Ocean Breeze Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Ocean Breeze Elementary School

1101 CHEYENNE DR, Indian Harbour Beach, FL 32937

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

Demographics

Principal: Shelley Michaud

Start Date for this Principal: 9/23/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	26%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (73%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: A (70%) 2015-16: A (71%)
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

Ocean Breeze Elementary School

1101 CHEYENNE DR, Indian Harbour Beach, FL 32937

http://www.ocean.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	29%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	17%

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.

Ocean Breeze Elementary School's mission is to develop motivated and confident life-long learners who are prepared for future challenges (updated 2019).

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to maintain a safe, respectful, and inclusive school community where responsibility for learning is shared, and everyone counts. Ocean Breeze will nurture and encourage every child to discover personal strengths and talents, develop a passion for learning, and acquire the skills to be a creative and collaborative problem solver. (updated 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
Michaud, Shelley	Principal	Oversee the day to day operations of the school including: fiscal monitoring, data analysis, supervision and evaluation, curriculum and instructional planning, behavior management, facilitate collegiality and collaboration, engaging stakeholders, talent recruitment and management, and all other duties necessary in building leadership.
Hill-Brodigan, Elizabeth	Assistant Principal	Assist the principal in overseeing the day to day operations of the school including: fiscal monitoring, data analysis, supervision and evaluation, curriculum and instructional planning, behavior management, facilitate collegiality and collaboration, engaging stakeholders, talent recruitment and management, and all other duties necessary in building leadership.
Del Vecchio, Francine	Instructional Coach	Support teachers with the collection and analysis of student data to inform instructional decisions based on data and promote student performance growth. Model and support best practice literacy instruction.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 9/23/2020, Shelley Michaud

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.*
4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
41

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)	26%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (73%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: A (70%) 2015-16: A (71%)
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	58	70	77	63	65	77	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	503
Attendance below 90 percent	8	8	6	7	4	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	3	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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 9/23/2020

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	86	77	79	73	72	91	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	552
Attendance below 90 percent	9	5	5	5	4	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	1	18	9	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	18	17	17	29	24	31	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	158

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	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	86	77	79	73	72	91	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	552
Attendance below 90 percent	9	5	5	5	4	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	1	18	9	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	18	17	17	29	24	31	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	158

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	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	80%	62%	57%	80%	63%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	68%	60%	58%	64%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	57%	53%	45%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	81%	63%	63%	83%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	79%	65%	62%	79%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	53%	51%	68%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	76%	57%	53%	74%	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	86%	64%	22%	58%	28%
	2018	77%	63%	14%	57%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	73%	61%	12%	58%	15%
	2018	75%	57%	18%	56%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	84%	60%	24%	56%	28%
	2018	66%	54%	12%	55%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
06	2019	80%	60%	20%	54%	26%
	2018	67%	63%	4%	52%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	77%	61%	16%	62%	15%
	2018	79%	62%	17%	62%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	71%	64%	7%	64%	7%
	2018	73%	59%	14%	62%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	79%	60%	19%	60%	19%
	2018	80%	58%	22%	61%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
06	2019	95%	67%	28%	55%	40%
	2018	84%	68%	16%	52%	32%

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
Same Grade Comparison		11%					
Cohort Comparison		15%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
05	2019	74%	56%	18%	53%	21%	
	2018	77%	57%	20%	55%	22%	
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	51	55	52	57	67	64	40				
HSP	88	78		92	76						
MUL	88	82		71	82						
WHT	81	67	67	84	81	73	75				
FRL	73	68	64	73	66	59	61				

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	29	30	25	27	39	33	31				
BLK	40			20							
HSP	73	40		82	67						
MUL	86	60		91	93						
WHT	71	52	35	81	70	58	77				
FRL	62	40	22	68	65	56	57				

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	57	44	54	64	56	30				
HSP	82	71		76	79						
MUL	95			84							
WHT	79	62	43	83	79	68	72				
FRL	75	61	50	78	77	67	71				

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	73
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	514
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	55
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	84

Hispanic Students	
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	75
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	66
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.

ELA Achievement for students with disabilities was the area with lowest performance. In 17-18, Ocean Breeze was targeted for support and intervention for it's SWD subgroup. To address this, we provided training on MTSS and Achieve the Core/IPG. Even though it is our lowest performance score, it is important to note that we went from 29% in 17-18 to 51% in 18-19. For 2020-2021, we have adjusted our ESE ELA support to more of a push in model where appropriate. In 18-19, we had 14 students score a level 1 in ELA, and 9 of those students took ELA in a pull out model grades 4-6. Thus, we determined that our SWD students were not benefitting enough from the pull out instruction with just SWD peers.

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

Our multi-racial students went from 91% to 71% in math achievement and math learning gains for the same group, went from 93% to 82%. One question we have is whether the change from Envision to Eureka in some grades and not all classes in those grades made an impact. We also looked at the cohorts and number of multi racial students who were in the out going 6th grade. In 18-19, 5 of 18 multi racial students scored a level 1 or 2 and in 17-18, 4 of 20 scored a level 1 or 2.

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.

All of our scores were above state average. The area where we scored closer to the state average was in ELA Learning Gains of 58% State, 68% OBE. In 18-19, we focused on the top 50% of level two's in order to increase our learning gains as the previous year we were below the State average.

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

We saw the most growth in ELA Lowest 25%. To address this, we offered training on MTSS, tiered interventions, decision trees and the resource links in them, the IPG/Achieve the Core documents, and refocused lesson objectives to standards. We also addressed our SMART time (interventions) and regularly reinforced what SMART looked like. This continues to be a work in process.

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

We have concerns for this year with the pandemic, the variety of learning options (e-learners, brick & mortar), tracking attendance, and the changes to the learning environment with social distancing, masks, etc... Many parents are changing from campus to e-learning and vice versa which makes it difficult to provide consistency in instruction and track student attendance & performance.

In looking at the iReady beginning of the year cohort data, we have seen a decrease in students scoring in the green range on the BOY benchmark than the same group of students started the previous year.
Grade 19-20 20-21

1st (k) 1st
Green 79 27
Yellow 21 73
Red 0 0

2nd (1st) (2nd)
Green 23 30
Yellow 74 57
Red 3 13

3rd (2nd) (3rd)
Green 37 70
Yellow 58 17
Red 6 13

4th (3rd) (4th)
Green 81 62
Yellow 17 34
Red 1 5

5th (4th) (5th)

Green 55 57
Yellow 45 36
Red 0 8

6th (5th) (6th)
Green 52 59
Yellow 34 18
Red 14 23

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

1. SWD subgroup- ELA & math
2. Lowest 25% ELA & math
3. ELA learning gains
4. Economically disadvantaged students
5. Parent engagement during a pandemic

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In 17-18, OBE was targeted for support and intervention by the State for our SWD subgroup. While we made great gains from 29% to 51% in 18-19, our SWD population performs well below that of their typical peers. iReady data: 19% (12 of 62) of students with disabilities dropped in iReady ELA scores from winter to fall. 32% (20 of 62) of SWD students dropped in iReady math scores from winter to fall.
Measurable Outcome:	We will increase ELA and proficiency for SWD students by 5% (ELA 51% to 56% and math 56% to 61%). While we saw a 22% jump from 2018 to 2019 in ELA and 30% in math, we chose 5% based on a number of factors: 1) It isn't reasonable to expect such large jumps a second time, 2) Our students were distance learning for 3 months in the 2020 school year, and our benchmark data shows regression of skills, and 3) Some of our SWD students are e-learning which is not the typical classroom environment for strength of services.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Shelley Michaud (michaud.shelley@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	-ESE teachers will provide push in services for ELA & math, particularly in the intermediate grades, to the maximum extent according to student needs. -SWD students will be provided tiered interventions according to the MTSS process and decision trees. -SWD students will complete 45 mins. per week on their iReady MyPath. -ESE & Gen ed. teachers will meet to analyze student data, discuss student growth, differentiate materials, and team plan. -Scaffolding of instruction to fill gaps. -Standards Mastery (i-Ready)- teachers will adhere to standards focus document and pacing guides. -Staff will continue to develop tasks which are aligned to the goal standard. We worked on this last year with the IPG and need to continue to assess standards alignment.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These strategies assisted us in not be TS&I by the State in 2019, and with the pandemic, we feel continuing to build on them will allow us to maintain that growth.

Action Steps to Implement

-Tiered interventions during SMART (intervention time).
-Scaffolding of instruction to fill gaps.
-Standards Mastery (i-Ready)- teachers will adhere to standards focus document and pacing guides.
-Observations looking for task alignment with standard

Person Responsible	Elizabeth Hill-Brodigan (hill-brodigan.elizabeth@brevardschools.org)

-Schedule ESE and gen ed. teams to allow for push in services as appropriate.
-Scaffolding of instruction to fill gaps.
-Standards Mastery (i-Ready)- teachers will adhere to standards focus document and pacing guides.
-Observations looking for task alignment with standard

Person Responsible	Shelley Michaud (michaud.shelley@brevardschools.org)

-Target top 50% of level 2's for learning gains
-Performance Matters data shared at regular data meetings to target learning gains.

Person Responsible	Francine Del Vecchio (delvecchio.francine@brevardschools.org)

-Completion of 45 mins. per week/per subject on iReady MyPath.
-Standards mastery (i-Ready) analysis.

Person Responsible	Francine Del Vecchio (delvecchio.francine@brevardschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Approximately, 15% of our student population is identified as SWD. The number of students identified has steadily increased over the past few years. We will start with reinforcing our core instructional program, standards based instruction, IPG, MTSS practices, tiered interventions, and differentiation techniques.
Measurable Outcome:	Strengthening standards based instruction, tiered interventions (MTSS), and differentiation techniques will fill instructional gaps as intended to maintain our SWD percentage at 15% and see a reduction over the next couple of years.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Shelley Michaud (michaud.shelley@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	-ESE teachers who push in to ELA & math will support gen ed. teachers in differentiating instructions, providing targeted support/interventions, and share accommodations. -All students will be provided tiered interventions according to the MTSS process and decision trees. -All students will complete 45 mins. per week on their iReady MyPath. -ESE & gen ed. teachers will meet to analyze student data, discuss student growth, differentiate materials, and team plan to address the needs of all learners. -Administrators will continue to focus on standards & IPG alignment when looking at lesson objectives and student work.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This year, we added an ESE resource teacher to assist with the steady increase in the number of students in need of services. This has made us look further at our core instruction and intervention practices to address the gaps. Typically, when a large number of students are being identified as ESE, it's not a tier 2 & 3 problem, it's a tier 1/core instruction issue.

Action Steps to Implement

-Tiered interventions during SMART (intervention time). IPST/MTSS process/form completion/data tracking.
-Observations will include looking for evidence of standards mastery (i-Ready) & adherence to standards focus document and pacing guides.
-Observations will include looking for tasks which are aligned to the goal standard/IPG.

Person Responsible	Elizabeth Hill-Brodigan (hill-brodigan.elizabeth@brevardschools.org)

-Completion of 45 mins. per week/per subject on iReady MyPath
-Standards mastery regular data review.

Person Responsible	Francine Del Vecchio (delvecchio.francine@brevardschools.org)

-PLC meetings to review standards alignment and focus with staff. Continued practice with aligning tasks with standards.
-Observations will include looking for evidence of standards mastery (i-Ready) & adherence to standards focus document and pacing guides.
-Observations will include looking for tasks which are aligned to the goal standard/IPG.

Person Responsible	Shelley Michaud (michaud.shelley@brevardschools.org)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Increase the percentage in the lowest 25% who are meeting proficiency in math and ELA.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA and math lowest 25th percentile meeting proficiency will increase from 65% to 68%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	-ESE and gen ed. teachers will co-plan and share differentiation and accommodation strategies & techniques. -All students will be provided tiered interventions according to the MTSS process and decision trees. Heavy focus on decision tree data (forms and data spreadsheet). -All students will complete 45 mins. per week on their iReady MyPath- teachers get weekly reports on the MyPath completion percentage. -ESE & Gen ed. teachers will meet to analyze student data, discuss student growth, differentiate materials, and team plan. -Data teams will track lowest 25%, interventions given, and target learning gains
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Proficiency in ELA and math lowest 25th percentile are our lowest scoring areas. This goal will work in conjunction with the SWD goal, as many SWD students are also in the lowest 25th percentile cohort.

Action Steps to Implement

-Tiered interventions during SMART time.
-Completion of 45 mins. per week/per subject on iReady MyPath- tracked weekly.

Person Responsible	Elizabeth Hill-Brodigan (hill-brodigan.elizabeth@brevardschools.org)

-Target specific learning gains for lowest 25%, looking specifically at the students and their areas for growth- i-
Ready & crosswalk data.

Person Responsible	Shelley Michaud (michaud.shelley@brevardschools.org)

-Standards Mastery (i-Ready) completed and instruction adjusted- Focus on pacing guides and standards focus document.

Person Responsible	Francine Del Vecchio (delvecchio.francine@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.

-Our school has a Facebook page to keep parents informed about events and happenings.
-We send out a monthly newsletter (Dolphin Digest) via BlackBoard.
-Event and other information is sent out via PeachJar.
-PTO (non-pandemic year) is incredibly involved and hosts a variety of family engagement activities throughout
the year.
-Students are recognized with dolphin slips & acknowledgement when the show "Dolphins CARE" (Cooperation,
Achievement, Respect, and Empathy).
-In non-pandemic years, volunteers are welcomed and acknowledged through VOY awards and a breakfast or
luncheon.
-Staff are acknowledged for excellence throughout the year by the PTO and other business partners (breakfasts,
lunch, treats, coffee bar, etc....).
-Staff are regularly acknowledged by administrators kudos notes, "I noticed" notes, shout outs via email, teacher
appreciation week celebrations, small rewards (can of soda, snack, etc...), etc...
-BFT rep and admins have open communication to address issues presented by staff.
-SAC meets monthly to focus on supporting school improvement.

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