Gemini Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Gemini Elementary School

2100 OAK ST, Melbourne Beach, FL 32951

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

Demographics

Principal: Christina Carver T

Start Date for this Principal: 9/14/2020

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)	21%
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (70%) 2015-16: A (72%)
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

Gemini Elementary School

2100 OAK ST, Melbourne Beach, FL 32951

http://www.gemini.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	21%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	11%

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.

Investing in every child, every day in every way.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Gemini community is dedicated to preparing today's students for tomorrow's launch to success.

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
Crissey-Akil, Natasha	Instructional Coach	Serve as School Advisory Co-Chair for SIP design and analysis Design agendas and guide monthly Instructional Planning for Student Growth (IPSG) Meetings Complete the Coaching Cycle and model standards-aligned instructional techniques Use i-Ready student data for goal setting and on-going progress monitoring Serve on the Individual Problem-Solving Team (IPST) to design student specific interventions based on the problem-solving model (academic and behavior)
Julian, Jennifer	Principal	Design master schedules to provide school-wide intervention and collaborative planning time Attend monthly IPSG grade level meetings to ensure standards-aligned lesson design based on student data Budget and allocate funds to support standards-aligned teacher/student materials and resources Collaborate with Parent Teacher Organization to develop fundraising opportunities to maintain funding Conduct classroom observations to provide teachers with continuous feedback on instructional practices
O'Brien, Erin	Teacher, K-12	Serve as School Advisory Co-Chair for SIP design and analysis Attend national math conference and train teachers on best practices in math acquisition Serve as school math curriculum leadership team to guide teachers through mathematical practices and lesson design
Rosado, Christine	Assistant Principal	Conduct classroom observations to provide teachers with continuous feedback on instructional practices Serve on the Individual Problem-Solving Team (IPST) to design student specific interventions based on the problem-solving model (academic and behavior) Provide curriculum updates and resources based on district pacing and sequence guides

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 9/14/2020, Christina Carver T

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.*

2

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

36

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)	21%
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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: A (66%) 2016-17: A (70%) 2015-16: A (72%)
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	54	70	49	61	63	56	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	429
Attendance below 90 percent	0	6	1	2	3	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/14/2020

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	65	58	71	59	67	85	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	470
Attendance below 90 percent	17	12	27	13	18	22	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	133
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	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	5	7	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	15	10	24	12	14	15	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	107

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	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	65	58	71	59	67	85	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	470
Attendance below 90 percent	17	12	27	13	18	22	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	133
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	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	5	7	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	15	10	24	12	14	15	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	107

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	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	83%	62%	57%	83%	63%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	68%	60%	58%	62%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	57%	53%	53%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	87%	63%	63%	84%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	81%	65%	62%	70%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	71%	53%	51%	59%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	75%	57%	53%	82%	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	91%	64%	27%	58%	33%
	2018	89%	63%	26%	57%	32%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	84%	61%	23%	58%	26%
	2018	75%	57%	18%	56%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	73%	60%	13%	56%	17%
	2018	68%	54%	14%	55%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
06	2019	77%	60%	17%	54%	23%
	2018	89%	63%	26%	52%	37%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	86%	61%	25%	62%	24%
	2018	87%	62%	25%	62%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	83%	64%	19%	64%	19%
	2018	75%	59%	16%	62%	13%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	81%	60%	21%	60%	21%
	2018	67%	58%	9%	61%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
06	2019	90%	67%	23%	55%	35%
	2018	100%	68%	32%	52%	48%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		23%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	73%	56%	17%	53%	20%
	2018	68%	57%	11%	55%	13%
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	63	61	57	71	67	65					
HSP	100	50		82	60						
WHT	82	69	65	87	81	70	74				
FRL	81	67	92	83	74	57	79				
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	49	38	43	63	42	40	31				
HSP	100			100							
MUL	77	80		77	50						
WHT	80	60	51	82	62	48	67				
FRL	70	69	61	70	55	40	50				
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	48	47	44	43	53	52					
MUL	86	67		93	67						
WHT	82	62	53	83	70	58	80				
FRL	67	57	43	68	56	53					

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

ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	76
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	530
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	64
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	73
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Hispanic Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	76
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.

This is data is a reflection of the 2018-2019 school year as there was no FSA for the 2019-2020 school year.
The data component showing the lowest performance on the FSA ELA is the subgroup, Lowest 25%. In 2018, 54% of our Lowest 25% made gains. In 2019, 65% of students in the Lowest 25%, again, made gains. This increase of 11% continues the upward trend that began in 2017. We believe the school wide focus on text-based writing, FSA aligned rubrics and impartial scoring of two practice assessments led to this increase for all of
Gemini in 2019.

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

Gemini reports no declines from the prior 2018-2019 school year.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

In evaluating the Learning Gains for ELA, Gemini showed only a 10 point gain over the state gain. We see a trend in our data starting when text-based writing is assessed. Starting in 2019-2020 school year, our school, in entirety, created cohesive language and assessments for writing, beginning in kindergarten and continuing throughout sixth grade. Grade level teams are meeting twice a month to problem solve and discuss common formative assessments for ELA and Math standards.

During the 2020-2021 school year teams will continue to meet, reflect and discuss achievement gaps for chosen priority standards per quarter.

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

The data component showing the most improved performance was on the FSA Math, in the Lowest 25% subgroup. In 2018, 49% of our Lowest 25% made gains. In 2019, 71% of students in the Lowest 25% made gains. This is an increase of 22%. We believe the school wide focus on understanding math question types and increasing mathematical discourse between students led to this increase for all of Gemini in 2019. We will continue to focus on these best practices to ensure that students continue to gain a deeper understanding of mathematics. Teachers will meet with our instructional coach and leadership to discuss the priority standards and create alignment school wide.

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

Students with two or more EWS is at 1%.

Consistently, attendance is a EWS currently at 5% of our students have attendance below 90%.This is consistent across grade levels.

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

1.Continue to grow the conceptual foundation of mathematical practice by providing collaborative math discourse, purposeful questioning, building procedural fluency and supporting productive struggle.
2.Continue to incorporate explicit vocabulary instruction as well as responding to comprehensive questions in literature and informational text using text-based evidence.
3. Grade levels are learning to prioritize standards by using data to better understand the depth and create and select common formative assessments that will guide instruction.
4.Teachers and Leadership are given the opportunity to participate in PD to engage in reading competencies to ensure literacy is a focus at Gemini.
5.Built into the master schedule is incorporated daily time of teacher-led instruction of social and emotional opportunities as well as child safety curricula. PD training in social and emotional learning and trauma awareness is on-going throughout the year.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Results on the 2018-2019 FSA ELA Text-based writing domain computed to a mean of 6.07, for grades 4-6. This is an increase from the previous year, but signifies an opportunity for growth.
Measurable Outcome:	Our desired outcome for the 2020 FSA ELA text-based writing domain is 6.5-7.0 out of a possible total of ten. We will also complete two practice writing assessments for K-6. By the second assessment, we will be looking for an average of 6.5-7.0 out of a total of ten.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Natasha Crissey-Akil (crissey-akil.natasha@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Timely feedback providing one on one student conferences leading to meaningful opportunities for growth is our evidence-based strategy taken from the work of Grant Wiggins.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	One on one student conferences with instructors will provide individualized reinforcement or enrichment of writing skills based on student friendly rubrics. Students, then, will be able to effectively goal set and describe how to reach their personal goals.
	The use of Write Score/iReady Toolbox Writing Component, provides a wealth of text-based lessons, designed to target specific areas of need identified from formative assessments and allows for interrater reliability of scoring.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Reviewing the Writing Rubric with K-6 teachers
2. Identify grade level strengths and weaknesses to inform teaching
3. Ongoing teacher assessments using writing rubrics to provide feedback (ex: ATU, CIS, DBQ, etc) (October- April)
4. Provide base-line formative writing assessment in October/November 2020 for Grades 2-6.
5. Results reviewed by grade levels during instructional Planning for Student Growth meetings.
6. Teachers will conferences with individual students for strengths and opportunities for growth and set future writing goals in specific domains.
7. Grades 4-6 will take their second formative writing assessment in February, and spend March and April fine tuning their areas of need.
8. K-3 will take their second formative assessment in April, and spend the rest of the year conferencing with students to fine tune writing and continue to apply systematic evidence based strategies.

Person Responsible	Christine Rosado (rosado.christine@brevardschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	At Gemini, we want to offer high quality, common formative and summative assessments that align to our standards and lead to intentional planning based on data.
Measurable Outcome:	For grades K-1, the measure indicating achievement will be the Ready MAFS End of Unit assessment. For grades 2-6, the measure indicating achievement will be our i-Ready Standards Mastery Assessments for the Priority Standards decided by the grade levels teams during the Instructional Planing for Student Growth meetings. We expect an increase on iReady EOY Math Diagnostic to be 60-70% or higher then our BOY iReady Math Diagnostic. Historically, we have seen a 30% gain in Tier 1 data from BOY to MOY, therefore due to the gaps that have occurred, we are aiming for a 60-70% proficiency.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Natasha Crissey-Akil (crissey-akil.natasha@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategy used will be standards based planning. This is based on Robert Marzano's The Essential Model for Achieving Rigor.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The strategy of standards-based planning for, per quarter, priority standards will help teachers develop criteria for success aligned to standards, create standards-based instruction in their classrooms, and set conditions for student success. Standard-based planning will influence all the other components of standards based instruction. Planning lessons and units that are built on instructional standards and standard-aligned assessments is the imperative first step for teachers. (Marzano article)

Action Steps to Implement

1. Leadership and Instruction coach required grade level teams to determine two priority standards that are critical to student success. This will be for each quarter.
2. Grade level teams will meet monthly to discuss the selected priority standards and fill out the "Understanding and Pre-Planning Form".
3. Grade levels teams will review the common formative assessment (K-1: End of Unit assessment - Ready Books) and (2-6: Standards Mastery on iReady).
4. Review assessment data, look for trends and update the "Understanding and Pre-Planning Form". Curriculum Leadership teams (with instructional coach) will support implementation through their monthly Instructional Planning for Student Growth meetings to review and map math standards in grade level teams.
5. Leadership Team will look at school-wide trends on the selected priority standards per grades during bi-weekly meetings.
6. Leadership Team will do walkthroughs and provide feedback using the IPG tool.

Person Responsible	Christine Rosado (rosado.christine@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

At the semester marks, teachers will complete Competencies 1 and 2 using the Reading Observation Checklist with support of our Instructional coach.

For our Social and Emotional Priority, we will have on-going PD during facility meetings where signature rosters will be collected for will be take as well as counselor will provide assistants in classrooms to ensure the Stanford Harmony lessons are bring carried out with fidelity.

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.

Gemini has an active participating PTO and SAC that meet once a month.

We teach and discuss school-wide character education with a different character taught and celebrated each month.

This 2020-2021 school year, we are implementing the Sanford Harmony curriculum which supports the Social and Emotional side of our students.

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