Suntree Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Suntree Elementary School

900 JORDAN BLASS DR, Melbourne, FL 32940

http://www.suntree.brevard.k12.fl.ud

Demographics

Principal: Shari Tressler D

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2017

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)	22%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (73%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (77%) 2015-16: A (73%)
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

Suntree Elementary School

900 JORDAN BLASS DR, Melbourne, FL 32940

http://www.suntree.brevard.k12.fl.ud

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	24%

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	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.

To provide a safe, rigorous, and inclusive learning environment where every student excels academically, socially, and emotionally.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Empower students to make a positive impact in an ever-changing world.

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
Tressler, Shari	Principal	Administrators review data, reflect on best practices, and develop professional development based on data. This is done with the Leadership Team, SAC, PTO, and other forums like Coffee with the Principal, engaging all stakeholders in the process. Once data is reviewed and input collected, the team moves forward in editing the goals to meet the needs of the site.
Martin, Heather	Teacher, K-12	SAC Chairperson ESE Resource teacher of all content areas and certified in General Education.
Hamilton-Brown, Kathy	Assistant Principal	Administrator reviews data, reflects on best practice, and develops professional development based on data. This is done with the Leadership Team, SAC, PTO, and other forums like Coffee with the Principal, engaging all stakeholders in the process.Once data is reviewed and input collected, the team moves forward to meet the needs of the site. Mrs. Hamilton-Brown also assists with state wide and district testing as well as supports our ESE team.
Meredith, Kathie	Instructional Coach	Responsible for coaching teachers in all content areas, support administration and teachers with state, district, and school based assessments, data collected and progress monitoring of student academic and behavior data, provide PD for teachers, MTSS facilitator, mentor new teachers. Ms. Meredith also assists with state and district assessments.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 6/1/2017, Shari Tressler D

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.*
9

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.*
7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
45

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)	22%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (73%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (77%) 2015-16: A (73%)
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	57	84	74	104	75	97	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	587
Attendance below 90 percent	2	2	4	5	3	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	6	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
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
Friday 9/11/2020

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	73	78	105	80	109	112	118	0	0	0	0	0	0	675
Attendance below 90 percent	0	30	2	2	7	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	2	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	0	3	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	2	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	0	3	6	2	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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	73	78	105	80	109	112	118	0	0	0	0	0	0	675
Attendance below 90 percent	0	30	2	2	7	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	2	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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	0	3	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	2	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	0	3	6	2	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
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	83%	62%	57%	81%	63%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	66%	60%	58%	68%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	62%	57%	53%	64%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	84%	63%	63%	85%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	75%	65%	62%	80%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	53%	51%	75%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	79%	57%	53%	83%	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	84%	64%	20%	58%	26%
	2018	83%	63%	20%	57%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	78%	61%	17%	58%	20%
	2018	75%	57%	18%	56%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	80%	60%	20%	56%	24%
	2018	80%	54%	26%	55%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
06	2019	85%	60%	25%	54%	31%
	2018	82%	63%	19%	52%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
03	2019	73%	61%	12%	62%	11%	
	2018	84%	62%	22%	62%	22%	
Same Grade Comparison		-11%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	87%	64%	23%	64%	23%	
	2018	80%	59%	21%	62%	18%	
Same Grade Comparison		7%					
Cohort Comparison		3%					
05	2019	86%	60%	26%	60%	26%	
	2018	83%	58%	25%	61%	22%	
Same Grade Comparison		3%					
Cohort Comparison		6%					
06	2019	84%	67%	17%	55%	29%	
	2018	91%	68%	23%	52%	39%	
Same Grade Comparison		-7%					
Cohort Comparison		1%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
05	2019	77%	56%	21%	53%	24%	
	2018	74%	57%	17%	55%	19%	
Same Grade Comparison		3%					
Cohort Comparison							

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	61	59	54	54	62	52	44				
ELL	79	94		89	89						
ASN	83	78		96	79		80				
BLK	73	80		75							
HSP	79	65	77	82	71	65	70				
MUL	77	53		86	71						
WHT	84	67	59	83	77	65	82				
FRL	79	65	62	77	70	69	63				

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	57	51	36	57	52	45	51				
ELL	62			69							

| 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
ASN	84	75		89	85						
HSP	73	63		78	71	55	64				
MUL	75	43		82	71						
WHT	83	69	56	86	70	64	78				
FRL	65	54	35	71	63	61	76				

| 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	54	50	47	58	67	67	56				
ELL	30			30							
ASN	84	92		79	83						
BLK	58			75							
HSP	71	64	62	71	70	60	80				
MUL	74	71		78	76						
WHT	84	69	65	89	82	83	84				
FRL	67	65	69	76	76	65	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	74
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	79
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	593
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	56
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	86

English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	83
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	76
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	73
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	72
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	76
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	69
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.

In 2018, Suntree Elementary's lowest performing data component was 4th grade ELA which continued to be below 80% overall proficiency despite a 3% increase from the year before. Beginning of the 2020 school year, iReady data shows the following grade level proficiency in ELA and Math in percentage:
Areas of lowest performance according to 2020 iReady Diagnostic areas:
Second Grade: 31% proficiency in math
Fourth Grade: 57% proficiency in ELA and 38% proficiency in Math
Fifth Grade: 57% proficiency in ELA and 50% proficiency in Math

In even more detail:
6th grade Black students are 17% proficient
ESE proficiency in first grade is 29%, Second grade 20%, and Fourth Grade 36% and Fifth Grade 21%
Fifth and Sixth grade ESE proficiency in Math is lowest at 22% and 25%

The 2018 Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) data shows:
Suntree has no areas below the 41% threshold, however there continue to be areas in need of improvement as they are below the 70% threshold.
Students with Disabilities (SWD) showed a 4% increase from 57% to 61% proficiency
Lowest 25% students showed 19% increase to 54% proficiency
Our goal continues to be 90% overall proficiency in FSA ELA and 80% overall proficiency in FSA Math and subgroup proficiency in all FSA domains (ELA and Math) and FCAT Science.

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

Due to COVID-19 and lack of new assessments, 2019 is referenced here. 2019 revealed that 3rd grade math dropped 11% and 6th grade math dropped 7% from 2018 Math FSA.
Contributing factors in 2019 was that this was the first year for grades K-5th to use the Eureka Math Program. The rigorous academic language from this program had not been used with grade levels prior to this year, therefore a decline in math scores was expected. The sixth grade students use a middle school curriculum with rich algebraic language that students had not previously been exposed to.
Another contributing factor for the 2020-21 school year is a new school based Instruction Coach. This person has strength in ELA and ESE supports and strategies, however will need to learn other content areas in order to be able to support teachers with instructional strategies.

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.

N/A

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

Due to COVID19 and lack of new assessments, 2019 data is referenced here:
4th grade showed 7% increase in the number of students earning Level 3 or higher on FSA Math
*4th and 6th grade each showed 3% increase in the number of students earning Level 3 or higher on FSA ELA.
*Lowest 25% showed an increase from 36% to 54% demonstrating a learning gain on FSA ELA.
To improve in these areas, across all grades levels, there was a concerted effort to focus on the MTSS process. This was done by conducting weekly TRACK (grade level data meetings) in which struggling students were the focus. Once students were identified, teams met to discuss interventions, progress monitoring strategies, as well establish and monitor short and long-term goals for the students and teachers.

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

CONTINUED FROM BOX D: 2019 data indicated students in the Lowest 25% made Learning Gains in ELA and showed the most growth in our school wide data by increasing from 49% in 2017-2018, to 62% in 2018-2019. This positive trend would have continued in 19-20 had we had FSA testing due to the fidelity to contributing factors include quarterly data chats with our Lowest 25% for both ELA and Math, where problem solving occurred and next steps were planned.
Teachers were focused and had planned for how to meet the needs of our highest performing students as well as our lowest performing students. Had we had FSA data from 2019-2020 school year, we would have seen a larger increase in overall proficiency from all students and in subgroup areas.
Suntree Elementary also demonstrated reduction in the learning gaps with subgroup areas from 2017-2018 to the 2018-2019 school year. These positive trends would have continued in 19-20 had we had FSA testing.

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

1. Increase total percentage of Suntree students scoring a level 3 or higher on FSA ELA AND Math to 80% or higher.
2. MTSS- using iReady data for targeted interventions to increase the number of students with disabilities and students in the lowest 25% making learning gains on FSA ELA and Math
3. Maintain or increase our students in the upper 25% earning Level 4 or Level 5 on FSA ELA, Math and Science
4.
5.

Contributing Factors (continued from box a)
This is the second year all teachers in grades K-5 are teaching the Eureka! Math curriculum. Sixth grade teachers use a middle school curriculum. Due to COVID19, teachers did not provide adequate instruction to students in K-5 with rigorous, on grade level math instruction using the Eureka curriculum. There will be gaps related to the second semester of 2019 and the next year's math standards and instruction.
This year, teachers will be challenged with not only providing instruction addressing grade level

standards, but closing existing reading, math, and science gaps as well as elearning/COVID gaps. Teachers will provide these additional supports through scaffolding instruction combined with progress monitoring and reteach.

SWD and our Lowest 25% performing students are making learning gains and the proficiency rate continues to increase. The majority of our ESE students receive Tier 1 instruction in the general education classroom. We have 19 students who are in our VE and VE/B classrooms. Of these 19 students, 4 students push out to the general education classroom for portions of the day where they can be with grade level, non ESE peers. This allows students to receive on grade level Tier 1 instruction from a General Education teacher. These push out students fluctuate throughout the year based on each student's ability to learn in a lesser restrictive environment for portions of the day.

Across all grade levels, third through sixth, we are not maintaining or increasing the number of Level 4 and Level 5 students on ELA and/or Math FSA. This continues to be an area of focus and concern. Each year, all third grade students are given a gifted screener test to determine if further gifted testing might be beneficial. Students who are considered in the gifted program spend one day a week with our gifted teacher who provides additional instruction at higher cognitive levels to challenge students to think and learn with more rigor. Additionally, teachers are expected to provide above grade level students with additional lessons during the 30 minute MTSS time daily as well as foster additional above grade level materials during class instruction. Teachers in each grade level monitor and adjust instruction for students who score above grade level on iReady ELA and Math diagnostics and Standards Mastery assessments throughout the year. Students receive additional above grade level instruction through MyPath lessons in iReady.

We continue to strengthen our Tier 1 Core instruction across all grade levels. In 2020, teachers used data-driven TRACK meetings and assistance from the school based Instructional Coach to provide differentiated instruction which was identified as on of the contributing factors in 2019. Additionally, teachers with the support of the instructional coach break apart the Florida Standards and use common asssesments to determine student proficiency of standards taught and any change in instruction that may be needed.
Teachers focused on creating and maintaining a designated 30 minute intervention block that focused on providing Tier 2 and Tier 3 support to identified students. Information text and vocabulary were identified as areas based on 2019 FSA ELA data for third through sixth grades and iReady data from all grade levels. Vocabulary and Information Text will continue to be areas of focus and growth in SY20-21 based on the beginning of the year ELA iReady diagnostic data.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Description of Area of Focus: Instructional practices specifically relating to standards-aligned instruction will focus on supporting teachers with research-based practices that follow state adopted standards within the specific content area. Rationale for Area of Focus: 3 years of FSA data has shown a slight increase in overall Level 3 or higher scores and 13% increase in Learning Gains for the lowest 25%, however a decrease of 1% in overall learning gains for all students. Beginning of the year iReady Diagnostic data showed 29% of first grade students on grade level in ELA and 25% in Math 46% of second grade students on grade level in ELA and 31% in Math 70% of third grade students on grade level in ELA and 25% in Math 57% of fourth grade students on grade level in ELA and 38% in Math 57% of fifth grade students on grade level in ELA and 50% in Math 66% of sixth grade students on grade level in ELA and 60% in Math 79% of fifth grade students demonstrated proficiency on the 2019 Science
Measurable Outcome:	On the mid year iReady Diagnostic, at least 75% of students in grades K-5 will demonstrate proficiency in ELA and Math. At least 80% of students in grades 3-6 will demonstrate proficiency in ELA and Math. On the Spring iReady Diagnostic, 100% of students in grades K-2 will demonstrate proficiency in ELA and Math. On 2021 FSA ELA and Math: 90% of our students will demonstrate Level 3 or higher in grades 3-6 80% of students will demonstrate a Learning Gain in ELA and Math 75% of our lowest 25% students will demonstrate a Learning Gain in ELA and Math 85% of fifth grade students will demonstrate grade level proficiency in Science
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Shari Tressler (tressler.shari@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Schoolwide writing across the content areas and text-based writing with complex text in ELA and a focus on Integration of Knowledge and Ideas.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We believe the problem is occurring due to misalignment of the level of the standard and task complexity. If task alignment with text-based writing the number of students earning Level 3 or higher, overall Learning Gains, and Lowest 25% Learning Gains will increase.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers, administrators, and instructional coach will participate in weekly TRACK meetings during planning time to analyze formative and summative assessment data and develop implement rigorous, standards aligned weekly units of study.

Person Responsible   Shari Tressler (tressler.shari@brevardschools.org)

Each grade level will develop a grade level ELA goal based on previous year's FSA data, district diagnostics, and current iReady data and develop

teacher and grade level strategies to achieve their grade level goal.
Teachers in each grade level review district and school level data to determine what area/standards they will focus on for improvement taking in to consideration cohort trend data, ESSA subgroups, and SWD needs.

Person Responsible   Kathy Hamilton-Brown (hamilton-brown.kathy@brevardschools.org)

Grade level teams will work together to create, maintain, and adjust
instruction based on the needs of the individual students in their grade level.
Teachers, with the guidance of administration and the instructional coach, will
provide 30 minute Walk to Success to meet the individual needs of each
student utilizing research based programs such as 95% Group and the iReady
Toolbox. Teachers will provide explicit instruction for all levels of student
abilities to include our lowest and highest 25% students four days a week.

Person Responsible   Shari Tressler (tressler.shari@brevardschools.org)

Instructional monitoring, feedback, and coaching will occur based on
student data trends and observational data. Leadership team will create a
monitoring schedule to provide feedback regarding effective implementation
of standard-based instruction. The instructional coach and administration will utilize the IPG tool to provide coaching support regarding grade level trends and areas of need for specific teachers. Additionally, school and district personnel will conduct at least 3 school wide instructional rounds focusing on Tier1/Core instruction in 3-6 grade classrooms. This will help to support the need to improve Tier 1/Core instruction in both ELA and Math.

Person Responsible   Shari Tressler (tressler.shari@brevardschools.org)

Students will complete 45 min/week on MyPath iReady ELA and Math lessons. This is to help close instructional gaps in students as well as enrich learning for other students. The Instructional Coach will monitor weekly. Teachers will provide small group instruction based on student needs/gap.

Person Responsible   Kathie Meredith (meredith.kathie@brevardschools.org)

Students in grade 2-6 will take Standards Mastery assessments through iReady 3 times a year. This data will be used by grade level teachers and administration to determine instructional changes to Tier 1 as well as Tier 2 and 3 needs for individual students. Teachers will collaborate, share ideas, and plan rigorous, Standards aligned instruction to meet the needs of all ability students in their classroom/grade level. Teachers will use data to determine instructional needs for their small group, MTSSS focus and individual student instructional needs.

Person Responsible   Kathie Meredith (meredith.kathie@brevardschools.org)

Lowest performance students in grades 3-6 will participate in our After School Academic Support Program. Teachers and administration will identify the lowest 25% performing students and/or students in ESSA subgroups in ELA and Math to participate in this afterschool program.

Person Responsible   Kathy Hamilton-Brown (hamilton-brown.kathy@brevardschools.org)

For two weeks before FSA testing, teachers in grades 3-6 will plan for an ELA, Math, and Science Blitz (5th grade only). Teachers will review data from iReady, district and grade level assessments, Standards Mastery data, and other data sources to determine grade level and small group instructional needs. This will ensure students are receiving one last effort to learn grade level standards they might not be proficient.

Person Responsible	Kathy Hamilton-Brown (hamilton-brown.kathy@brevardschools.org)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Due to the COVID-19 pandemic which required schools to remotely work the last nine weeks of the 2019-2020 school year and changes in the way the 2020-2021 school year re-opened this year, there is a priority to meet the social-emotional and mental healthy well-being of students, families, and school staff as we move forward.
Measurable Outcome:	100% of teachers will participate in the Trauma Informed/Compassion Fatigue training during the first semester of the 2020-2021 school year. 100% of teachers will conduct lesson focused on Mental Health Education, Child Trafficking Education and Substance Use and Abuse Education.as mandated by Florida Statutes. 100% of K-2 teachers will complete Conscious Discipline training.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Shari Tressler (tressler.shari@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	SEL Recovery Lesson Plan- Monique Burr Resources
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Trauma Informed Classroom/Compassion Fatigue Training is being encouraged by the district to help our students, parents, and teachers handle situations that might be brought on by COVID-19. Teachers must be educated on how to identify signs of trauma in our students not just signs brought on by the pandemic, but in all possible trauma situations.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers and staff will participate in 6 professional development trainings taught by the school guidance counselor on Trauma Informed Classroom/Compassion Fatigue during the first semester of the 2020-2021 school year.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Allison (allison.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

Teachers will provide time during the school day and within daily lessons to address the social emotional needs of their students utilizing district approved resources and student literature.

Person Responsible	Kathy Hamilton-Brown (hamilton-brown.kathy@brevardschools.org)

Teachers and staff will participate in a book study, Braving the Wilderness by Brene' Brown to share and discuss trauma, compassion fatigue, and current culture issues going on in the world.

Person Responsible	Shari Tressler (tressler.shari@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

n/a

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.

On the 2019-2020 BPS Annual Parent Survey 43% of parents responded that their child's teacher communicates weekly about their child's progress and 25% stated the teacher communicates monthly. Additionally, 59% of parents responded that the they would play a more active role in school decision making if more information was communicated to parents and 42%stated with more convenient meeting times they would be available. This school year, 2020-2021, school wide information will be shared with parents by email, text messages, voice messages, school website, PeachJar including zoom sessions. Teachers and support staff sign up for one school based Action Team (ELA, Math/Science, Technology, Social-Emotional, and Safety). Each Action team will create a yearly plan which includes information to share with parents. Also, administration will schedule several Coffee with the Principal Zoom sessions three times a year which are offered at different times of the day to accommodate parent schedules. The Coffee with the Principal sessions are available to parents so they have a venue to ask questions and offer ideas and suggestions in a risk free, small group, friendly atmosphere. This year, due to COVID-19, these sessions, along with parent conferences, Open House, and other parent events, will be conducted through Zoom sessions.

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: Standards-aligned Instruction	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00