

Brevard Public Schools

Surfside 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	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Surfside Elementary School

475 CASSIA BLVD, Satellite Beach, FL 32937

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

Demographics

Principal: Kassie Erenstoff R

Start Date for this Principal: 7/15/2013

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)	25%
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 (68%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (75%) 2015-16: A (70%) 2014-15: A (84%)
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	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Surfside Elementary School

475 CASSIA BLVD, Satellite Beach, FL 32937

<http://www.surfside.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>20%</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>13%</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.

Surfside Elementary School provides a safe and positive environment where high quality education occurs for all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Surfside Elementary will create a challenging, positive learning environment that promotes excellence and group achievement. Staff, students, and parents will work together to encourage children to realize their maximum potential for learning, problem solving, and responsible citizenship.

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
Masterson, Lori	Principal	Oversee all aspects of curriculum, staff and physical plant; monitors development and implementation of SIP; responsible for budget
Larkin, Lisa	Assistant Principal	Oversees curriculum, assessment, school improvement and discipline; monitors ELA proficiency and learning gains
Oehlmann, Patricia	Instructional Coach	Oversees teacher mentoring and coaching; supports iReady for grades K-6
Malta, Jaime	Teacher, K-12	5th grade teacher; SAC member; plan development
McMullen, Erin	Teacher, K-12	3rd grade teacher; SAC member; plan development

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	57	50	72	73	55	80	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	459
Attendance below 90 percent	2	12	17	13	14	18	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	2	2	2	0	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	8	5	11	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	5	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/13/2019

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	14	11	13	14	14	10	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	9	5	9	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	69%	62%	57%	80%	63%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	60%	58%	65%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	57%	53%	63%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	79%	63%	63%	86%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	76%	65%	62%	81%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	68%	53%	51%	81%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	77%	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	57 (0)	50 (0)	72 (0)	73 (0)	55 (0)	80 (0)	72 (0)	459 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	2 ()	12 ()	17 ()	13 ()	14 ()	18 ()	14 ()	90 (0)
One or more suspensions	2 ()	2 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	3 (0)	2 (0)	12 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	8 (0)	5 (0)	11 (0)	7 (0)	31 (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	72%	64%	8%	58%	14%
	2018	72%	63%	9%	57%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	71%	61%	10%	58%	13%
	2018	81%	57%	24%	56%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	78%	60%	18%	56%	22%
	2018	82%	54%	28%	55%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
06	2019	54%	60%	-6%	54%	0%
	2018	82%	63%	19%	52%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		-28%				
Cohort Comparison		-28%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	70%	61%	9%	62%	8%
	2018	65%	62%	3%	62%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	82%	64%	18%	64%	18%
	2018	81%	59%	22%	62%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		17%				
05	2019	71%	60%	11%	60%	11%
	2018	77%	58%	19%	61%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
06	2019	87%	67%	20%	55%	32%
	2018	95%	68%	27%	52%	43%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	76%	56%	20%	53%	23%
	2018	67%	57%	10%	55%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
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	31	45	40	34	60	53					
HSP	75	30		75	60						
WHT	70	56	54	81	79	79	79				
FRL	58	42	43	69	73	73	73				

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	50	57	42	44	43	39					
HSP	92	64		92	73						
MUL	70			60							
WHT	79	62	61	80	72	63	65				
FRL	70	59	62	72	66	62	60				
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	62	67	58	55	67	69					
HSP	77			77							
MUL	92	80		92	100						
WHT	79	63	61	86	79	81	67				
FRL	77	71	75	83	93	94	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	68
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	473
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
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	
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	60
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	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	62
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.

Surfside's English/Language Arts proficiency for our lowest 25% was our lowest performing component on this year's FSA results when calculating our school grade. The majority of students in our lowest 25% are in an Exceptional Education program, which has increased exponentially over the past few years. Surfside attempted a Walk to Intervention strategy and envisioned smaller groups of students working on targeted skills during this scheduled time. Teachers were diligent to organize groups of children and create meaningful lesson plans. The I-Ready instructional grouping report helped us to arrange these groups. Lack of curriculum resources was a challenge for teachers. While teachers felt that building relationships and getting to know students from other classes was important, because of the fluidity of the groups, this posed a challenge. These instructional groups were not comprised of small numbers of children as hoped. 50% of our lowest 25% made learning gains on the 2019 ELA FSA, which was lower than both the district and the state.

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

Surfside's ELA Achievement dropped 11 percentage points from the prior year and was the area showing the greatest decline school-wide. While significant time was used assessing students using the I-Ready diagnostic and growth monitoring assessments, we did not have the instructional component to address identified gaps. We did organize Walk to Intervention small groups, yet did not see positive gains academically from our attempts.

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.

Surfside's ELA Learning Gains component showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Surfside was 4% lower than the state score in this area. Many of our students remained in their same achievement level when comparing the two years of test data. Surfside analyzed prior FSA scores to determine what each child would need to earn on the 2018-2019 FSA in order to make a learning gain. Teachers were working toward these goals and monitoring I-Ready results to see growth, yet lack of appropriate curriculum resources posed a challenge.

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

Surfside showed a 10% gain from the prior year in SSA Science. Standards based instruction and hands-on science were utilized to achieve this goal. District-created assessments, along with STEMscopes curriculum and Discovery Streaming, and the review of third and fourth grade standards, helped prepare students for success.

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

Looking at Surfside's Early Warning System data from Part I, we are fortunate to have low numbers in most areas analyzed. The 'Level 1 on statewide assessment' indicator is an area of concern. Surfside has 14 current students that earned a level 1 on the ELA FSA.

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

1. Focus on ELA Core Instruction
2. Professional Development for our staff in iReady usage and reading block management

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA 3+ Proficiency and Learning Gains and ELA Learning Gains for the Lowest 25%
Rationale	Surfside's ELA learning gains decreased from 63% in 2018 to 54% in 2019. Surfside's ELA gains have shown a downward trend over the last three years. Surfside's lowest 25% of students making a learning gain in ELA scored below the district and the state. The learning gains of our lowest 25% was also Surfside's lowest performance area overall.

State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Surfside's ELA proficiency will return to 80% and the learning gains will increase from 54% to 70% this coming school year. Surfside's learning gains component for the lowest 25% in ELA on the 2019-2020 FSA assessments will show that 65% or more will achieve a learning gain in ELA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lisa Larkin (larkin.lisa@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Surfside will make it a school-wide priority to increase the intensity and time spent in teacher-led small-group work and differentiation in core instruction. Surfside's staff will prioritize data analysis, support networks, and reflection as evidence-based strategies as children in our lowest 25% quartile are monitored throughout the year.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Teachers' input was sought through a survey as well as grade level and team discussions as we set goals and strategies for the year. While teachers embraced the philosophy of Walk to Intervention, they prefer to have small group instruction within their classrooms. Teachers will continue review student data. Involving parents in assessment and academic reviews was also a desire of our staff to enhance the family/school team network and accountability for student success.

Action Step

Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Within the first month of the school year, all FSA results were shared with Surfside's staff members along with our initial I-Ready diagnostic data. Grade level data will be rank ordered showing the lowest 25%. 2. For all students scoring Level 1 and Level 2 on the 2018-2019 ELA FSA, a meeting will be held at the school with the student, their family members, and their school support team, including relevant instructional staff, a mentor staff member, and a member of Surfside's leadership team. A school-based document will be developed to monitor past and current progression. Intentional "mentor" relationships will be planned for these students so that at least two faculty members are regularly checking in with them and their families, helping them meet their established goals. Additionally, staff members will be organized into teams of support so every grade level has at least one additional teammate to utilize when organizing small group instruction, activities, and assessment schedules throughout the year. Each grade level's support staff member(s) will be utilized regularly to lead small groups, assess students helping ensure all accommodations are provided for, and be that support network and resource for the classroom teachers in their grade level(s). 3. Surfside will purchase the ELA I-Ready instructional piece for our lowest 25%. 4. Professional Development for our teachers will continue to be scheduled, including iReady and MTSS training. A teacher cadre will visit high-performing schools to observe best practices in ELA core instruction. Teachers will stop, collaborate, and listen to ideas learned during the visits. The school expectation is that standards-based centers/rotations are occurring in classrooms at least three days each week.
--------------------	---

5. A parent cadre will be developed to support enrichment opportunities allowing classroom teachers small group time to work with lowest 25%.

Person Responsible Lori Masterson (masterson.lori@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).