

Brevard Public Schools

Tropical 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	16

Tropical Elementary School

885 S COURTENAY PKWY, Merritt Island, FL 32952

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

Demographics

Principal: Neleffra Marshall A

Start Date for this Principal: 6/3/2019

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)	51%
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 (67%) 2017-18: A (67%) 2016-17: A (68%) 2015-16: A (72%) 2014-15: A (76%)
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	16

Tropical Elementary School

885 S COURTENAY PKWY, Merritt Island, FL 32952

<http://www.tropical.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	47%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	26%

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.

Inspiring, Leading and Learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To foster an atmosphere that inspires young people to become lifelong learners and positive collaborators through engaging instruction, equipping them with enduring academic and social understandings necessary for a fulfilling, successful future.

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
Marshall, Neleffra	Principal	School Leadership Team: The leadership team meets weekly to observe instruction, provide feedback, and provide professional development to impact instruction. Student data is disaggregated and analyzed by the leadership team and the data is monitored by the team. The leadership team ensures the safety and protection of instructional time on a daily basis.
Wehrly, Katherine	Assistant Principal	Curriculum, Professional Development, Evaluations, Discipline, Threat Assessment Team. As part of the leadership team, she meets weekly to observe instruction, provide feedback, and provide professional development to impact instruction. Student data is disaggregated and analyzed by the leadership team and the data is monitored by the team. The leadership team ensures the safety and protection of instructional time on a daily basis.
Pokorny, Jessica	Instructional Coach	Meets weekly to observe instruction, provide feedback, and provide professional development to impact instruction. Student data is disaggregated and analyzed by the leadership team and the data is monitored by the team. The leadership team ensures the safety and protection of instructional time on a daily basis.

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	104	132	96	124	111	115	0	0	0	0	0	0	793	
Attendance below 90 percent	58	61	46	43	40	44	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	357	
One or more suspensions	4	3	2	12	11	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	49	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	14	6	25	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	51	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	17	14	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	50	

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	2	0	19	8	22	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	70

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	17	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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

55

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/16/2019

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	51	39	51	38	28	38	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	282
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	2	2	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	6	4	16	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	20	26	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	71

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	12	6	13	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

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	72%	62%	57%	75%	63%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	67%	60%	58%	65%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	57%	53%	51%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	71%	63%	63%	79%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	74%	65%	62%	71%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	53%	51%	61%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	66%	57%	53%	77%	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)	104 (0)	132 (0)	96 (0)	124 (0)	111 (0)	115 (0)	793 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	58 ()	61 ()	46 ()	43 ()	40 ()	44 ()	65 ()	357 (0)
One or more suspensions	4 ()	3 (0)	2 (0)	12 (0)	11 (0)	6 (0)	11 (0)	49 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	14 (0)	6 (0)	25 (0)	6 (0)	51 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	17 (0)	14 (0)	9 (0)	10 (0)	50 (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	63%	64%	-1%	58%	5%
	2018	66%	63%	3%	57%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	66%	61%	5%	58%	8%
	2018	65%	57%	8%	56%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	77%	60%	17%	56%	21%
	2018	69%	54%	15%	55%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
06	2019	75%	60%	15%	54%	21%
	2018	76%	63%	13%	52%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	57%	61%	-4%	62%	-5%
	2018	62%	62%	0%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	66%	64%	2%	64%	2%
	2018	63%	59%	4%	62%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	68%	60%	8%	60%	8%
	2018	87%	58%	29%	61%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-19%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
06	2019	85%	67%	18%	55%	30%
	2018	79%	68%	11%	52%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	64%	56%	8%	53%	11%
	2018	77%	57%	20%	55%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
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	47	48	40	38	55	52	26				
ELL	55	55		45	73						
BLK	33	50		33	50						
HSP	64	54	31	62	71	75					
MUL	68	50		78	79						
WHT	76	72	70	74	75	60	67				
FRL	62	64	58	57	68	61	56				
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	38	52	51	50	57	58	39				
ASN	92	70		100	82						
BLK	40	36		40	55						
HSP	55	63	56	56	68	50	50				
MUL	74	74		76	78		55				
WHT	72	63	47	77	75	64	85				
FRL	60	59	48	64	69	59	67				
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	39	42	30	48	50	33	53				
ELL	30	50		50	40						
ASN	71	58		93	75						
BLK	41	36		59	64						
HSP	60	59	45	71	63	42					
MUL	81	65		78	75						
WHT	78	67	59	81	72	65	78				
FRL	66	58	51	69	65	56	65				

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	67
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	470

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
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	57
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	42
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	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	69
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	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	61
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.

Math FSA achievement and Math subgroup data showed the lowest performance. Fifth grade particularly decreased by 19% from the previous year. A contributing factor was the lack of consistent instruction in Eureka math. Fifth grade, as well as some other grades, did not utilize Eureka with fidelity.

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

Attendance showed the greatest decline from 2018 to 2019. There were 282 students in 2018 that had an attendance rate below 90%, whereas there were 357 students in 2019 that fell below the 90% attendance rate. Factors that contributed to this decline was no follow through on student attendance with parents, and no parameters set if a student was chronically absent.

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.

Third grade Math has the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Tropical scored 5 points below the state average. Math instruction and standards aligned assessments have contributed to this gap.

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

Fifth grade ELA scores showed the most improvement. Actions that were taken included collaborative planning and team teaching.

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

1. Attendance
2. Students with 2 or more early warning indicators

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

1. ELA achievement and learning gains for subgroups
2. Math achievement and learning gains for subgroups
3. Decrease discipline referrals and suspensions
4. Increase the attendance rate
5. Improve science scores for 5th grade on the state assessment

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Standards Aligned Instruction
Rationale	The 2019 grade level data showed 3rd grade dropping 3% on ELA proficiency. In Math, 3rd grade decreased by 5% and 5th grade decreased by 19%. Furthermore, the ESSA Federal Index showed that only 44% of the Students with Disabilities (SWD) and only 42% of the Black/African American students experienced a learning gain.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	On the FSA 2020 ELA, 3rd grade proficiency will increase from 63% to 68%, and in Math, 3rd grade will increase from 57% to 62%, and 5th grade will increase from 68*% to 75%. On the ESSA Federal Index, 47% of SWD will show learning gains and 45% of Black/African Americans will show learning gains,
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Neleffra Marshall (marshall.neleffra@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Collaborative planning with the literacy coach will be implemented as an evidence based strategy to align lesson plans and activities with the intended rigor of the standards. Additionally, iReady Standards Mastery Assessment will be utilized as professional development throughout the year to help align plans and activities with the standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The literacy coach will be utilized as she is the ELA expert and can assist teachers with aligning plans and activities with the standards. The literacy coach is also available to model for the teachers when planning or in the classroom. The iReady Standards Mastery assessments for ELA and Math will be utilized because they are aligned with the standards and the Florida State Assessments.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Collaborative planning will be scheduled at least monthly between the teachers and the Literacy Coach by grade level teams and the VE self contained teachers. 2. Literacy Coach will schedule model lessons to demonstrate in the teacher's classroom. 3. Feedback will occur after administrative observations. 4. PD will occur at least once per month during Thursday Team Chats and at least once per month during Early Release PD utilizing iReady Standards Mastery materials. Only 1-2 standards will be utilized by each grade level within the year to ensure proper instruction in understanding the full intent of the standard. Students will take the Standards Mastery Form B assessment after the standard is taught to determine mastery. 5. BPIE will be incorporated into assuring SWD are receiving standards based instruction 6. SDI will be utilized to help teachers increase the learning gains for SWD and Black/African American students.
Person Responsible	[no one identified]

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).

Another priority that will be addressed is attendance. In 2018, 282 (34%) students had attendance below 90%, whereas in 2019, 357 (44%) students had an attendance rate less than 90%. The school counselor

and administration will look at attendance on a weekly basis. When a student reaches 5 absences within a nine week period, a letter will be sent home after which a meeting will be scheduled with the parents. Additionally, incentives will be given for students holding their attendance above 90% every nine weeks. An Attendance Committee will be created, and the School Advisory Council will be utilized, to help determine incentives to improve attendance and tardies.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Standards Aligned Instruction	\$0.00
Total:			\$1,500.00