# W. Melbourne Elementary School For Science

**2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan**

## Table of Contents

# W. Melbourne Elementary School For Science

### 2255 MEADOWLANE AVE, West Melbourne, FL 32904

### http://www.wmelbourne.brevard.k12.fl.us

## Demographics

## Principal: Theresa Benson

Start Date for this Principal: 6/3/2020

| | |
|---|---|
| **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) | 17% |
| **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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: A (78%) 2017-18: A (77%) 2016-17: A (84%) 2015-16: A (74%) 2014-15: A (88%) |
| **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, <u>click here</u>. | |

## 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 <u>www.floridacims.org.</u>

## 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

## W. Melbourne Elementary School For Science

### 2255 MEADOWLANE AVE, West Melbourne, FL 32904

### http://www.wmelbourne.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 | No | 17% |

| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 38% |

### 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 educate today's students utilizing scientific discovery and implementation of technology to meet the challenges of tomorrow's world.

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

Our vision is to help each child develop their full potential while becoming creative producers and self-directed, life-long learners. We will accomplish this through a commitment to excellence and collaboration between parents, staff, students, and community.

### 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 |
|------|-------|-------------------------------|
| Benson, Theresa | Principal | *Instructional Leader<br>*Manages Curriculum<br>*Monitors Lesson Plans<br>*Allocates Resources<br>*Evaluates Teachers<br>*Monitors Quality Instruction<br>*Promotes Student Learning & Growth<br>*Oversees Cafeteria, Custodial & SACC Staffs |
| Batman, Amanda | Assistant Principal | *Assists Principal with all above mentioned duties and responsibilities<br>*FSA Testing Coordinator<br>*Maintains Discipline Records<br>*Maintains Investigation Records |

### 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 | 72 | 72 | 71 | 72 | 87 | 88 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 549 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| One or more suspensions | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| | 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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 1 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| 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)**
37

**Date this data was collected or last updated**
Thursday 8/15/2019

**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 | 6 | 6 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 34 |
| One or more suspensions | 4 | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 6 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |

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

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

## 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 | 88% | 62% | 57% | 92% | 63% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 73% | 60% | 58% | 80% | 60% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 65% | 57% | 53% | 77% | 52% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 84% | 63% | 63% | 84% | 64% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 73% | 65% | 62% | 83% | 62% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 69% | 53% | 51% | 80% | 52% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 92% | 57% | 53% | 90% | 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 | 72 (0) | 72 (0) | 71 (0) | 72 (0) | 87 (0) | 88 (0) | 87 (0) | 549 (0) |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 4 () | 2 () | 1 () | 1 () | 2 () | 3 () | 3 () | 16 (0) |
| One or more suspensions | 2 () | 3 (0) | 2 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (0) | 3 (0) | 8 (0) | 19 (0) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 1 () | 3 (0) | 1 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 5 (0) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 () | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 7 (0) | 8 (0) | 1 (0) | 16 (0) |
| | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (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 | 90% | 64% | 26% | 58% | 32% |
|  | 2018 | 81% | 63% | 18% | 57% | 24% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 9% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 80% | 61% | 19% | 58% | 22% |
|  | 2018 | 90% | 57% | 33% | 56% | 34% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -10% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 90% | 60% | 30% | 56% | 34% |
|  | 2018 | 89% | 54% | 35% | 55% | 34% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 06 | 2019 | 90% | 60% | 30% | 54% | 36% |
|  | 2018 | 91% | 63% | 28% | 52% | 39% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 1% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 82% | 61% | 21% | 62% | 20% |
|  | 2018 | 81% | 62% | 19% | 62% | 19% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 79% | 64% | 15% | 64% | 15% |
|  | 2018 | 80% | 59% | 21% | 62% | 18% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -1% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 90% | 60% | 30% | 60% | 30% |
|  | 2018 | 86% | 58% | 28% | 61% | 25% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 10% | | | | |
| 06 | 2019 | 87% | 67% | 20% | 55% | 32% |
|  | 2018 | 87% | 68% | 19% | 52% | 35% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 1% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 92% | 56% | 36% | 53% | 39% |
|  | 2018 | 95% | 57% | 38% | 55% | 40% |
| 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 | 56 | 37 | 42 | 54 | 63 | 67 | | | | | |
| ELL | 82 | 78 | | 90 | 75 | | 83 | | | | |
| ASN | 88 | 83 | | 90 | 72 | 80 | 73 | | | | |
| BLK | 78 | 60 | | 61 | 67 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 91 | 71 | 64 | 87 | 76 | | 100 | | | | |
| MUL | 94 | 73 | | 83 | 73 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 87 | 71 | 63 | 85 | 73 | 68 | 94 | | | | |
| FRL | 89 | 76 | | 82 | 68 | 69 | 100 | | | | |

| 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 | 53 | 55 | | 50 | 50 | | | | | | |
| ELL | 80 | | | 80 | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 95 | 81 | | 91 | 77 | | 94 | | | | |
| BLK | 82 | 64 | | 71 | 79 | 73 | | | | | |
| HSP | 91 | 86 | | 87 | 67 | | 100 | | | | |
| MUL | 85 | | | 77 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 86 | 65 | 63 | 82 | 70 | 58 | 98 | | | | |
| FRL | 82 | 72 | 68 | 74 | 68 | 48 | 84 | | | | |

| 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 | 86 | 76 | | 68 | 86 | 82 | | | | | |
| ELL | 86 | | | 79 | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 98 | 78 | | 96 | 88 | | 93 | | | | |
| BLK | 93 | 100 | | 50 | 70 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 88 | 75 | 73 | 75 | 69 | 73 | 92 | | | | |
| MUL | 75 | 80 | | 75 | 80 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 93 | 81 | 79 | 86 | 86 | 84 | 90 | | | | |
| FRL | 84 | 75 | 77 | 76 | 73 | 73 | 89 | | | | |

## 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 | 78 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 544 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|---|
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 53 |
| 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 | 82 |
| 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 | 81 |
| 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 | 67 |
| 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 | 82 |
| 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 | 81 |
| 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 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 | 77 |
| 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 | 81 |
| 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 looking at our data, our Students with Disabilities showed the lowest performance. One possible factor that contributed to this low performance, was a change in ESE teachers at the mid-point of the year. Building relationships and understanding the needs of each child was an adjustment and strategies needed to be more targeted. During the summer of 2019, the ESE schedule was considered first before the master schedule was finalized to guarantee the needs of SWD is a priority. Based upon the 18-19 FSA data, we have identified 18 ESE students that need targeted instruction and place with teachers that will work closely our ESE teachers, Administration and ESE Specialist.

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

The subgroup showing the greatest decline was the 4th grade Math cohort. Based on our FSA & IReady data, 4th grade math decreased by 3%. There were 71 out of 87 students or 82% the previous year and 69/87 students or 79% this year. This is a steady decrease. 2019-2020 5th grade Teachers have put many interventions in place to close the gap and increase student achievement for this rising 5th grade cohort. Factors contributing to this decline was the rigor in the classroom was not consistently attained. We hired a brand new teacher mid-year with a learning curve of being a new

teacher with a new curriculum (i.e Eureka Math). To help this teacher be successful, we provided access to a mentor teacher and an Instructional Coach. We have provided the opportunity to attend staff development management training and many informal observations with feedback has been given. Having the support of grade level and planning with vertical peers has been beneficial this year.

**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.**

Our data is higher in comparison to the state average in all areas. The contributing factor to this trend is ALL stakeholders are held accountable. Parent Involvement, Community Support, triangular communication between parent, teacher and student are what makes this school excel. Administration is committed to making certain that excellence is our standard ant that we make every moment count in presenting thoughtful instruction and differentiation for all students.

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

The component that showed the most improvement was the lowest 25% learners in math. In 2018, 60% of these students made a learning gain, and in 2019, 69% made a learning gain. This is an increase of 8 %. The actions our school took was that our ESE teacher and Instructional Coach were instrumental in modeling strategies to teachers to meet the needs of these learners.

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

Due to our belief that attendance matters at our school, we noticed that there were 16 students that were below 90% in attendance. Our goal is to decrease this number by 50%. We can achieve this by being proactive in reaching out to families that are absent at the early stages, have parents work with our guidance counselor and remind parents the success rate of students present at school.
Another area we noticed from our data, was that we had 19 students with one or more suspensions. Our goal is to decrease this number by 50%, as well. We will achieve this by kicking off our year presenting our school-wide rules and expectations to all teachers and students. We will implement restorative practices, creative discipline that includes reflective assignments and and conflict resolutions prior to suspending students.

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

1. Meeting the needs of our ESE population by providing collaborative planning time between ESE teacher and
Gen Ed teachers, utilizing our data wall through data discussions and creating an intervention block in our
master schedule.
2. Ensuring a learning gain for EVERY student in Reading and Math. We have constructed a data wall that
continues data chats among Administrators, Instructional Coach and Teachers about where students are, their
needs and the tools we will use to get them on or above grade level. We have purchased the iReady instructional piece in Reading and Math to have more progress monitoring data.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

| #1 | |
|---|---|
| **Title** | Meet the needs of our ESE population. |
| **Rationale** | In 2019, our students with disabilities demonstrated that they are our highest-priority. This equates to a total of 19 students identified as SWD.<br>In ELA, 56% of our ESE students achieved proficiency or higher, which equates to 11 students. 37% made a learning gain, which equals 7 students. Out of the lowest 25%, 42% made a learning gain, which equates to 8 students.<br>In Math, 54% of our ESE students achieved proficiency or higher with equates to 10 students. 63% made a learning gain which equates to 12 students. Out of the lowest 25%, 67% made a learning gain, which equates to 13 students. |
| **State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve** | In 2020, we will be able to measure whether students with disabilities made larger gains through the use of inclusive practices, individual student data chats and benchmark data from iReady in Reading and Math.<br>In ELA, 100% will make a learning gain. Out of the lowest 25%, 100% will make a learning gain.<br>In Math, 100% will make a learning gain. Out of the lowest 25%, 100% will make a learning gain.We realize that these are big goals to aspire to, however, we feel that every student should make a learning gain every year while bridging the gap on student achievement. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome** | Theresa Benson (benson.theresa@brevardschools.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy** | IReady Instruction will be utilized for our student population. IReady implementation will establish clear benchmarks for students and teachers. Analyzing this data immediately after diagnostic testing and throughout online instruction will allow teachers to make decisions to immediately differentiate their instruction and support each and every student. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy** | The IReady System has been vetted and endorsed by Brevard County. This system allows us to analyze our data to understand our students better, plan instructional support, gauge progress toward goals, and improve instruction to meet students' diverse needs. |
| **Action Step** | |
| **Description** | 1. Instruction and Remediation from ESE teachers, Instructional Assistant and General Ed Teacher is inclusive.<br>2. Collaboratively analyze ESE students scores with Administration, gen ed teacher, ESE teacher &<br>instructional coach.<br>3. Appropriately assign IReady instruction to meet the needs of learners for 45 minutes weekly in addition to<br>small group instruction by support personnel and Gen. Ed Teacher<br>4. Assess program and learning periodically throughout the year.<br>5. Standardize testing (FSA) results in the Spring, 2020 will prove whether our plan was successful in meeting<br>the needs of not only SWD, but all students. |
| **Person Responsible** | Theresa Benson (benson.theresa@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).**