

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	5	10	14	16	36	33	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	146

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	11	3	4	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Monday 9/9/2019

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	44	52	39	40	59	59	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	330
One or more suspensions	2	3	1	4	1	5	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
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	2	30	22	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	86

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	4	41	27	13	31	27	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	186

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	59%	62%	57%	57%	63%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	64%	60%	58%	63%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	57%	53%	62%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	64%	63%	63%	61%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	75%	65%	62%	66%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	53%	51%	52%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	59%	57%	53%	65%	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	111 (0)	83 (0)	102 (0)	90 (0)	122 (0)	133 (0)	127 (0)	768 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	69 ()	42 ()	45 ()	37 ()	57 ()	62 ()	41 ()	353 (0)
One or more suspensions	5 ()	4 (0)	7 (0)	4 (0)	11 (0)	9 (0)	15 (0)	55 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	13 (0)	8 (0)	12 (0)	34 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	22 (0)	17 (0)	21 (0)	18 (0)	78 (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	58%	64%	-6%	58%	0%
	2018	50%	63%	-13%	57%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	59%	61%	-2%	58%	1%
	2018	48%	57%	-9%	56%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	52%	60%	-8%	56%	-4%
	2018	45%	54%	-9%	55%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
06	2019	59%	60%	-1%	54%	5%
	2018	67%	63%	4%	52%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	50%	61%	-11%	62%	-12%
	2018	51%	62%	-11%	62%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	67%	64%	3%	64%	3%
	2018	58%	59%	-1%	62%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		16%				
05	2019	57%	60%	-3%	60%	-3%
	2018	52%	58%	-6%	61%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
06	2019	67%	67%	0%	55%	12%
	2018	72%	68%	4%	52%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		15%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	56%	56%	0%	53%	3%
	2018	61%	57%	4%	55%	6%
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	20	45	45	30	48	41	16				
ELL	41	60	68	56	79	56	39				
BLK	42	56	58	51	70	53	59				
HSP	53	58	56	56	72	55	50				
MUL	63	63		66	65						
WHT	65	68	63	69	78	57	65				
FRL	50	63	55	56	69	54	51				
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	12	29	36	23	38	37	10				
ELL	29	46	58	39	46	31					
BLK	39	54	63	45	61	63	48				
HSP	44	44	31	51	55	33	41				
MUL	52	55		59	43		62				
WHT	59	55	43	65	61	55	77				
FRL	46	53	44	51	56	51	55				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	25	48	53	33	50	34	22				
ELL	22	55	53	34	59	48	27				
BLK	39	50	55	44	52	41	40				
HSP	43	66	67	53	66	57	52				
MUL	56	68		60	79						
WHT	70	66	65	69	69	52	82				
FRL	50	61	59	54	63	51	62				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	69
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	503

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	59
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	56
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	59
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	64
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	66
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	58
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.

Overall, our SWD showed the lowest performance as well as the smallest % making learning gains. Contributing factors may include underperforming ESE teachers, teachers with a large caseload of ESE students, and a lack of intervention planning and implementation for these students. Low achievement for our SWD has been a trend over the past several years at Westside. However, in 2017-2018, only 12% of our SWD scored on grade level for FSA ELA compared with 21% in 2018-2019 school year. Though we still have a long way to go, the improvement is evident.

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

White students showed the greatest decline in Science from 77% in 2018 to 65% in 2019. In addition, black students in the lowest 25% showed a decline in ELA Learning Gains from 63% in 2018 to 58% in 2019. Though our 6th grade scores overall decreased (ELA -8%, Math -5%), the cohort comparison increased greatly (ELA 14%, Math 15%). Overall science decreased 5%. The data doesn't show any significant trends in subgroups that would indicate a specific problem in any one area. Data does show that the group of 6th graders we had this year performed at a lower rate than the previous year, but that does not seem to be an indication of low teacher performance as the current students made great learning gains. The population from 4th grade to 5th grade in 2019 was different as well, which may explain the decrease in science scores.

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.

We were above the state average in all school-wide components.

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

Math Learning Gains showed the most improvement. We used Title one funding to hire a retired teacher as an instructional assistant that worked in Tier 2 groups with students at every grade level. The lessons were specific, well-delivered, and Progress Monitored regularly.

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

Our SWD are the main area of concern. Though the number of students passing increased in both reading and math, there is still a large achievement gap for these students and we are far below the goal of 41% in this area.

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

1. Overall ELA Achievement
2. Lowest 25% Learning Gains ELA, focusing on Students with Disabilities
3. Overall Math Achievement
4. Lowest 25% Learning Gains Math, focusing on Students with Disabilities
5. Overall Science Achievement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA 3+ Proficiency and Learning Gains
Rationale	We believe the problem is occurring because students are unaware of expectations and processes for achieving those expectations. If teachers would conduct regular data chats including specific success criteria, we believe the overall proficiency and learning gains would increase.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	ELA Proficiency will increase from 59% to 65%. ELA learning gains will increase from 64% to 68% and ELA L25% will increase from 59% to 66%. The SWD subgroup will increase from 21% ELA achievement to 40%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Darlene Rogers (rogers.darlene@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	School-wide implementation of teacher clarity, including regular data chats in ELA.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Best practices reveal that when students understand their learning in relation to the goal or standard, learning increases significantly. Since Westside achievement in ELA increased from 17-18 to 18-19 while employing this strategy, we will continue to improve our practices in this area in order to increase further.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Participate in weekly ELA planning meetings with a focus on planning for teacher clarity. Standards-based objectives, success criteria and student progress monitoring will be designed for easy implementation in the classroom. This will increase the likelihood that data chats and teacher clarity are occurring regularly. 2. Conduct remediation groups for students not meeting success criteria. Groups will be formed using exit slips based on standards-based learning objectives and will include all students that did not meet success criteria, including SWD. 3. Provide teachers with professional development and embedded coaching cycles on teacher clarity and data chats. 4. Conduct regular observations and provide feedback to teachers, specifically on their implementation of teacher clarity. 5. Leadership team will collaborate to analyze school-wide data and trends to tier teachers for targeted coaching support. 6. SWD will be monitored monthly through MTSS meetings. They will participate in intervention groups as needed. 7. Students in grades 3-6 that are performing below grade level expectations, including SWD, will be invited and encouraged to attend ASP. ASP will focus on Writing in response to reading for grades 3-6. Third grade will also include a reading comprehension component.
Person Responsible	Darlene Rogers (rogers.darlene@brevardschools.org)

#2	
Title	Math 3+ Proficiency
Rationale	We believe the problem is occurring because students are unaware of expectations and processes for achieving those expectations. If teachers would conduct regular data chats including specific success criteria, we believe the overall proficiency would increase.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Math proficiency will increase from 64% to 68%. Math L25% will increase from 54% to 60%. SWD will increase math achievement from 31% to 40%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Darlene Rogers (rogers.darlene@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	School-side implementation of teacher clarity, including regular data chats in Math.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Best practices reveal that when students understand their learning in relation to the goal or standard, learning increases significantly. Since Westside achievement in ELA increased from 17-18 to 18-19 while employing this strategy, we will employ this strategy in math as well.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Participate in weekly Math planning meetings with a focus on planning for teacher clarity. Standards-based objectives, success criteria and student progress monitoring will be designed for easy implementation in the classroom. This will increase the likelihood that data chats and teacher clarity are occurring regularly. 2. Conduct remediation groups for students not meeting success criteria. Groups will be formed using exit slips based on standards-based learning objectives and will include all students that did not meet success criteria, including SWD. 3. Provide teachers with professional development and embedded coaching cycles on teacher clarity and data chats. 4. Conduct regular observations and provide feedback to teachers, specifically on their implementation of teacher clarity. 5. Leadership team will collaborate to analyze school-wide data and trends to tier teachers for targeted coaching support. 6. SWD will be monitored monthly through MTSS meetings. They will participate in intervention groups as needed.
Person Responsible	Darlene Rogers (rogers.darlene@brevardschools.org)

#3	
Title	Attendance Rate
Rationale	We believe the problem is lack of knowledge on the importance of attendance. In addition, lack of accountability for attendance is a contributing factor for low attendance rates. If incentives and information are provided and accountability is consistent, we believe the attendance rates would improve.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	During the 18-19 school year, 67% of our students had an attendance rate below 95%. This year, we will decrease that number to 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Darlene Rogers (rogers.darlene@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Communication with all stakeholders on the importance of attendance in conjunction with a strict adherence to the district procedures for chronic absences. Increase interpersonal relationships and positive culture.</p> <p>Research shows constant, personal communication between family and school is most important in improving attendance rates of students. Research on comprehensive, effective, truancy prevention programs indicates that consistent policies, building-level support and commitment, and continuous evaluation are important for success. Research also shows that in schools where there is trust, caring, and support, there is higher attendance, higher student performance, and lower rate of suspensions. Studies show attendance is an indicator of larger, more complex issues of disengagement/student motivation, and that school culture and structure contribute to both. There is a growing recognition that schools need to take a positive approach in looking at how school structures, culture, academics, and other factors contribute to attendance problems. Strategies for increasing attendance can be placed into the following categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Sound attendance policies with consequences for missing school *Early interventions *Targeted interventions for chronic problems *Strategies to increase engagement and personalization with students/families
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Communicate with all stakeholders the importance of attendance through newsletters, BlackBoard Connect messages, social media, daily class meetings, school wide assemblies, family engagement events and faculty meetings. 2. Incorporate the following steps for chronic absenteeism: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Students with 3 unexcused absences in a calendar month will receive a phone call from the receptionist, who will start the attendance communication log. She will then give the classroom teacher an attendance referral as well as the started communication log. Teacher will follow up on all subsequent unexcused absences and record on communication log. b. Students with 5 unexcused absences within a grading period will be reviewed by the attendance team consisting of the guidance counselor, assistant principal and principal. the team will meet with parents. c. Students with 8 unexcused absences within 90 days will be reviewed by the attendance team and an attendance referral packet will be completed. The team will meet again with

parents.

3. If an underlying cause for truancy is uncovered in the parent conferences, guidance will work with the family to assist in any way we can.
4. Build personal relationships within and amongst students and staff through the Sanford Harmony curriculum and peer mentors for students and staff.
5. Provide positive reinforcements via PBIS charms for all students with an attendance rate at or above 95% each quarter of the school year.
6. Provide classroom incentives using the words "PERFECT ATTENDANCE". Classroom teachers will provide an incentive for their class each time they have perfect attendance for 17 days (the number of letters in PERFECT ATTENDANCE.)

**Person
Responsible**

Darlene Rogers (rogers.darlene@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).

We will increase our science scores from 59% to 63% which is what we earned 17-18. We will do this by using data to identify gaps students have from previous years in science and will plan collaboratively with the team in order to ensure instruction is focused on closing those gaps and understanding 5th grade science standards. Planning will be done during ELA content meetings to ensure we are integrating science into our ELA curriculum as well as the scheduled science instructional time.