Ralph M Williams Junior Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Ralph M Williams Junior Elementary School

1700 CLUBHOUSE DR, Rockledge, FL 32955

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

Demographics

Principal: Susan Schroeder M

Start Date for this Principal: 5/23/2018

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)	41%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: A (63%)
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

Ralph M Williams Junior Elementary School

1700 CLUBHOUSE DR, Rockledge, FL 32955

http://www.williams.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	39%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	38%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	B	B	A	B

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission is to serve every student with excellence as the standard.

Six Conditions for a Glasser Model Quality School:

Quality develops with warm, caring, trusting relationships. Quality is always useful.
Quality is the best everyone can do at the time. Quality always feels good.
Quality is never destructive. Quality can always be improved.

Caring Habits for a Quality School:

Listening – Try to understand the perspective of others; be aware of our perceptions and the perceptions of others.
Supporting – uphold, value, validate; believe in the other person.
Encouraging – See strength in others; have confidence in others.
Respecting – Hold others in high regard; believe in the person.
Trusting – Communicating I care; I am here to help, not to hurt you.
Accepting – See value, work and capability in others.
Negotiating Disagreements – Value the relationship; agree to talk it out; win/win.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Students at Ralph Williams Elementary discover that learning adds quality to their lives.

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
Back, Terrie	Assistant Principal	Curriculum Support, Testing Coordinator, Behavior Management, Observation and Feedback, and MTSS Facilitator.
Webb, Jessica	Instructional Coach	Lesson Modeling, Curriculum Design, Collaborative Planning Facilitator, Data Analysis, and Intervention Design.
Herold, Wesley	Principal	Learning Cycle Facilitation, Communicating Action Plan with Stakeholders, Collaborative Planning Facilitator, Data Analysis, Observation and Feedback, Building School Culture, Connecting with Community and Instructional Coaching.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 5/23/2018, Susan Schroeder M

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

44

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)	41%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: A (63%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A

Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <u>click here</u>.	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
Number of students enrolled	42	62	69	69	74	72	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	447
Attendance below 90 percent	4	12	13	13	18	10	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	2	2	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	8	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	13	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	1	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	67	88	78	80	77	66	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	552
Attendance below 90 percent	5	27	27	29	23	18	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	151
One or more suspensions	0	3	2	1	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	4	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	2	1	1	7	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	9	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
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	67	88	78	80	77	66	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	552
Attendance below 90 percent	5	27	27	29	23	18	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	151
One or more suspensions	0	3	2	1	3	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	4	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	4	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	2	1	1	7	5	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	9	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
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	62%	62%	57%	76%	63%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	65%	60%	58%	65%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	57%	53%	47%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	69%	63%	63%	71%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	64%	65%	62%	53%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%	53%	51%	29%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	64%	57%	53%	75%	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	54%	64%	-10%	58%	-4%
	2018	74%	63%	11%	57%	17%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	62%	61%	1%	58%	4%
	2018	70%	57%	13%	56%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-12%				
05	2019	66%	60%	6%	56%	10%
	2018	64%	54%	10%	55%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
06	2019	69%	60%	9%	54%	15%
	2018	72%	63%	9%	52%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
03	2019	55%	61%	-6%	62%	-7%	
	2018	75%	62%	13%	62%	13%	
Same Grade Comparison		-20%					
Cohort Comparison							
04	2019	83%	64%	19%	64%	19%	
	2018	70%	59%	11%	62%	8%	
Same Grade Comparison		13%					
Cohort Comparison		8%					
05	2019	62%	60%	2%	60%	2%	
	2018	72%	58%	14%	61%	11%	
Same Grade Comparison		-10%					
Cohort Comparison		-8%					
06	2019	73%	67%	6%	55%	18%	
	2018	79%	68%	11%	52%	27%	
Same Grade Comparison		-6%					
Cohort Comparison		1%					

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison	
05	2019	65%	56%	9%	53%	12%	
	2018	70%	57%	13%	55%	15%	
Same Grade Comparison		-5%					
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	24	47	45	39	58	52	33				
ELL	30										
ASN	75			67							
BLK	35	50	58	38	43	38	40				
HSP	62	64		72	71						
MUL	61	86		72	100						
WHT	66	65	55	74	63	41	69				
FRL	52	61	50	60	55	39	36				

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	25	38	39	30	54	38	29				
ASN	92	82		100	91						

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
BLK	46	41	33	42	64	43					
HSP	59	52		65	83						
MUL	82			64							
WHT	73	56	41	78	79	61	69				
FRL	61	55	46	61	74	59	66				

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	39	44	39	37	32	22	50				
ASN	92	73		92	73						
BLK	50	40		50	40						
HSP	68	54		62	32						
MUL	92			58							
WHT	78	67	49	74	56	35	77				
FRL	65	57	37	59	42	35	65				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
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	55
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	485
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
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	71
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	43
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	67
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	80
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	62
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	50
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 proficiency was the lowest performing category. This is reflected in the overall proficiency as well as subgroups. Students with Disabilities, Black/African American, and English Language Learners all performed below 36% proficiency. Whole group instruction has been a main emphasis in prior years. Prior to 2019-2020 data driven small groups have only occurred during RtI. While we focused on professional development and the use of guided reading for stronger data driven small group instruction, FSA was not administered to reflect the growth of the students and staff. iReady data indicates that in Fall 2019 46% of our students scored proficient and in Fall 2020 only 44% of our students scored proficient. Students with disabilities were 24% proficient in Fall 2019 and 25% in Fall 2020. Black/African American students scored 29% proficient in Fall 2019 and 26% in Fall 2020. English Language Learners are not able to be compared this year due to the decrease in our ELL population (3 students).

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

Math learning gains reflected the largest decline from 79% to 64%. In 2017-2018 we implemented Eureka Math curriculum after having historically low performance in math in 2016-2017. Learning gains were extremely high in 2017-2018. While we had a lower percentage of learning gains, 62% is above average from prior years performance. Math learning gains for the lowest 25% also showed a similar rate of decrease from 61% to 48%. The focus of collaborative planning was on ELA, which may have impacted the planning and discussion of math instruction and performance. iReady data comparing Fall 2019 to Fall 2020 showed the greatest decline in overall math proficiency from 28% proficient in 2019 to 2% proficient in 2020. Subgroups showed similar declines. Students with disabilities scored 8% proficient in Fall 2019 and declined to 13% proficient in Fall 2020. Black/African American students scored 19% proficient in Fall 2019 and declined to 13% proficient in Fall 2020. English Language Learners are not able to be compared this year due to the decrease in our ELL population (3 students).

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.

When comparing the performance of our 3rd grade students, in 2019 students performed 4% below the state average for ELA with a proficiency of 54%. 3rd grade students in 2019 also performed 7% below the state average for math with a proficiency of 55%. This cohort of students includes 44% of the grade level representing the subgroup Students With Disabilities (SWD). This cohort also experienced large class sizes which impacted the ability to provide more opportunities for frequent

small group instruction. iReady Overall data indicated that our students are performing higher than the district average (State iReady scores are not available). Ralph Williams students in Fall 2020 scored 45% on grade level, 41% One grade below grade level, and 14% two or more years below grade level. Students in Brevard County in Fall 2020 scored 40% on grade level, 41% one grade below grade level, and 19% two or more years below grade level.

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

ELA Lowest 25% Learning Gains showed the most growth in our school wide data. We increased from 42% in 2017-2018, to 58% in 2018-2019. We conducted quarterly data chats with our Lowest 25% for both ELA and Math. We discussed who was growing and who was struggling and what we could try to include to support them. We also included goal setting for our students in the lowest 25%.

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

Our students in the subgroup Free-Reduced Lunch were suspended at a higher rate than our other subgroups. In 2018-2019 75% of our students that were in the Free-Reduced Lunch subgroup and were suspended also earned a Level 1 in ELA or Math. The Students with Disabilities (SWD) Subgroup also had the highest suspension rate in 2019-2020.

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

1.Subgroup Achievement Performance (Students with Disabilities, Black/African American, and English Language Learners).
2. Increase the quality of the delivery of data based small group instruction during core academic time.
3. Reduce the suspension rate of students in the Free-Reduced Lunch subgroup and ESE subgroup.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students with Disabilities (SWD) continue to be our lowest performing subgroup. Students in this subgroup performed at 24% proficiency for ELA and 39% proficiency for math. When designing small group instruction, it is critical to ensure that students in this subgroup are monitored closely in their performance and included in small group instruction when necessary.
Measurable Outcome:	Students with disabilities (SWD) will improve their proficiency from 24% to 35% in ELA and from 39% to 45% in Math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Wesley Herold (herold.wesley@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Collaborative planning for reviewing complex text, aligning tasks to grade level standards, and analyzing data will support grade level teams in their planning for ELA instruction. Our planning sessions with our instructional coach and administration will include identifying scaffolds to support all learners in access grade level content toward mastery of standards. Guided Reading (Jan Richardson) will also be included as a support for small group instruction based on current student performance during the reading block.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our focus the past few years has been centered around improving core instruction. We saw increased performance from the collaborative planning model, but also experienced some decreases in 2018-2019. Students with Disabilities (SWD) continues to under-perform compared to other subgroups. With a proficiency of 24% in ELA and 39% in math, our students with disabilities require additional planning for scaffolding and small group support to help them progress on grade level standards. We used the research provided in the book "The Next Step Forward in Guided Reading" by Jan Richardson to support our focus for small group in ELA. We also have used a variety of resources from TNTP and our District Training for scaffolding instruction for all learners to support our planning sessions and professional development.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Analyze data from iReady diagnostic and foundational skill assessments
2. Provide professional development for Guided Reading structures (Refresher)
3. Establish learning cycle calendar to support collaborative planning organization
4. Establish progress monitoring schedule and data analysis meetings
5. Administer Standards Mastery assessments according learning cycle calendar
6. Analyze data from Standards Mastery Assessments and foundational skill assessments
7. Design lessons for re-teach and provide additional scaffolding as needed.

Person Responsible	Wesley Herold (herold.wesley@brevardschools.org)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students in the subgroup Black/African American performed at 35% proficiency in ELA and 38% proficiency in math in 2018-2019. While there were positive learning gains, the subgroup is still has a federal index of 43% which is close to the 41% benchmark monitored by the state for ESSA. When designing small group instruction, it is critical to ensure that students in this subgroup are monitored closely in their performance and included in small group instruction when necessary.
Measurable Outcome:	Students in the subgroup Black/African American will improve their proficiency from 35% to 43% in ELA and from 38% to 43% in Math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Wesley Herold (herold.wesley@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Collaborative planning for reviewing complex text, aligning tasks to grade level standards, and analyzing data will support grade level teams in their planning for ELA instruction. Our planning sessions with our instructional coach and administration will include identifying scaffolds to support all learners in access grade level content toward mastery of standards. Guided Reading (Jan Richardson) will also be included as a support for small group instruction based on current student performance during the reading block.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our focus the past few years has been centered around improving core instruction. We saw increased performance from the collaborative planning model, but also experienced some decreases in 2018-2019. The Black/African American subgroup continues to perform close to the threshold of 41% as established as a guideline for ESSA. With a proficiency of 35% in ELA and 38% in math, our students in this subgroup require additional planning for scaffolding and small group support to help them progress on grade level standards. We used the research provided in the book "The Next Step Forward in Guided Reading" by Jan Richardson to support our focus for small group in ELA. We also have used a variety of resources from TNTP and our District Training for scaffolding instruction for all learners to support our planning sessions and professional development.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Analyze data from iReady diagnostic and foundational skill assessments
2. Provide professional development for Guided Reading structures (Refresher)
3. Establish learning cycle calendar to support collaborative planning organization
4. Establish progress monitoring schedule and data analysis meetings
5. Administer Standards Mastery assessments according learning cycle calendar
6. Analyze data from Standards Mastery Assessments and foundational skill assessments
7. Design lessons for re-teach and provide additional scaffolding as needed.

Person Responsible	Wesley Herold (herold.wesley@brevardschools.org)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In an effort to help support the social and emotional needs of students at Ralph Williams, we have shifted additional focus and training to improving Tier 1 instruction. Student mental and emotional health has a significant impact on their ability to perform academically. Our students with Free-Reduced Lunch (FRL) and Students With Disabilities (SWD) are suspended at a greater rate than other subgroups. Last year we had 36% of suspensions were for Students with Disabilities (SWD). 54% of suspensions were from the subgroup Free-Reduced Lunch (FRL). Both of these percentages were greater than their percentage relation to the school population.
Measurable Outcome:	The Students with Disabilities (SWD) subgroup will reduce suspensions below 24% in 2019-2020. The Free-Reduced Lunch (FRL) subgroup will reduce suspensions below 30% in 2019-2020.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Terrie Back (back.terrie@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Ralph Williams entire staff are participating in professional development for Conscious Discipline by Dr. Becky Bailey. This course is a 10 hour series of webinars that our lead teachers are guiding our staff through with conversation and practice on the new approach of classroom management and relationship building. In addition, to support our Tier 1 social emotional instruction is the implementation of Sanford Harmony. The guidance counselor is providing Trauma-informed Classroom training to our instructional staff as well.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Conscious Discipline was selected as a whole school initiative because of the connections it has to the work of Quality School with Dr. William Glasser. Over half of our staff was trained in Quality School and a large focus is on building the whole child. We had a team of 10 teachers participate in training this summer with Dr. Becky Bailey for Conscious Discipline to organize this initiative. The modules were purchased to be able to train the rest of the staff throughout the school year.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Select 10 members for the Conscious Discipline Cadre
2. Purchase the virtual training platform and resources for Conscious Discipline
3. Conscious Discipline professional development opportunities are planned for the year to support implementation.
4. Teacher leaders guide debrief sessions for each module. Discussions include opportunities for teachers to share what is working well and next steps.
5. Teachers have established a timeline to implement lessons from the Sanford Harmony curriculum to support their students' social-emotional needs. These lessons are also supported by the school Guidance Counselor.

Person Responsible	Terrie Back (back.terrie@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

All areas of focus have been included in the School Improvement Plan.

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.

Parents are included in ongoing feedback on school based performance and needs assessment through monthly Mocha Monday meetings with administration and the SRO (Virtually this year). They also have a portion of the agenda for open comment for School Advisory Council meetings and PTO meetings (Virtually this year). Annually we conduct a parent survey to provide feedback on all areas of school operations.

Our Partners in Education program has continued to grow with new partnerships with community organizations and businesses. We have been able to share our areas of focus with them and see how they could help support our students in accomplishing our school goals.

In January 2020, students at Ralph Williams participated in the Youth Truth Survey. Students felt the strongest themes were in our Culture and Instructional Methods. This supports the initiatives that have been in place with a focus on the whole child as well as a commitment to ongoing professional development. Students also felt our school could improve in engagement and academic rigor. Further data supports their lower rating for academic rigor was in relation to homework. This data will be communicated to our grade level teams and used to influence our collaborative planning efforts when selecting assignments. In response, students will feel a greater connection to their extra practice opportunities.

In focusing on the culture of our school, 2020 Insight Survey data indicated a significant gap between the district average and the ratings of our staff in relation to Peer Culture. Our professional development of Conscious Discipline is designed to support the adult interactions first to be a model for the students. Our learning cycles with collaborative planning have also been strengthened to support team growth and support from administration and the instructional coach. Our hope is that these efforts will continue to improve the working relationships for each team as well as the ancillary staff supporting students through inclusion and other services.

Parents shared through the 2019-2020 parent survey that they would like more opportunities to participate in meetings related to school decisions. Most of our meetings, whether in the morning, after school, or evening are not inclusive of all parents' schedules. Due to COVID we have seen great feedback from our virtual meetings. We are holding all Mocha Monday, School Advisory, and PTO meetings through Zoom. Parents that are working have been more available to participate if they desire.

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

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: African-American	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00