Sea Park Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Sea Park Elementary School

300 SEA PARK BLVD, Satellite Beach, FL 32937

http://seapark.es.brevard.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Stephanie Hall E

Start Date for this Principal: 6/22/2020

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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	39%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: C (52%)
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

Sea Park Elementary School

300 SEA PARK BLVD, Satellite Beach, FL 32937

http://seapark.es.brevard.k12.fl.us

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	No	35%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	25%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
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 work collaboratively to create an enriched environment that supports all students and help them strive for academic excellence.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Sea Park Elementary school community is committed to providing quality education in a supportive, engaging and academic rich environment.

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hall, Stephanie	Principal	The principal is the Instructional Leader in charge of executing and monitoring personnel, resources, and strategies to ensure all students have equitable access to standards-based instruction. Supports the MTSS team and equips teachers with tools they need to disaggregate student performance data. Perform classroom observations and provide continuous feedback on instructional practices.
Lizek, Angele	Assistant Principal	Supporting the principal in executing and monitoring personnel, resources, and strategies to ensure all students have equitable and equal access to effective standards-based instruction. Conduct classroom observations to provide teachers with continuous feedback on instructional practices. Supports the MTSS team and equips teachers with tools they need to disaggregate student performance data. Participate in parent conferences, refers students and parents to appropriate resources, oversees the utilization of district curriculum.
Willman, Debra	Instructional Coach	The instructional coach will serve as member of the MTSS/IPST Team. The role of the coach is to complete the coaching cycle and model standards-aligned lessons. Provide support to the teacher by modeling lessons, providing feedback from classroom observations and sharing resources to the teachers. Share effective instructional strategies, progress monitoring interventions, and diagnostic data with teachers to improve instruction.
Schroeder, Sarah	School Counselor	The Guidance Counselor will operate as an active member of the school leadership team and MTSS/IPST. Focus on developing Tier I and Tier II academic and behavior plans. Conduct focus group sessions to address social/emotional needs of identified students and conduct training to proactively combat bullying. Support families that are in transition with providing resources available throughout the community.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 6/22/2020, Stephanie Hall E

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
3

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
17

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	39%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (64%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: C (52%)
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](#).	

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	45	33	45	31	38	0	0	0	0	0	0	257
Attendance below 90 percent	5	4	7	6	13	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	1	1	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	2	1	1	0	0	0	1	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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/8/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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	
Number of students enrolled	42	41	45	36	43	63	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	311
Attendance below 90 percent	17	19	10	9	9	19	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	3	4	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	2	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	2	5	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	
Number of students enrolled	42	41	45	36	43	63	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	311
Attendance below 90 percent	17	19	10	9	9	19	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	3	4	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	2	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	2	5	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	75%	62%	57%	76%	63%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	65%	60%	58%	73%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	57%	53%	52%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	77%	63%	63%	72%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	63%	65%	62%	52%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	53%	51%	33%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	75%	57%	53%	79%	56%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey								
Indicator	**Grade Level (prior year reported)**							**Total**
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
	(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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	78%	64%	14%	58%	20%
	2018	82%	63%	19%	57%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	74%	61%	13%	58%	16%
	2018	61%	57%	4%	56%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	69%	60%	9%	56%	13%
	2018	86%	54%	32%	55%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
06	2019	80%	60%	20%	54%	26%
	2018	89%	63%	26%	52%	37%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	86%	61%	25%	62%	24%
	2018	82%	62%	20%	62%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	74%	64%	10%	64%	10%
	2018	77%	59%	18%	62%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	73%	60%	13%	60%	13%
	2018	70%	58%	12%	61%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
06	2019	83%	67%	16%	55%	28%
	2018	94%	68%	26%	52%	42%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	75%	56%	19%	53%	22%
	2018	80%	57%	23%	55%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	40	50	47	40	42	35	33				
HSP	80			60							
MUL	75			81							
WHT	77	67	52	80	62	48	74				
FRL	60	58	50	58	53	29	53				
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	48	39	31	52	48	50					
HSP	67			67							
MUL	92			83							
WHT	80	70	48	82	64	56	80				
FRL	66	59	40	59	48	53	74				

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	37	45	28	32	25	19					
HSP	72	77		72	54						
MUL	75	70		55							
WHT	78	74	62	73	55	48	86				
FRL	66	59	33	60	42	19	50				

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	64
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	448
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0

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%	0
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%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	70
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	78
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	66
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	52
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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.

2019 ELA Lowest 25% showed the lowest performance level. Although we remained constant the last two years at 52%, the district increased from 46% to 57% and the state increased form 48% to 53%. Our lowest 25% students are below both the district and state average. Looking at our Lowest 25% on IReady includes our SWD. Interventions have been determined by individual teacher resources versus research based programs. Covid-19 closure at the end of last year impacted our Lowest 25%. Additionally, a proportion of our Lowest 25% began as e-learners at the beginning of the year, which has affected their performance. This has impacted students and families causing stress not only financially but emotionally and socially. Several students who are identified in the lowest 25%, qualify for ESE and/or FRL.

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

2019 Math Lowest 25% decreased from 58% to 41% (-17 points). This was the first year of school-wide implementation of Eureka Math. This standards aligned math program is rigorous and requires teachers to dive deeply into the math practices. In our second year of implementation students became more familiar with the format, vocabulary and expectations of the curriculum. The recommended instructional time to implement Eureka Math leaves less time for math intervention.

Based on current 2020-2021 IReady data, 3rd, 1st, and 4th grade have lowest scores in math. Number and Operations is lowest strand in math. Interventions for math looked like small group reteaching a problem from the day's work. Math intervention was done a few times a week with minimal/none progress monitoring. Some departmentalized grades are at the beginning phases at math intervention with Voyager.

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 greatest gap is in Math with the Lowest 25%. The students identified in this subgroup are SWD. At times coordinating the general education teacher and ESE teacher to provide interventions has been difficult due to scheduling time constraints. Currently our e-learners are a concern with monitoring their progress as there is a delay in assignments, turn around, etc. Losing the last quarter of last year has exacerbated existing inequities and opportunity gaps in our school-wide data. Attendance also has been impacted negatively due to our current pandemic.

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

Fourth Grade Reading proficiency increased from 61% to 74% (+13 points). Our fourth grade is departmentalized and we made an instructional change. Sea Park Elementary 2019 Science Level 3 and above score was 75% (+22 points) higher than the state average of 53%. Sea Park Elementary 2018 Science Level 3 and above score was 81% (+26 points) higher than the state average of 55%. Our science teachers utilize the NGSSS Item specs and teachers use the 5E Model of Instruction focusing on the science priority standards. STudents had an opportunity to participate in the Maker Space program.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Based on our EWS Data Attendance is an issue at Sea Park Elementary. 52 students have Attendance below 90%. If a student is not at school they are missing academics. Additionally, this year, we have approximately 62 e-learners that teachers report difficulty engaging students and retrieving completed work. This is challenging communicating and engaging students in real time with technology and the concern for the impact on their learning over time. Covid-19 has impacted our attendance rate significantly at the end of last year and the beginning of this year. Many students returning are stressed from the impact of Covid-19 on their families in a variety of ways. The effect of Covid-19 has affected every family in some way. Supporting students with SEL strategies is more important than ever.

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

1. ELA Lowest 25%
2. Math Lowest 25%
3. Culture and Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning
4. Attendance

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students who are identified with a disability and/or scoring in the lowest 25% have the lowest scores in ELA achievement. Lowest 25% in ELA scored 52%, compared to the district scored 57%. This is the only area where we fell below the district in achievement. The subgroup SWD ELA Achievement scored 40% and Lowest 25% that were SWD scored 47%. The BPIE indicates that we need to increase our inclusion time for our SWD.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase SWD ELA Achievement from 40% to 45%. Increase Lowest 25% from 52% to 57%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stephanie Hall (hall.stephanie@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers collaboratively plan standards aligned lessons to actively engage the learner at the three levels of learning (Surface, Deep, Transfer). It is important for the teacher to communicate clear learning intentions. According to John Hattie in the book Visible Learning for Literacy, "Teacher Clarity" has an effect size of .75. Students should be able to answer, and ask these questions of each lesson: What am I learning today, why am I learning this, and how will I know that I learned it?
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidence supports that student achievement increases when collaborative planning and professional development utilizing standards aligned resources occurs for instructional staff. Students who can articulate what and why they are learning will further deepen their understanding of concepts taught.

Action Steps to Implement

1. All teachers will identify what students must learn and how they will demonstrate that learning at a mastery level by collaborative planning during PLC's. Teachers will communicate to students why they are learning the content selected and tie to the standards to support understanding.

Person Responsible	Debra Willman (willman.debra@brevardschools.org)

2. Teachers provide ongoing feedback to students regarding their learning and additional opportunities to learn, practice and demonstrate their knowledge and skills though accountable talk to show, explain, and prove reasoning. Observed through Administrative Classroom Walkthroughs.

Person Responsible	Stephanie Hall (hall.stephanie@brevardschools.org)

3. All teachers (ESE and General Education) will analyze standards and test item specification during the planning process utilizing IReady Standards Mastery to support planning. This is a formative tool to assess student mastery and to plan for re-tech standards as appropriate.

Person Responsible	Debra Willman (willman.debra@brevardschools.org)

4. Teachers will plan differentiated small group instruction within all ELA classes across all grade levels. Planning small groups instruction and re-teach the focus standard using lessons from the Teacher Toolbox in IReady.

Person Responsible Debra Willman (willman.debra@brevardschools.org)

5. Maximize teacher clarity for students through the use of Standards Focused Boards.

Person Responsible Debra Willman (willman.debra@brevardschools.org)

6. Build school wide intervention schedule in advance and utilize Standards Mastery Assessment in grades 2-6 to assess priority standard ELA instruction

Person Responsible Debra Willman (willman.debra@brevardschools.org)

7. Students will be remediated and enriched through digital and blended learning opportunities using adaptive technology; IReady Reading Program.

Person Responsible Debra Willman (willman.debra@brevardschools.org)

8. Student identified below level in reading will receive research based daily instruction utilizing a variety of materials. Use school wide diagnostics such as IReady, running records, DIBELS, DORF, PASI/PSI, etc. to determine unfinished learning.

Person Responsible Debra Willman (willman.debra@brevardschools.org)

9. Monthly MTSS grade level team meetings to assess intervention success and get input from MTSS Team on intervention strategies to meet student needs.

Person Responsible Stephanie Hall (hall.stephanie@brevardschools.org)

10. Develop Professional Development to support classroom teachers differentiate instruction to support Lowest 25% and Students with Disabilities.

Person Responsible Debra Willman (willman.debra@brevardschools.org)

11. Include children with disabilities in general education classrooms to the greatest extent possible as part of our Best Practices for Inclusive Education.

Person Responsible Sarah Schroeder (schroeder.sarah@brevardschools.org)

12. Invite third-sixth grade students who are below proficiency in reading to participate in the after school academic support program.

Person Responsible Angele Lizek (lizek.angele@brevardschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students who are identified with a disability and/or scoring in the lowest 25% have the lowest scores in math achievement. Lowest 25% in Math, school scored 41%, district 53%.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase SWD from 40% to 45% Increase lowest 25% from 41% to 53%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stephanie Hall (hall.stephanie@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	1. Response to Intervention
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Response to Intervention has been determined to have an effect size of 1.29 from Hattie's 2018 updated Visible Learning Research.

Action Steps to Implement

1. All students will engage with current grade level materials, tasks, and assignments that meet the rigor of the standard throughout the math block. Core Instruction Eureka is a highly aligned math curriculum. This is year three of school wide implementation.

Person Responsible Angele Lizek (lizek.angele@brevardschools.org)

2. Invite District Math Resource Teacher to assist with classroom walkthroughs to monitor standard aligned math instruction.

Person Responsible Angele Lizek (lizek.angele@brevardschools.org)

3. Use i-Ready for prescriptive pathways and deficits.

Person Responsible Debra Willman (willman.debra@brevardschools.org)

4. Target small group instruction for lowest 25% in math through Response to Intervention.

Person Responsible Debra Willman (willman.debra@brevardschools.org)

5. Utilize Activity Teachers to provide RtI support.

Person Responsible Angele Lizek (lizek.angele@brevardschools.org)

6. Progress monitor lowest 25% through monthly data meetings and monthly MTSS meetings.

Person Responsible Debra Willman (willman.debra@brevardschools.org)

7. Include children with disabilities in general education to the greatest extent possible as part of our Best Practices in Inclusive Education.

Person Responsible Stephanie Hall (hall.stephanie@brevardschools.org)

8. Invite third-sixth grade students who are below proficiency in math to participate in the after school academic support program.

Person Responsible Angele Lizek (lizek.angele@brevardschools.org)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Provide equitable supports in a safe learning environment for every student's social, emotional, and behavioral development.
Measurable Outcome:	Survey the Sea Park Community to determine student and families social emotional needs and ways we can support every student's social-emotional development. Utilize the Youth Truth Survey to measure learning environment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Angele Lizek (lizek.angele@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Develop and implement a multi-tiered framework to support social-emotional learning, behavior, and mental health across the Sea Park Elementary School Community.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The emotional health and well-being of our students and faculty has been challenged during COVID 19. If we provide an equitable approach to student social-emotional development, then we will maximize opportunities for teaching and learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Set aside more time for the "start of school" acclimation, taking into account the longer, more stressful break.

Person Responsible	Stephanie Hall (hall.stephanie@brevardschools.org)

2. Identify which students this transition might be exceptionally challenging by meeting daily with the Leadership Team at a stand-up meeting to discuss students who have social emotional concerns and how we are addressing those concerns.

Person Responsible	Stephanie Hall (hall.stephanie@brevardschools.org)

3. Integrate Social/Emotional Program that will help students restart school. Classroom morning meetings use explicit lessons from the Sanford Harmony and Child Safety Matters Curriculum.

Person Responsible	Angele Lizek (lizek.angele@brevardschools.org)

4. VPK, Kindergarten, and First Grade students attend weekly Guidance Lessons utilizing Second Step Curriculum.

Person Responsible	Sarah Schroeder (schroeder.sarah@brevardschools.org)

5. Provide Professional Development in Trauma Informed Classroom and Conscious Discipline Training to all teachers.

Person Responsible	Angele Lizek (lizek.angele@brevardschools.org)

6. Within IPST and MTSS review data and utilize screening tools to assess for academic, SEL, Mental Health concerns. Develop and implement tiered interventions for students needing additional assistance.

Person Responsible	Stephanie Hall (hall.stephanie@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

The School Leadership Team will monitor the Lowest 25%, attendance and Early Warning Indicators on a quarterly basis. Our monthly data meetings with administration, guidance, and classroom teachers will support research based interventions. Our Media Specialist will support instruction by enriching their background knowledge with a diverse collection. The Media Specialist enhances the core curriculum in the classroom which is done with collaboration between the Media Specialist and the classroom teacher. To address the Lowest 25% in Reading and Math, we will offer the Academic Support Program for identified students and those identified at risk or below benchmark from IReady or Diagnostic Testing. This program will be offered during the year while existing funds last. This will be first offered to 3-6 and if space available, move to K-2. Additionally, daily Stand Up meetings, students of concern will be discussed and action plans to reallocate resources will be developed to address individual student concerns.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Sea Park has a positive school culture supported by a very active and involved PTO. Our Business Partner Liaison is our school Guidance Counselor and she has helped to create relationships with community members to support our school. Youth Truth Student Survey results indicate that students scored Culture the Highest at 44%, and conversely scored Academic Rigor the lowest at 8% followed by Engagement at 13%. Academic Rigor is 5 points below the typical Brevard school as well as Engagement is 3 points below typical Brevard school. Students scored the question "Does what you learn in class help you outside of school?" at 31%, which was the lowest in the Academic Rigor questions, and 4 points lower than the district. Academic rigor will be addressed in our School Improvement Plan for improving Instructional Practice in ELA and Math.

We believe that when schools and families work together, children have a far better chance of being successful both in school and in life. A strong home-school connection sets the stage for a child who will grow up with a love for learning. Parents and community members are invited to join us at our PTO and School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings, virtual curriculum nights, ceremonies, parent meetings, and other events and volunteer opportunities.

Also, in alignment with the BPS strategic plan, Goal 1, Obj 3 (Provide equitable supports in a safe learning environment for every student's social, emotional, and behavioral development.) the following will be implemented:

*Sanford Harmony
*Child Safety Matters Curriculum
*Second Step Curriculum - Weekly Guidance Lessons (VPK - 1st)
*Conscious Discipline
*Trauma Informed Classroom

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00