Jupiter Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Jupiter Elementary School

950 TUPELO RD SW, Palm Bay, FL 32908

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

Demographics

Principal: Sherie Troisi L

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2014

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: C (45%)
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	TS&I

> * 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

Jupiter Elementary School

950 TUPELO RD SW, Palm Bay, FL 32908

http://www.jupiter.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	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	61%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	C

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.

Reaching every child, every day. (Reviewed June 2020)

Provide the school's vision statement.

Jupiter Elementary School will challenge our diverse community of learners, and establish a positive and productive school culture, set high expectations for achievement, and encourage independent, self-directed learning. (Reviewed June 2020)

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
Troisi, Sherie	Principal	As the instructional leader, Sherie Troisi provides vision and strategic focus for all stakeholders. She ensures high academic expectations for all students by holding teachers accountable through regular observations with feedback and individual teacher data chats, supervises curriculum and instruction and ensures weekly data analysis and progress monitoring are occurring. She facilitates weekly leadership team meetings to review student data (academic, behavioral and attendance) and current practices to determine professional development needs and/or additional supports for teachers and students.
Ouellette, Amber	Assistant Principal	Amber Ouellette supports classroom instruction by ensuring all teachers have the appropriate curriculum and instructional resources. She conducts regular classroom observations with feedback to improve instructional practices. Mrs. Ouellette oversees the implementation of our response to intervention and our academic support programs and oversees our new teacher mentor program. She organizes and facilitates professional development and coordinates all testing.
Cirino, Stacy	Teacher, K-12	Stacy Cirino coordinates our Title I program. She supports administration with discipline, maintains discipline records and oversees our Positive Alternative to School Suspension program (PASS). Mrs. Cirino supports classroom teachers in the areas of classroom management and math instruction utilizing the coaching model and coordinates our new teacher program. Mrs. Cirino provides RtI instruction to students in need of academic support.
Lopez, Jenifer	Instructional Coach	As our Literacy Coach, Jenifer Lopez supports classroom teachers with all aspects of reading instruction. She utilizes the coaching model to support reading instruction, coordinates implementation of iReady Reading, mentors teachers and facilitates our weekly data chats.
Daniels, Chrystal	School Counselor	Chrystal Daniels coordinates our MTSS program. She supports classroom teachers with the creation and implementation of behavior plans and supports the social emotional needs of our students via individual and small group counseling.
Brennan, Nancy	Teacher, ESE	Nancy Brennan is the Lead ESE Teacher. She works with the ESE team to ensure that all students with disabilities are provided rigorous instruction designed to meet their individual needs. She monitors the academic progress of our students with disabilities and ensures that classroom teachers are aware of student accommodations.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 7/1/2014, Sherie Troisi L

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.*

5

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

56

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	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (48%) 2015-16: C (45%)
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	TS&I
* 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	90	108	92	89	96	91	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	653
Attendance below 90 percent	64	26	20	15	16	18	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	177
One or more suspensions	5	6	4	6	3	10	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
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	21	28	13	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	30	37	28	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	118

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	9	10	5	6	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
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

Monday 6/22/2020

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	78	96	89	92	96	83	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	619
Attendance below 90 percent	12	17	9	9	6	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
One or more suspensions	0	4	5	7	4	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	32	39	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	106

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	3	6	12	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	13	8	4	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	78	96	89	92	96	83	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	619
Attendance below 90 percent	12	17	9	9	6	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
One or more suspensions	0	4	5	7	4	15	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	5	32	39	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	106

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	3	6	12	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	13	8	4	5	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	47%	62%	57%	44%	63%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	57%	60%	58%	59%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	66%	57%	53%	48%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	48%	63%	63%	46%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	59%	65%	62%	55%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	53%	51%	43%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	34%	57%	53%	40%	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	49%	64%	-15%	58%	-9%
	2018	54%	63%	-9%	57%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	48%	61%	-13%	58%	-10%
	2018	30%	57%	-27%	56%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				
05	2019	38%	60%	-22%	56%	-18%
	2018	34%	54%	-20%	55%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
06	2019	47%	60%	-13%	54%	-7%
	2018	46%	63%	-17%	52%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
03	2019	43%	61%	-18%	62%	-19%	
	2018	36%	62%	-26%	62%	-26%	
Same Grade Comparison		7%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	40%	64%	-24%	64%	-24%	
	2018	42%	59%	-17%	62%	-20%	
Same Grade Comparison		-2%					
Cohort Comparison		4%					
05	2019	42%	60%	-18%	60%	-18%	
	2018	39%	58%	-19%	61%	-22%	
Same Grade Comparison		3%					
Cohort Comparison		0%					
06	2019	59%	67%	-8%	55%	4%	
	2018	57%	68%	-11%	52%	5%	
Same Grade Comparison		2%					
Cohort Comparison		20%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
05	2019	33%	56%	-23%	53%	-20%	
	2018	42%	57%	-15%	55%	-13%	
Same Grade Comparison		-9%					
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	28	58	53	23	59	61					
ELL	25	55		22	65						
BLK	33	49	60	36	49	38	15				
HSP	50	67	69	47	63	50	36				
MUL	52	58		67	72						
WHT	53	57	81	53	61	53	48				
FRL	42	57	65	43	57	46	27				
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	18	30	26	22	48	42	26				
ELL	29	65	67	33	46						
BLK	33	41	22	32	44	37	19				

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
HSP	46	50	43	54	61	45	36				
MUL	37	56		59	75						
WHT	50	50	50	51	58	37	57				
FRL	38	45	38	44	55	37	40				
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	15	42	35	20	42	30	18				
ELL	17	37		31	62						
BLK	30	53	48	28	38	41	30				
HSP	49	62	50	46	60	47	50				
MUL	42	64		50	55		40				
WHT	51	59	46	55	62	50	40				
FRL	38	55	46	40	52	42	36				

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	48
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	406
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
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	43
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	40
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	53
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	62
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	58
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	48
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.

Jupiter Elementary's lowest performing data component was on the 5th grade science assessment during the 2019 school year. During the 2020 school year, the district science pre-test showed that Jupiter Elementary students scored an average of 48% on state science standards. Due to Covid-19 students were unable to be assessed on the state assessment for comparison. Contributing factors include: science instruction remaining at the surface level, students not being exposed to complex science text, and a need to increase focus on analyzing data from informational text features.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline was in science achievement. Jupiter Elementary's science data in 2018 showed 44% of students scored a level 3 or above. During 2019, 34% of students scored a level 3 or above resulting in a 10% decline. During the 2020 school year, the district science pre-test showed that Jupiter Elementary students scored an average of 48% on state science standards. Due to Covid-19 students were unable to be assessed on the post-assessment for comparison. The same factors that contributed to science being our lowest performing area continues to be the same contributing factors.

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.

As previously listed, Jupiter's science achievement data had the largest gap, which was at 34% compared to the state average of 53%.

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

In 2018, Jupiter Elementary's lowest 25% in ELA increased from 39% of students showing a learning gain, to 66% of the lowest 25% students showing a learning gain in 2019. This is an increase of 27% of students that showed a learning gain on state assessments. This can be directly contributed to tracking the lowest 25% students during data team meetings, implementation of small group guided reading instruction, and implementing i-Ready with fidelity.
During the 2020 school year i-Ready ELA data showed a 17% increase of students on grade level.

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

After reflecting on the Early Warning System data, students scoring in the lowest 25% on state and district assessments continues to be an area of concern for Jupiter Elementary. Based on the 2019

FSA/ELA, 22% of students that will be attending Jupiter Elementary during the 20-21 school year scored a level 1. The 2020 midyear i-Ready diagnostic assessment showed that 52% of all students scored below grade level in ELA.

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

1. Science Achievement
2. ELA and Math Proficiency
3. African American students meeting ESSA requirements
4. ELL students continue to meet ESSA requirements (as it has been on the decline)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Data have shown inconsistent growth of the ELA and math standards proficiency. On the Florida Standards Assessment in 2019, Jupiter scores fell 10 percentage points below the state in ELA and fell 15 percentage points below the state in math. During the fall 2020 iReady diagnostic the percentage of students in the "At Risk, Tier 3" category was 22% in ELA and 29% in math. Therefore, Jupiter Elementary will continue to focus on standards aligned instruction through the use of focus boards and collaborative planning to ensure teachers are reaching the full intent of the standard.
Measurable Outcome:	Jupiter Elementary will increase proficiency in ELA and math as evidenced by i-Ready assessments. i-Ready, ELA, mid year assessment during the 2020 school year showed that 48% of students were on grade level. i-Ready Math, mid year assessment during the 2020 school year showed that 31% of students were on grade level. In the 2021 school year, Jupiter Elementary will increase the percentage of students scoring on grade level to 52% in ELA and 38% in Math. We will also increase ELA and Math proficiency on the Florida Standards Assessment from 47% to 52% in ELA and 48% to 53% in math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amber Ouellette (ouellette.amber@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence based strategy Jupiter Elementary will employ during the 20-21 school year will be standards focus boards. Using progressive monitoring/walk-thrus, the leadership team will look for a standards focus board that is aligned with the grade level based on collaborative planning. During the second semester the team will monitor the components of the focus board.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	During the 2020 school year we continued to notice that student tasks were not consistently aligned to the standards. Observations indicated that students were not clear on what they were expected to learn, why they needed to learn it and what success looked like. We believe that we can overcome these barriers by implementing standards focus boards. According to John Hatti's research, teacher clarity has an effect size of .75 which makes this a high impact strategy that will lead to increased student achievement. Standard focus boards will ensure that teachers and students are connecting the learning, to the mastery of the standard.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Standards Focus Board refresher (required for reading during the 2020-2021 school year and required for reading and math during the 2021-2022 school year).

Person Responsible	Sherie Troisi (troisi.sherie@brevardschools.org)

2. Provide teachers with time to plan collaboratively each week with an instructional coach utilizing enhanced standards focus documents, iReady Teacher Toolbox and planning strategies that support scaffolding.

Person Responsible	Sherie Troisi (troisi.sherie@brevardschools.org)

3. Literacy coach (.5 T) will provide ongoing professional development focused on teacher clarity, standards aligned instruction and Standards Focus Boards.
Title I Math Contact (T) will provide ongoing professional development based on needs identified through classroom observations.
Provide professional development on how to develop excellent instruction in an eLearning environment.

Person Responsible Jenifer Lopez (lopez.jenifer@brevardschools.org)

4. Conduct classroom observations and support teachers with implementation to provide feedback on standards focus boards.

Person Responsible Amber Ouellette (ouellette.amber@brevardschools.org)

5. Offer a reading and math Academic Support Program after school targeting our lowest 25% and the lowest performing subgroups including African American and English as a Second Language students.

Person Responsible Amber Ouellette (ouellette.amber@brevardschools.org)

6. Utilize i-Ready curriculum and diagnostic assessments to monitor student progress. Utilize Standards Mastery to assess mastery and plan for reteaching of standards as appropriate. Utilize Ready Reading and Math assessments to progress monitor student growth. Utilize iReady Growth Monitoring to monitor progress of our African American, English Language Learners, and our Students with Disabilities.

Person Responsible Sherie Troisi (troisi.sherie@brevardschools.org)

7. Analyze data by subgroup with a focus on our lowest 25% and the lowest performing groups, African American, English as a Second Language students during weekly grade level data chats and leadership team. Based on the data we will develop a plan to support students who are not demonstrating growth. Data will also be used to support planning for intervention groups.

Person Responsible Sherie Troisi (troisi.sherie@brevardschools.org)

8. Offer at least one Title I Family Night each semester focused on ELA standards.

Person Responsible Stacy Cirino (cirino.stacy@brevardschools.org)

9. Utilize Title I funds to employ two Title I teachers and two instructional assistants to support ELA and math instruction. (T)

Person Responsible Sherie Troisi (troisi.sherie@brevardschools.org)

10. Utilize Title I funds to purchase materials to support ELA and math instruction based on weaknesses noted in iReady domains through data analysis. (T)

Person Responsible Stacy Cirino (cirino.stacy@brevardschools.org)

11. Provide opportunities outside of the school day through the use of MyOn and Summer Academic clinic. (Utilize Title I funds)

Person Responsible Jenifer Lopez (lopez.jenifer@brevardschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Jupiter's scores dropped on the State Science Assessment from 44% in 2018 to 34% in 2019. The average score on this assessment was 53% at the state level and 57% at the district level in 2019. Therefore, Jupiter Elementary was 11% percentage points below the state and 13% percentage points below the district. In 2020, Jupiter Elementary students scored an average of 48% on the district assessment pre-test. During the 2020 school year students scored inconsistently on the district science assessments. Jupiter Elementary will use the 5E instructional model (Engage, Explore, Explain, Elaborate, Evaluate) to guide teachers in planning and implementing science inquiry lessons. Implementation of the 5E model will ensure students are engaged through active participation and therefore able to demonstrate overall proficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	Jupiter Elementary students will increase the State Science Assessment scores from 34% in 2019 to 44% in 2021. Students will score an average of 60% on the district assessment post test in 2021.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sherie Troisi (troisi.sherie@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Jupiter Elementary will use the evidence-based strategy, the 5E instructional model (Engage, Explore, Explain, Elaborate, Evaluate). The use of the 5E model will be monitored during weekly data chats with teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students at Jupiter Elementary are not demonstrating proficiency on the Florida Science Standards and are scoring below state and district averages on the SSA (State Science Assessment). The 5E instructional model provides a planned sequence of instruction that is considered a best practice in science instruction. The 5E instructional model is a proven model of guiding students from the point of engagement of science concepts and walking them through the understanding of the concept to enable them to explain and elaborate on what they have learned. This model is proven to be effective in science instruction and helps students to retain what they have learned, resulting in increased achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. The Title I science teacher will provide professional development during pre-planning to teachers to include a refresher of the 5E instructional model and strategies to support online hands on science for our eLearners.. (Title I funds are used to employ the Title I science teacher)

Person Responsible	Stacy Cirino (cirino.stacy@brevardschools.org)

2. The Title I science teacher will support classroom teachers with implementation of the 5E instructional model. (Title I funds are used to employ the Title I science teacher)

Person Responsible	Amber Ouellette (ouellette.amber@brevardschools.org)

3. Progress monitor district online science assessments during grade level data chats.

Person Responsible	Sherie Troisi (troisi.sherie@brevardschools.org)

4. Analyze science data by the lowest performing subgroups, African American and English as a Second Language students, in collaborative teams. Data will be used to reteach and inform instruction.

Person Responsible	Sherie Troisi (troisi.sherie@brevardschools.org)

5. Integrate the use of science texts during the ELA block.

Person Responsible   Jenifer Lopez (lopez.jenifer@brevardschools.org)

6. Offer a Saturday science program utilizing Academic Support Program funds.

Person Responsible   Amber Ouellette (ouellette.amber@brevardschools.org)

7. Integrate science into a Title I curriculum night. (Title I funds are used to pay for the resources to be sent home with families during the Title I night)

Person Responsible   Stacy Cirino (cirino.stacy@brevardschools.org)

8. Utilize Title I funds to pay for the 4th grade Indian River Lagoon science trip.

Person Responsible   Sherie Troisi (troisi.sherie@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.

Jupiter Elementary creates a positive school culture in many ways. Title I funds are currently used to pay for a second guidance counselor. The guidance counselor provides support and resources to students and families in need, offers support and guidance groups for students, during data chats/MTSS process she provides strategies and next steps for behavioral concerns, facilitates school and family meetings regarding attendance concerns, and helps to create positive relationships between school, families and the community.
Jupiter Elementary provides family nights throughout the school year to create positive relationships between home and school. These family nights include Title I academic nights as well as social events that include; father/daughter dance, mother/son dance, spring carnival, student talent night, PRIDE awards, school concerts and teacher meet and greet.
Teachers at Jupiter Elementary implement the "Second Step" character education program which teaches

students social-emotional learning strategies and creates a home school connection.

Grades K-2 implement research based curriculum, "I Can Problem Solve" through classroom morning meetings. Teachers also have implemented the research based strategy "Restorative Practices" school-wide to create a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations.

Based on feedback from the Jupiter Elementary YouthTruth Student survey, we will employ a part time social worker to address issues of bullying. The social worker will implement bullying lessons and activities through whole group and small group instruction.

Parent Survey results indicated that 75% of our families stated that email or text is the best way for them to receive important information in regards to the school or their child. Jupiter will continue to utilize these forms of communication in addition to flyers and posts on our school website and student FOCUS accounts.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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