

Brevard Public Schools

# Theodore Roosevelt Elementary School



## 2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Theodore Roosevelt Elementary School

1400 MINUTEMEN CSWY, Cocoa Beach, FL 32931

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Elizabeth Hill Brodigan J**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2017

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	39%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: A (68%) 2016-17: A (73%) 2015-16: A (71%) 2014-15: A (66%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A

\* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Theodore Roosevelt Elementary School

1400 MINUTEMEN CSWY, Cocoa Beach, FL 32931

<http://www.roosevelt.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	31%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	27%

## 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.

Our mission is to set high expectations and create a rigorous learning environment that cultivates collaboration throughout our school community to help our students reach their full potential.

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

Roosevelt is an enriching environment where our community encourages life-long learning to reach our full potential.

### 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
Humphrey, Kimberly	Principal	
Carlo-Coryell, Doreen	Assistant Principal	
Parker, Elizabeth	Instructional Coach	

### 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	34	31	52	47	50	58	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	337
Attendance below 90 percent	7	11	13	11	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	1	3	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on FSA Math	0	0	0	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
	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	3	5	11	7	13	26	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	91

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	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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

28

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

Tuesday 7/9/2019

### 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	34	31	52	47	50	58	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	337
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA or Math	3	1	3	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

**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	3	5	11	7	13	26	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	91

## 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	78%	62%	57%	83%	63%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	62%	60%	58%	76%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%	57%	53%	76%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	75%	63%	63%	78%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	71%	65%	62%	72%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	72%	53%	51%	55%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	73%	57%	53%	71%	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	34 (0)	31 (0)	52 (0)	47 (0)	50 (0)	58 (0)	65 (0)	337 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	7 ( )	11 ( )	13 ( )	11 ( )	15 ( )	10 ( )	0 ( )	67 (0)
One or more suspensions	1 ( )	0 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	3 ( )	1 (0)	3 (0)	4 (0)	4 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	15 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ( )	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (0)	4 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	8 (0)
Level 1 on FSA Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	4 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	7 (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	70%	64%	6%	58%	12%
	2018	78%	63%	15%	57%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	70%	61%	9%	58%	12%
	2018	74%	57%	17%	56%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	79%	60%	19%	56%	23%
	2018	77%	54%	23%	55%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
06	2019	82%	60%	22%	54%	28%
	2018	81%	63%	18%	52%	29%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	57%	61%	-4%	62%	-5%
	2018	59%	62%	-3%	62%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	69%	64%	5%	64%	5%
	2018	71%	59%	12%	62%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
05	2019	88%	60%	28%	60%	28%
	2018	87%	58%	29%	61%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		17%				
06	2019	84%	67%	17%	55%	29%
	2018	83%	68%	15%	52%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	72%	56%	16%	53%	19%
	2018	83%	57%	26%	55%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
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	57	55	56	49	66	64	69				
HSP	67	50		63	56						
MUL	79	45		79	82						
WHT	81	64	56	78	70	71	78				
FRL	83	72		69	71	77	60				

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	59	50	14	57	59	42	55				
BLK	70			80							
HSP	67	61		67	61						
MUL	93	75		80	67						
WHT	84	68	44	80	61	56	84				
FRL	79	65	45	68	63	55	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	64	85	83	44	50	42	30				
BLK	91			73							
HSP	73	82		68	100						
MUL	88	80		76	80						
WHT	83	74	72	82	67	33	73				
FRL	72	77	64	69	69	42	45				

### 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	69
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	484
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	59
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

English Language Learners	
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	
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	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	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 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	71
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	72
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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was in Math 3rd grade. In 2018 we were at 59% and in 2019 we decreased to 57%. Overall as a school, we made gains in math, but we show our lowest performance was in math 3rd grade with measurement, data, and geometry scoring the lowest. Inconsistency of staffing and rigorous instruction contributed to this weakness.

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

The school data reflect the greatest decline in Science. The percentage went from 83% to presently 72%.

In looking deeper into the data we see that SWD made an increase of 14%, while decreases were made from WHT and FRL students. WHT students went from 84% to 78%. This was declined by 6%. FRL students went from 80% to 60% showing the greatest decline of 20%. Factors that may have contributed could be because students did not master standards in 3rd and 4th grade, therefore, when tested in 5th they did demonstrate proficiency at high levels.

#### 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.

Compared to the state average the biggest gaps were found in Math in 3rd grade. While the state overall average was at 62% for math our averages were 57%. Factors that may have contributed to this gap inconsistency with staffing and rigorous standards-based instruction.

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

The school data reflect that most gains were made in the Math Lowest 25th percentile. Gains are as follows:

Overall LG went for 56% to 72% which as an increase of 16 percentage points.

Subgroup break is as follows:

2018 2019 Gains

SWD 42% 64% +22

WHT 56% 71% +15

FRL 55% 80% +25

Our action plan for increasing in this area reflected implementing small group instruction in math. This showed to be a great success for all students.

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

Roosevelt has a population of less than 400 students. Of those students, 91 students show as having two or more Early Warning Indicators. The majority in grades 5 and 6 with 26 students in each. Secondly, sixty-seven students had an attendance rate of below 90%

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

1. ELA-Learning Gains and Lowest 25%
2. Science Achievement
3. Math Achievement
- 4.
- 5.

### **Part III: Planning for Improvement**

**Areas of Focus:**

#1	
<b>Title</b>	ELA Learning Gains and Lowest 25%
<b>Rationale</b>	This area of focus was identified from FSA data. It showed that only 62% of our students showed a learning gain in ELA and only 53% of our lowest 25% showed learning gains. All other learning gain categories are higher than 70%. When students are proficient in reading this impacts all other academic subjects positively. Deficiencies are a critical issue as the overall impact in academics is negative.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	The FSA data showed a decrease in students earning a level three or higher in ELA with 3rd and 4th grade being the lowest. The measurable outcome would be an increase in third from 57% to 62% and fourth grade from 69% to 74%, fifth grade from 88% to 89% and sixth grade from 84% to 85%.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Elizabeth Parker (parker.elizabeth@brevardschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Students will practice ELA skills using i-Ready for 45 minutes a week. Teachers and students will have weekly/bi-weekly data chat with each student in their class regarding their i-Ready progress. Students will monitor their data using an individualize data notebook. Teachers will monitor their WTI groups and use research-based instruction.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	The rationale for selecting these strategies are as follow: -Students need to understand the rationale behind i-Ready and to take ownership in their learning through data chat and a data notebook -Teachers need to have rigorous research-based instruction in their WTI and a monitoring tool in place
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Monitor student usage and passage on i-Ready, using data to modify instruction in small groups, teachers meet with students to ensure they are on track. Incentive programs to increase passage rate.</li> <li>2. Data Chats- Occur monthly and bi-monthly to discuss student strengths and weaknesses based on assessments such as: SRI, QLA, Running Record, iReady, Dibels, formative and summative teacher observations. Instruction in small, whole, individual groups are modified based on data. In addition Tiered Support is modified as needed.</li> <li>3. Training on i-Ready: Roosevelt's focus is increasing understanding of how to take iReady lessons and use them to address gaps or deficiencies.</li> <li>4. In K-4 Wtl is required. research-based materials being used with monitoring tool.</li> <li>5. Data notebooks: It is always highly recommended that educators utilize data notebooks to afford students the opportunity to track their progress and set goals relative to iReady.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	[no one identified]

#2	
<b>Title</b>	Science
<b>Rationale</b>	Our second area of focus was selected for two reason. First, there was a double digit decrease in overall achievement. Second our FRL student achievement decreased by 20 percentage points which was the largest decrease overall. Science achievement makes up one full component of school grade calculation. It can essentially make or break a school's grade.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Overall science score will improve from 72% to 74%. .
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Doreen Carlo-Coryell (carlo-coryell.doreen@brevardschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Roosevelt Elementary will implement the 5Es Model of Science Instruction. It is important to avoid front-loading and to instead allow students to develop an understanding through engagement and exploration. These experiences allow students to understand the concept, even define it, before a term is presented. This gives the students the opportunity to "discover" the concepts on their own and something to connect the terms to. Students can then elaborate, or apply, the new concepts to related phenomena for a deeper understanding. Incorporating differentiated instruction as well as open ended journal writing will assist students in better conceptualizing topics.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	When we learn things, it isn't for memorizing a piece of information. Just reciting science facts or principles is not what we want children to be able to do. We want them to be able to go out in the world and make sense of novel phenomenon. The NGSS calls for students to actively engage in science. 5E mentally engages students with a question or activity. Hands on activities will be explored. Teachers will then provide the concepts or terms used for students to provide explanations and elaborate via writing on what was observed. Students will discuss and compare ideas with others. Finally they will reflect and evaluate their learning. With the changes required in the updated science, engineering and computer technology fair teachers and students can use the 5E model to go through the process together as a class prior to working on individual or team projects.
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Ms. Ferro, district Science teacher, will provide professional development to all teachers of science on the 5E.</li> <li>2. Review the test specs with teachers. Test items specs will be used to help teachers see how standards are being tested so that they can better align their instruction.</li> <li>3. Review 5th grade science practice test results with 3, 4, &amp; 5th grade science teachers. Identified standards will be incorporated into daily/weekly instruction.</li> <li>4. Students will maintain a Science writing journal (IAN).</li> <li>5. Monitor subgroups via district science assessments.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Doreen Carlo-Coryell (carlo-coryell.doreen@brevardschools.org)



#3	
<b>Title</b>	Math
<b>Rationale</b>	Overall we did well in Math, however there has been a gradual decline of overall achievement in math over the past few years. In addition data show that 3rd grade demonstrated the lowest performance in one of the strands. Due to these data, we must continue to prioritize Math. Math competence is needed in many life circumstances and is linked in many ways to Science.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	Math Achievement, Math Learning Gains, and Learning Gains for the Lowest 25% for Roosevelt were at 75%, 72%, and 71% respectively. Although our percentages in these three categories were higher than the state and district, we are looking to grow continuously. With this in mind, the goal is to show a 3% or higher overall growth percentage in all three categories.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Kimberly Humphrey (humphrey.kimberly@brevardschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	In the 2018-2019 school year, Roosevelt began targeting the instructional needs of students via: differentiated instruction (DI) and progress monitoring using iReady, FSA, subgroup and other formative assessments. We will continue these strategies for the 2019-2020 school year.
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	DI relies on the teacher knowing students' academically and social emotionally and using these data to meet the needs of the students (Tomlinson, 2013, Ferlazzo (n.d.)). Acquiring and using data effectively, calls for both students and teachers to engage in progress monitoring. Monitoring student progress provides ongoing checks which enables the teacher to plan for instruction based on the various data collection tools (i.e. iReady, FSA, formative and summative classroom assessments etc...) Effect size speaks to the impact that a particular strategy has on student achievement. Any effect size .40 or higher, is positive (Hattie, 2013). Roosevelt has shown increases in our Math Learning Gains and Lowest 25th Percentile learning gains by double digits. The teachers know that what they have implemented works. Teacher confidence after a year of success implementing these strategies will increase and confidence in one's ability has a .92 effect size (Hattie, 2017).
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Review and Analyze FSA data with faculty during pre-planning.</li> <li>2. Assess students current level on iReady.</li> <li>3. Have teachers complete a Subgroup Analysis for their homeroom.</li> <li>4. Provide opportunities for observations, collaborative planning and professional development for teachers in Eureka Math.</li> <li>5. Conduct regular walk-throughs, observations and provide feedback to teachers.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Kimberly Humphrey (humphrey.kimberly@brevardschools.org)

#4	
<b>Title</b>	Family Engagement
<b>Rationale</b>	Although the data for family engagement are not included in this online form as we are a non-Title I school. Our 2018-2019 Parent Survey was completed by 95 parents. The following paraphrased questions: Do you feel welcome at school?, Do you have opportunities to provide input/feedback?, and Does the school value your input? Were answered by 83, 86, and 82 parent respectively. Fifty-four out of the 83 felt welcome. Forty-three out of the 86 felt they had opportunities for input/feedback. 42 felt their input was valued. All schools need their families engaged in the student's education. These three questions are important to helping to ensure that the home school connection is strong. In addition, having more participation in our Parent Survey will help us have an better overall understanding of the needs of our families.
<b>State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve</b>	The goal is to increase participation in the parent survey by 50% or more. Another goal is to improve the feelings of the 54,43, and 42 parents who feel welcome, feel they have opportunities for input, and feel their input is valued by 50% or more.
<b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome</b>	Kimberly Humphrey (humphrey.kimberlya@brevardschools.org)
<b>Evidence-based Strategy</b>	Finding Opportunities for Engagement Working Around Work Schedules Communicating Ways Parents Can Be Involved
<b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy</b>	The evidence-based strategies were taken from a study on parent involvement and family engagement conducted by Baker, T. L., Wise, J., Kelley, G., & Skiba, R. J. (2016). The study participants were comprised of both families and faculty/staff. The two perspectives are instrumental in creating a plan of action to address this area of focus.  Baker, T. L., Wise, J., Kelley, G., & Skiba, R. J. (2016). Identifying barriers: Creating solutions to improve family engagement. School Community Journal, 26(2), 161-184. Retrieved from <a href="https://search.proquest.com/docview/1862999694?accountid=35796">https://search.proquest.com/docview/1862999694?accountid=35796</a>
<b>Action Step</b>	
<b>Description</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Provide several opportunities for families to review and provide additional feedback on Parent Survey.</li> <li>2. Host Principal Coffees (morning and evening).</li> <li>3. Work to establish a second option for meetings such as School Advisory Council and Parent Teacher Organization (In collaboration with the Assistant Principal &amp; Tech)</li> <li>4. Increase visibility throughout the school to allow for parents to share concerns or thoughts in an informal setting when possible (i.e. confidential matters would not be discussed in the halls).</li> <li>5. During next year's survey window, provide more opportunities for completion on campus during drop off and pick-up hours and incentives for completion.</li> </ol>
<b>Person Responsible</b>	Kimberly Humphrey (humphrey.kimberlya@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).**