Quest Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Quest Elementary School

8751 TRAFFORD DR, Melbourne, FL 32940

http://www.quest.brevard.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Karry Castillo A

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

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)	20%
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 (76%) 2017-18: A (76%) 2016-17: A (74%) 2015-16: A (79%)
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

Quest Elementary School

8751 TRAFFORD DR, Melbourne, FL 32940

http://www.quest.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	19%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	30%

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 a Quest for educational excellence in a nurturing 21st century environment that promotes exemplary character, independent thinking, and a desire for lifelong learning.

(revised/discussed 2018-2019)

Provide the school's vision statement.

A collaborative learning community on a journey to reach its highest potential.

(revised/discussed 2018-2019)

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
Boyd, Christine	Principal	Administrators review data, reflect on best practices, and develop professional development based on data. This is done with the Shared Leadership committee, SAC, PTO, and other forums like Coffee with the Principals, engaging all stakeholders. Once data is reviewed and input is collected, the team moves forward in editing the goals to meet needs of the site.
Phillips, Tauna	Assistant Principal	Administrators review data, reflect on best practices, and develop professional development based on data. This is done with the Shared Leadership committee, SAC, PTO, and other forums like Coffee with the Principals, engaging all stakeholders. Once data is reviewed and input is collected, the team moves forward in editing the goals to meet needs of the site. Mrs. Phillips also assists with FSA testing, as well as being the MTSS coordinator and ESOL supervisor.
Kostka, Julie	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach sits with administration to review data, reflect on best practices, and develop professional development based on data. This is done with the Shared Leadership committee, SAC, PTO, and other forums like Coffee with the Principals, engaging all stakeholders. Once data is reviewed and input is collected, the team moves forward in editing the goals to meet needs of the site. Randi also assists all grade levels with the iReady diagnostic testing.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Saturday 7/1/2017, Karry Castillo A

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.*

7

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

52

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)	20%
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 (76%) 2017-18: A (76%) 2016-17: A (74%) 2015-16: A (79%)
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, <u>click here</u>.	

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	84	109	123	116	114	123	109	0	0	0	0	0	0	778
Attendance below 90 percent	2	2	4	2	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

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	1	0	3	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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
Sunday 9/20/2020

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	162	171	180	158	187	169	155	0	0	0	0	0	0	1182
Attendance below 90 percent	7	9	8	7	11	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	3	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	7	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	0	2	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	162	171	180	158	187	169	155	0	0	0	0	0	0	1182
Attendance below 90 percent	7	9	8	7	11	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	3	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	7	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	28

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	0	2	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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	81%	62%	57%	87%	63%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	67%	60%	58%	65%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	57%	53%	59%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	88%	63%	63%	88%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	79%	65%	62%	74%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	67%	53%	51%	65%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	82%	57%	53%	80%	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	79%	64%	15%	58%	21%
	2018	87%	63%	24%	57%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	82%	61%	21%	58%	24%
	2018	89%	57%	32%	56%	33%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	88%	60%	28%	56%	32%
	2018	74%	54%	20%	55%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
06	2019	75%	60%	15%	54%	21%
	2018	86%	63%	23%	52%	34%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
03	2019	87%	61%	26%	62%	25%	
	2018	90%	62%	28%	62%	28%	
Same Grade Comparison		-3%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	86%	64%	22%	64%	22%	
	2018	88%	59%	29%	62%	26%	
Same Grade Comparison		-2%					
Cohort Comparison		-4%					
05	2019	85%	60%	25%	60%	25%	
	2018	81%	58%	23%	61%	20%	
Same Grade Comparison		4%					
Cohort Comparison		-3%					
06	2019	93%	67%	26%	55%	38%	
	2018	92%	68%	24%	52%	40%	
Same Grade Comparison		1%					
Cohort Comparison		12%					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	81%	56%	25%	53%	28%
	2018	71%	57%	14%	55%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
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	51	54	37	68	74	55	63				
ELL	70	52		92	70	75					
ASN	89	58		97	92						
BLK	70	79		82	79						
HSP	80	60	65	80	69	55	83				
MUL	80	62		92	84	70					
WHT	82	69	66	89	79	71	80				
FRL	63	58	45	70	65	43	76				
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	55	53	53	64	67	61	46				
ELL	72	68		92	68						

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	85	71		93	67		91				
BLK	79	50		88	71						
HSP	84	67	55	87	78	54	76				
MUL	76	69		78	76		63				
WHT	87	70	75	90	73	78	70				
FRL	74	65	63	82	75	80	63				

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	49	49	29	59	58	38	47				
ELL	94	77		100	80						
ASN	91	86		95	93						
BLK	75	50		79	69						
HSP	82	68	61	84	73	65	81				
MUL	94	71		91	76						
WHT	88	63	58	89	73	60	79				
FRL	76	56	42	76	69	57	68				

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	76
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	81
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	610
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	57
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	73
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	84
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	78
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	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	77
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	60
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 2019, our lowest 25% in both ELA and Math have a data component with the lowest performance. Although the lowest 25% showed gains similar to the grade level on the Fall 2020 iReady Diagnostic Test, this group is still performing lower than their peers. Particular subgroups, ESE, ELL, and low Socioeconomic are all contributing factors. Not having all activities aligned to standards based instruction, in both ELA and Math, as well as building our inclusion model for ESE and ELL students are factors as well.

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

In 2019, the biggest decline was in our ESE, lowest 25%. The factors were an increase of students in ESE, change in ESE staffing, and inconsistent data collection supporting accommodations.

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.

Quest, overall, in 2019, is about 30% higher then the state average in most sub-groups. However, the economically disadvantaged has a smaller gap increase than other subgroups. This is reflected into our Hispanic population and our lowest 25%, as well as our ELL subgroup.

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

In 2019, our 5th Grade, level 3-5 Percentage increased from 74 to 88. This was the largest percentage increase in all grade levels, in ELA or Math. The fifth grade team focused on common planning and aligning assessments with the standards. They also incorporated a Walk to Intervention at their grade level.

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

Though it was not shown in our 2019 EWS data, one potential area of concern is our learning gains for our top 25 %. Our learning gains dropped this past school year. When the data was broken down more specifically, it showed that our Level 5's do not always stay Level 5's and our other higher students are not moving up in levels.

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

1. Lowest 25 %
2. ESE and ELL Subgroup
3. Highest 25%

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to FSA 2019 data, our lowest 25% decreased in both ELA and Math. ELA decreased by 5%. Math decreased by 7 percent. Our ESE subgroup fell within that lowest 25% typically. The Fall 2020 iReady Diagnostic Data showed that our bottom 25% demonstrated gains similar to their peers (from the Winter 2020 assessment); however, they are still working below that of their peers. 2019-20 classroom walk-throughs show that the majority of teachers are using complex text to support their instruction; however there is a need to focus on tasks aligned to the full intent of the standard in 20-21. Collaborative data chats are becoming embedded and now a need to focus on multiple sources of data to make instructional decisions for both tier 1 and tier 2 is evident. This will be a focus as well in 20-21. We will additionally be addressing those students who show gaps from our iReady Diagnostic in September from Distant Learning due to COVID.
Measurable Outcome:	In 2019, our ESE subgroup, lowest 25% will increase the learning gains from 65 to 70 in ELA and 67 to 72 in Math. Targeting students that score 1-2 grade levels below on the iReady Diagnostic at the beginning of the school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christine Boyd (boyd.christine@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards-based planning (collaboratively between general education teachers, ESE teachers, and ELL teacher) to focus on grade level assessments and iReady Standards Mastery in 3rd through 6th grades. Teacher clarity is imperative and will include Standards Focus Board usage school-wide.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher clarity is imperative for successful instruction. Hattie's effect size for organizing instruction (.64), explaining content (.70), and assessment of student learning (.64) make this an important area to focus on. Learning gains for the bottom 25% will occur with effective planning, instruction, and assessment are utilized.

Action Steps to Implement

Standards Focus Boards
-Teachers will post learning targets; communicate to students throughout lessons.
-Administration will provide Standards Focus Board PD for staff; instructional coach will model where needed.
ELA
-Continue walkthroughs looking for complex text in all lessons- 100% teachers goal- begin looking for task alignment to full-intent of standard. Instructional coach provides support during collaborative planning.
-School-wide Write Score use to assist in common language across grade levels. ESE graphic organizer usage is successful; ESOL will begin use.
-Data chat meetings will use revamped worksheet looking at tier 1/2 student data. Walk-to-Intervention will use common planning, approved curriculum/ progress monitoring.
-Tutoring support for students 1-2 grade levels below.
Math
-Teachers implement Eureka pacing with fidelity and provide intervention with iReady/Zearn lessons. Instructional coach will assist teachers as needed.
-Instructional coach will model/ coteach as needed and refer to online video PD.
-Tutoring support for students 1-2 grade levels below.

Person Responsible	Christine Boyd (boyd.christine@brevardschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Though it is not listed in EWS data, the highest 25% of students, in 2019, show a pattern of decreasing from a 5 to a 4 or not keeping the learning gains from year to year.
Measurable Outcome:	In 2020, 80% of our highest 25% will show a Learning Gain.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Christine Boyd (boyd.christine@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards-based planning (collaboratively between general education teachers, ESE teachers, and ELL teacher) to focus on grade level assessments and iReady Standards Mastery in 3rd through 6th grades. Teacher clarity is imperative and will include Standards Focus Board usage school-wide.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher clarity is imperative for successful instruction. Hattie's effect size for organizing instruction (.64), explaining content (.70), and assessment of student learning (.64) make this an important area to focus on. Learning gains on the FSA for the top 25% will occur with effective instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

Standards Focus Boards
-Teachers will post learning targets; communicate to students throughout lessons.
-Administration will provide Standards Focus Board PD for staff; instructional coach will model where needed.
ELA
-Continue walkthroughs looking for complex text in all lessons with 100% of teachers; begin walkthroughs looking for task alignment to full intent of the standard. Instructional coach will provide support during collaborative planning.
-School-wide Write Score use to assist in common language across grade levels. ESE graphic organizer usage is successful; ESOL will begin use.
-Data chat meetings will use revamped worksheet looking at tier 1/2 student data. Walk-to-Intervention will use common planning, approved curriculum/ progress monitoring.
Math
-Teachers will implement Eureka pacing with fidelity and provide students intervention with iReady/ Zearn lessons. Instructional coach will assist teachers as needed.
-Instructional coach will model/ coteach as needed and refer to online video PD.

Person Responsible	Christine Boyd (boyd.christine@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

This will be supported by having in person or online Parent Evenings; Writing, Reading, or Math Strategies to Support your Child at home. We will also provide support in the area of interpreting iReady data for the parents. Need noted in our parent survey with 75% of our parents wanted Academic Support Resources at home.

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.

Quest involves stakeholders throughout the decision making and planning of the school year. There is a strong partnership between the PTO and Administration. We work collaboratively on events that support family engagement at the school site and parent volunteerism.

Administration holds 3 Coffee with the Principals a year, with the parents and community members. We touch on topics relative to the school population, topics requested by our parents, and answer upcoming questions.

Through our parent survey, with over 72% wanting additional resources on how to help their child in school, we conducted 2 literacy nights each year, as well as math support for parents.

With teacher input in our leadership meetings and staff survey, we have created a strong communication system with our families using email, text, websites, and social media. These steps support over a 1 point increase in Leadership and School Operations on the Staff Insight Survey.

Through analysis of the student survey, Youth Truth, we added more social emotional supports addressing bullying, including the implementation of the Sanford Harmony Program, the Counselors Cottage teaching small group lessons on bullying and friendship, and lunch bunch for to have individualized conversations with our guidance team.

It was ultimately through our School Data, SAC and parent surveys that has guided us to offer enrichment programs within the school day, including advanced math and grade level reading enrichment groups.

Our vision and goals support a collaborative community with all stakeholders.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link
The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.