

Brevard Public Schools

W. Melbourne Elementary School For Science



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	0

W. Melbourne Elementary School For Science

2255 MEADOWLANE AVE, West Melbourne, FL 32904

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

Demographics

Principal: Theresa Benson

Start Date for this Principal: 6/3/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	17%
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 (78%) 2017-18: A (77%) 2016-17: A (84%) 2015-16: A (74%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

W. Melbourne Elementary School For Science

2255 MEADOWLANE AVE, West Melbourne, FL 32904

<http://www.wmelbourne.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	23%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	41%

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 educate and prepare today's students as strong readers, writers and mathematicians utilizing scientific discovery and the implementation of technology to meet the challenges of the world of tomorrow.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to help each child develop their full potential while becoming creative producers and self-directed, life-long learners. We will accomplish this through a commitment to excellence and collaboration between parents, staff, students and community stakeholders.

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
Benson, Theresa	Principal	School Leadership Team, Supervision of Progress Monitoring, Facilitator of Data collection and discussions, ESSA subgroup data, instructional leader of Professional Development
Batman, Amanda	Assistant Principal	Discipline Data and Intervention, professional development, instructional coaching, subgroup data monitoring, school leadership team
Kane, Melissa	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coaching, professional development, school leadership team, data monitoring, intervention assistance and design

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/3/2019, Theresa Benson

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

38

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)	17%
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 (78%) 2017-18: A (77%) 2016-17: A (84%) 2015-16: A (74%)
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	69	68	70	69	87	81	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	529
Attendance below 90 percent	1	2	2	2	3	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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

Wednesday 9/9/2020

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	72	72	71	72	87	88	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	549
Attendance below 90 percent	4	2	1	1	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
One or more suspensions	2	3	2	0	1	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	7	8	1	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	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	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	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	

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	72	72	71	72	87	88	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	549
Attendance below 90 percent	4	2	1	1	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
One or more suspensions	2	3	2	0	1	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	7	8	1	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	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	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	88%	62%	57%	92%	63%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	73%	60%	58%	80%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	57%	53%	77%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	84%	63%	63%	84%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	73%	65%	62%	83%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	69%	53%	51%	80%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	92%	57%	53%	90%	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	90%	64%	26%	58%	32%
	2018	81%	63%	18%	57%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	80%	61%	19%	58%	22%
	2018	90%	57%	33%	56%	34%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	90%	60%	30%	56%	34%
	2018	89%	54%	35%	55%	34%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	90%	60%	30%	54%	36%
	2018	91%	63%	28%	52%	39%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	82%	61%	21%	62%	20%
	2018	81%	62%	19%	62%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	79%	64%	15%	64%	15%
	2018	80%	59%	21%	62%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	90%	60%	30%	60%	30%
	2018	86%	58%	28%	61%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
06	2019	87%	67%	20%	55%	32%
	2018	87%	68%	19%	52%	35%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	92%	56%	36%	53%	39%
	2018	95%	57%	38%	55%	40%
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	56	37	42	54	63	67					
ELL	82	78		90	75		83				
ASN	88	83		90	72	80	73				
BLK	78	60		61	67						
HSP	91	71	64	87	76		100				
MUL	94	73		83	73						
WHT	87	71	63	85	73	68	94				
FRL	89	76		82	68	69	100				
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	53	55		50	50						
ELL	80			80							
ASN	95	81		91	77		94				
BLK	82	64		71	79	73					
HSP	91	86		87	67		100				
MUL	85			77							
WHT	86	65	63	82	70	58	98				
FRL	82	72	68	74	68	48	84				
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	86	76		68	86	82					
ELL	86			79							
ASN	98	78		96	88		93				
BLK	93	100		50	70						

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
HSP	88	75	73	75	69	73	92				
MUL	75	80		75	80						
WHT	93	81	79	86	86	84	90				
FRL	84	75	77	76	73	73	89				

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	78
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	544
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	53
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	82
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	81

Asian Students	
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	67
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	82
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	81
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	81
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, the lowest performing data component was the SWD subgroup. During the 2020 school year, the ESE schedule was considered first before the master schedule was finalized to guarantee the needs of SWD were our first priority. We implemented the Facilitative Support Model to give students the opportunities in all grade levels to receive intervention strategies from the Gen. Ed teacher and ESE teacher with their peers. Implementing this component is best practice and will decrease loss of instruction due to transitions. This year, teachers are challenged with not only providing instruction addressing IEP goals for our ESE students, but closing existing reading achievement gaps plus elearning/COVID gaps through scaffolded instruction combined with progress monitoring.

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

Due to COVID19 and lack of new assessments, BOY 2020 iReady data revealed the greatest decline was in overall math achievement. The contributing factors were that WMSS implemented Eureka Math schoolwide with the exception of 6th grade (Big Ideas). In 2019, action steps were implemented, including providing staff development, math vertical articulation meetings, Teacher planning to include Eureka Pacing, thoughtful planning with progress monitoring discussion, as well as, observation/feedback sessions to improve math instruction. We are continuing to work on this data component in the 20-21 school year with greater fidelity.

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.

In reviewing our 2018-2019 FSA data, our scores are higher when compared to the state averages in all areas. However, due to COVID 19, we continue to refer to data from the iReady data that shows Math has the greatest gap when compared to Reading. We are utilizing iReady data this year and focusing on instructional practice specifically relating to standards aligned instruction. Our 19-20 SIP action steps included MATH PLC's, data teams, and instructional rounds to help improve instruction as indicated by benchmarks, common assessments and Standard Focus Documents. This continues to be an area of focus for the 2020-2021 school year.

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

We analyzed the BOY iReady data of 2019 and the BOY iReady data of 2020. We made some improvements in BOY Reading results from 60% at or above grade level in 2019 to 67% at or above grade level in 2020. In looking at the contributing factors, we feel the results were a direct correlation to a lengthy loss of instruction due to COVID. To remedy this, we are continuing to provide uninterrupted instructional time for problem solving, goal setting of next steps, and professional development for teachers in providing authentic instructional techniques that are aligned with the Enhanced Standard Focus Documents. Additionally, goal setting with our students is an established practice for classroom learning targets. Students continue to be identified and are remediated/enriched in our Success Zones for the 2020-2021 school year. Our Success Zone is embedded and documented in our Master Schedule.

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

Due to our belief that attendance matters at our school, in 2019-20, we identified 15 students that were below 90% in attendance. Our goal is to decrease this number by 50%. We can achieve this by being proactive in reaching out to families that are absent at the early stages, have parents work with our guidance counselor and remind parents of the success rate students will have by being present at school.

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

1. Meeting the needs of our ESE population by continuing to provide collaborative planning time between the ESE teacher and Gen. Ed teacher, utilizing data in data discussions and creating an intervention block within our master schedule.
2. Year 2 of the implementation of Eureka Math, Common Assessments in K-5, Designated Vertical Articulation Meetings to discuss student achievement and best practices

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

In the 2019 school year, our students with disabilities were our highest priority. This equates to a total of 26 students identified as SWD.

The beginning of the 19-20 school year iReady diagnostic revealed the following information regarding SWD proficiency: In ELA, only 40% of our ESE students achieved proficiency or higher, which equates to 10 out of 26 students. In Math, 20% of our ESE students achieved proficiency or higher which equates to 5 students.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

The beginning of the 20-21 school year iReady diagnostic revealed the following information regarding SWD proficiency: In ELA, only 35% of our ESE students achieved proficiency or higher, which equates to 9 out of 26 students. In Math, 15% of our ESE students achieved proficiency or higher which equates to 4 students.

The WMSS instructional staff will use scaffolding strategies to support ALL students access to grade level work. Through our Tiered Interventions, general Ed, ESE and TA staff will individualize instruction to meet the needs of our Tier 2, Tier 3 and ESE students in conferences and small groups.

Measurable Outcome:

ELA proficiency for SWD will increase from 35% to 60%. This would equate to 16 out of 26 students reaching at or above grade level. Math proficiency will increase from 15% to 50%. This would equate to 13 out of 26 students reaching at or above grade level. Along with targeted instruction and interventions, these increases will bridge the learning gaps in our ESE subgroup.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Theresa Benson (benson.theresa@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Aligning Standards with purposeful planning and iReady assessments, including Standards Mastery, will be implemented and utilized schoolwide. iReady implementation with the instructional toolbox has established clear benchmarks for students and teachers. Analyzing this data immediately after diagnostic testing. Online testing will allow teachers to make decisions and create teacher lessons to immediately differentiate their instruction and support each and every student.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

iReady has been vetted and endorsed by BPS. This system allows us to analyze our data to understand where our students are academically. It also helps us plan instructional support that is customized to each student, especially our SWD subgroup. It helps teachers and students monitor progress toward goals and improve instruction to meet students' diverse needs.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Instruction and Remediation from Gen. Ed. Teacher, ESE resource Teacher and ESE Teacher Assistant is inclusive and Support Facilitative Model is adopted. 2018 BPIE assessments will be reviewed and incorporated to align with this area of focus (i.e. Resource teacher and teacher assistant push in to classrooms to support inclusive best practices, ESE schedule is considered prior to the building of the Master Schedule). Students will receive scaffolded instruction during a dedicated intervention block based on need.

Person Responsible Theresa Benson (benson.theresa@brevardschools.org)

2. All students will receive grade level instruction in Tier 1. Teachers will appropriately assign individual instruction in small groups, 45 minute instruction given from iReady, MyPath, and customized activities found in the instructional toolbox. Through progress monitoring, teachers will collect data, analyze and presented to MTSS team to review growth and next steps. Students identified at the Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction in Reading and Math will receive additional support in 2nd and 3rd grades in our Academic Support Program after school. ASP and Cares Funds will be utilized in hiring teachers to support students two days a week.

Person Responsible Melissa Kane (kane.melissa@brevardschools.org)

3. Instructional Leadership will provide professional development and technical assistance to teachers so that students with disabilities have access to on-grade level instruction, curriculum resources, and the use of appropriate accommodations. Our MTSS Support Team will provide examples of research based interventions that teachers will use with students at these Tiered Levels.

Person Responsible Amanda Batman (batman.amanda@brevardschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

In 2019-2020, WMSS made the decision to implement Eureka Math fully in K-5, with the exception of 6th grade (Big Idea Math). Making this decision will impact our students through common math language across grade levels and a stronger teaching cohort by implementing math vertical articulation opportunities for teachers.

Measurable Outcome:

Mid year, we will analyze the iReady Diagnostic #2 Assessment. By December 2020, K-2 grade will increase their BOY math scores from 60 % to 75% and 3rd through 6th grade will increase their BOY math scores from 70% to 85% . By May 2021, each grade level will increase their MOY scores by 20%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Theresa Benson (benson.theresa@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Increased focus on common Math curriculum. Full implementation of this schoolwide Math adoption (K-5), with fidelity and targeted lessons based on data from exit tickets, module assessments and iReady data will decrease deficits in Math. Purposeful planning and instruction will assist with aligning the curriculum and the enhanced standard document to decrease fragmented skills.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

In previous years, teachers utilized a variety of curriculum supports to teach math. The variance in programming caused inconsistencies with instruction. Incorporating a Math adoption across grade levels will increase the rigor of questioning, critical thinking and math language schoolwide.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers in K- 5th grade will utilize planning time with Administrators and Instructional Coach to plan for Eureka instruction, align with State Standards, Enhanced Focus Documents, Pacing Guides and instructional strategies implemented with fidelity. Students identified at the Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction in Reading and Math will receive additional support in 2nd and 3rd grades in our Academic Support Program after school. ASP and Cares Funds will be utilized in hiring teachers to support students two days a week.

Person Responsible

Melissa Kane (kane.melissa@brevardschools.org)

School Leadership will facilitate classroom walk throughs to observe and provide feedback on instruction and the implementation of instructional shifts. Weekly data chats with grade levels as well as focused conversation in vertical articulation meetings monthly.

Person Responsible

Theresa Benson (benson.theresa@brevardschools.org)

School Leadership will utilize District instructional rounds' feedback to formulate action plans, in order to celebrate and reflect upon instructional practice. At WMSS, our teachers are consistently given the opportunity to reflect and perfect their instructional craft through planning sessions with colleagues and Administration.

Person Responsible

Theresa Benson (benson.theresa@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

"Due to our belief that attendance matters at our school, in 2019-20, we identified 15 students that were below 90% in attendance. Our goal is to decrease this number by 50%. We can achieve this by being proactive in reaching out to families that are absent at the early stages, have parent work with our guidance counselor and remind parents of the success rate students will have by being present at school" The school leadership will continue to address attendance proactively. Our school clerk will run an attendance report weekly and administration/counselor will reach out to parents to offer assistance, if needed.

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.

Due to the feedback we received from our Youth Truth Survey last year, we wanted to align our procedures in and out of the classroom more positive and connected relationships with our students. CHAMPS is a proactive and positive approach to classroom management and a positive school environment. Student responses revealed a lack of teacher relationships. CHAMPS is the acronym for Conversation, Help, Activity, Movement, Participation and Success. Our teachers were retrained during our 20-21 PrePlanning schedules with the CHAMPS Team. The team consisted of teachers across the school that have a passion for the message that CHAMPS transcends. Through conversation with teachers, motivation of teachers and students was our number one focus. In focusing on Motivation, our plan is to build positive relationships, provide frequent positive feedback and motivate students to demonstrate their best behavior through modeling and high expectation.

Periodically throughout the school year, teams will meet to discuss the implementation, feedback and next steps for CHAMPS. Administration walk-through classrooms and share data from counselor and discipline reports. As a school, we will decide if we need to revise and tweak our CHAMPS plan of action.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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