

Brevard Public Schools

Sherwood Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| School Demographics | 3 |
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement | 18 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 25 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Sherwood Elementary School

2541 POST RD, Melbourne, FL 32935

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

Demographics

Principal: Sandra Marines K

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

| | |
|--|---|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-6 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2019-20 Title I School | Yes |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: C (51%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southeast |
| Regional Executive Director | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | N/A |

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 12 |
| Planning for Improvement | 18 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Sherwood Elementary School

2541 POST RD, Melbourne, FL 32935

<http://www.sherwood.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 | 72% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 44% |

School Grades History

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

Sherwood Elementary School, in partnership with our community and families, will strive to provide a rigorous and nurturing learning environment which fosters respect, responsibility, and safety.
Reviewed and updated August 2019.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Sherwood is to build a high trust collaborative culture that meets the academic and social emotional needs of all students. Reviewed and updated August 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 |
|--------------------|---------------------|---|
| Marines, Sandra | Principal | The principal, Sandra Marines, is the instructional leader of the school. She focuses on academic excellence for all students and provides a common vision for school improvement and action steps. Ms. Marines leads the Leadership Team with an active role in data-based decision-making and engages stakeholders in collaboration with their school community. Ms. Marines facilitates learning through the use of high quality, standards-aligned materials, intentional teacher planning sessions, and monitors student data. She fosters instructional coaching to build educator capacity, focuses on student performance and individual learning needs, cultivates social-emotional development and a safe learning environment. In accordance with the Brevard Public Schools Strategic Plan 2020-2025, Mr. Marines is devoted to increasing academic excellence, building an exceptional workforce, growing community connections, and continued operational sustainability. |
| McDonough, Adrea | Assistant Principal | Adrea McDonough supports all aspects of school improvement. She leads the work of the MTSS development and ensures all aspects of intervention are implemented with fidelity. In accordance with the Brevard Public Schools Strategic Plan 2020-2025, Mrs. McDonough is devoted to increasing academic excellence, building an exceptional workforce, growing community connections, and continued operational sustainability. |
| Winslow, Anita | School Counselor | Anita Winslow provides support for healthy social and emotional development strategies and programs and is the lead facilitator for the Positive Behavior Interventions and Support (PBIS) program. She ensures compliance for the ESOL and ESE programs. Mrs. Winslow facilitates the MTSS/IPST process and provides support services to parents, teachers, and students throughout the intervention process. |
| Johnson, Shyrl | Teacher, ESE | Shyrl Johnson ensures ESE students IEPs are implemented with fidelity. She analyzes our behavior data and chairs the School Advisory Committee. |
| Caddell, Rachel | Teacher, K-12 | Rachel Caddell is the Gifted Instructor, serves on the Leadership Team, and is an interventionist. She ensures School Improvement Plan action steps and goals are being carried out for all stakeholders. Mrs. Caddell monitors student progress and analyzes data which provides interventions to the lowest 25th percentile in reading and math. In addition, Ms. Caddell supports Parent and Family Engagement events and other school events. |
| Haffner, Christine | Instructional Coach | Mrs. Haffner is the Literacy Coach and serves as a member of the school Leadership Team. She ensures SIP goals are being carried out for all stakeholders and analyzes data which provides interventions to the lowest 25th percentile in reading. Mrs. Haffner supports building educator capacity in the areas of reading, writing, and focused intervention blocks. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Sandra Marines K

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.*

1

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

39

Demographic Data

| | |
|--|---|
| 2020-21 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-6 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2019-20 Title I School | Yes |
| 2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: B (57%) 2017-18: B (55%) 2016-17: B (56%) 2015-16: C (51%) |
| 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 | 43 | 64 | 46 | 45 | 46 | 41 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 340 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| Course failure in ELA | 2 | 13 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |

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 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 12 |

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 | 13 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/18/2020

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 | 55 | 69 | 55 | 48 | 52 | 61 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 392 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 2 | 13 | 10 | 1 | 7 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 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 | 8 | 15 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |

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 | 2 | 11 | 10 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |

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 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

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 | 55 | 69 | 55 | 48 | 52 | 61 | 52 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 392 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 2 | 13 | 10 | 1 | 7 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 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 | 8 | 15 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |

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 | 2 | 11 | 10 | 1 | 5 | 3 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |

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 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

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 | 69% | 62% | 57% | 58% | 63% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 67% | 60% | 58% | 62% | 60% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 50% | 57% | 53% | 43% | 52% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 56% | 63% | 63% | 61% | 64% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 60% | 65% | 62% | 68% | 62% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 39% | 53% | 51% | 50% | 52% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 59% | 57% | 53% | 49% | 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 | 67% | 64% | 3% | 58% | 9% |
| | 2018 | 69% | 63% | 6% | 57% | 12% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 71% | 61% | 10% | 58% | 13% |
| | 2018 | 53% | 57% | -4% | 56% | -3% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 18% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 59% | 60% | -1% | 56% | 3% |
| | 2018 | 56% | 54% | 2% | 55% | 1% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 6% | | | | |
| 06 | 2019 | 72% | 60% | 12% | 54% | 18% |
| | 2018 | 58% | 63% | -5% | 52% | 6% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 14% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 16% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 53% | 61% | -8% | 62% | -9% |
| | 2018 | 66% | 62% | 4% | 62% | 4% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -13% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 59% | 64% | -5% | 64% | -5% |
| | 2018 | 52% | 59% | -7% | 62% | -10% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -7% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 42% | 60% | -18% | 60% | -18% |
| | 2018 | 45% | 58% | -13% | 61% | -16% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -10% | | | | |
| 06 | 2019 | 64% | 67% | -3% | 55% | 9% |
| | 2018 | 67% | 68% | -1% | 52% | 15% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 19% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2019 | 53% | 56% | -3% | 53% | 0% |
| | 2018 | 66% | 57% | 9% | 55% | 11% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -13% | | | | |
| 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 | 41 | 59 | 50 | 25 | 41 | 50 | 33 | | | | |
| ELL | 70 | 77 | | 50 | 77 | | | | | | |
| ASN | 90 | | | 100 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 57 | 56 | 45 | 38 | 44 | | 27 | | | | |
| MUL | 72 | 62 | | 53 | 69 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 73 | 70 | 50 | 61 | 64 | 44 | 67 | | | | |
| FRL | 62 | 63 | 52 | 46 | 49 | 29 | 39 | | | | |
| 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 | 32 | 43 | 43 | 29 | 32 | 21 | | | | | |
| ELL | 54 | 82 | | 54 | 45 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 43 | 40 | | 38 | | | | | | | |

| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| HSP | 50 | 48 | | 40 | 39 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 65 | 55 | | 63 | 40 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 64 | 52 | 50 | 63 | 61 | 40 | 70 | | | | |
| FRL | 53 | 44 | 41 | 48 | 44 | 25 | 65 | | | | |
| 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 | 41 | 57 | 38 | 29 | 41 | 18 | | | | | |
| ELL | 31 | 30 | | 54 | 82 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 35 | 47 | | 45 | 53 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 42 | 43 | | 47 | 73 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 50 | 67 | | 47 | 69 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 63 | 67 | 46 | 65 | 68 | 56 | 50 | | | | |
| FRL | 51 | 58 | 40 | 52 | 69 | 52 | 35 | | | | |

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 | 63 |
| 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 | 100 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 500 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| 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 | 75 |
| 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 | 95 |
| 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 | |
| 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 | 52 |
| 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 | 64 |
| 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 | 61 |
| 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 | 55 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

In 2019, Sherwood's lowest performing data component was Math. Overall, math achievement fell from 60% proficient to 56% proficient. This data reflects a downward trend in Sherwood's mathematics performance since 2017 (69% proficient).

In 2019, the lowest performance area in math was the Lowest 25th percentile where only 39% of our students scored proficiently. Sherwood students performed 14% behind the district (53% proficient) and 12% behind the state (51% proficient).

In addition, only 38% of Sherwood's Hispanic subgroup scored proficiently. This presents a 19% achievement gap in comparison to the state's FSA math average of 57% proficiency for Hispanic students. There is a 23% gap between Sherwood students in the white subgroup (61% proficient) and Hispanic subgroup (38% proficient).

Only 25% of Sherwood's SWD students scored proficiently. This illustrates a 7% achievement gap compared to the state's FSA math average of 32% proficiency for the SWD subgroup. There is a 36% performance gap between Sherwood students in the white subgroup (61% proficient) and SWD subgroup (25% proficient).

During 2020, the Math iReady Diagnostic revealed only 25% of Sherwood students in grades 1-6 earned proficient scores. This year, teachers are challenged with closing existing math achievement gaps along with eLearning/COVID gaps.

Contributing factors include:

- *Lack of analyzing diagnostic data for ESSA subgroups
- *Lack of utilizing district pacing guides- addressing key math standards
- *Understanding skill deficits of students in ESSA subgroups
- *Need professional development on standards-aligned instruction and scaffolding
- *School-closure (loss of brick and mortar learning) due to COVID-19

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

Due to COVID-19 and lack of new assessments, 2019 data is referenced here.

Science showed the largest decline with a 10% drop from 69% proficient in 2018 to only 59% proficient in 2019.

According to SSA results in 2019, only 59% of Sherwood's 5th grade students scored proficiently in comparison to 57% district proficiency and 53% state proficiency.

ESSA data indicates the greatest achievement gap for Sherwood's Hispanic population. In 2019, only 27% of Sherwood's Hispanic subgroup earned a level 3 or above on the SSA. This Hispanic subgroup presents the greatest achievement gap (-36%) in comparison to the state's average of 63% proficiency for 5th grade students on the SSA.

During the 2020 school year, the district science pre-test showed that Sherwood's 5th grade students scored an average of 50% on state science standards. This data highlights the existing achievement gap along with the eLearning/COVID learning loss as a result of school closures.

Several factors contributed to the decline:

- *Lack of aligned standards-based instruction in Science
- *Limited review of Zoo School Standards and previous learning
- *Scarce hands-on, exploratory lab opportunities for students
- *Need to increase Domain Specific vocabulary instruction during Science
- *Need Professional Development on the following topics:
 - *5E Instructional Model: A Learning Cycle Approach for Inquiry-Based Science Teaching,
 - *CER Framework: Claim, Evidence, and Reasoning framework
 - *Study Island-technology use in lessons

This year, teachers are challenged with providing instruction addressing key science standards and vocabulary and closing eLearning/COVID-19 gaps through scaffolded instruction and hands-on science labs and reteach.

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 2019, Sherwood's Math Lowest 25th percentile group showed the greatest gap between the school and state average (-12%). A deeper look at ESSA subgroups and math achievement indicates performance discrepancies for Sherwood's Hispanic and SWD population.

Only 38% of Sherwood's Hispanic subgroup (grades 3-6) earned a level 3 or above on the Math FSA. This presents a 19% achievement gap in comparison to the state's FSA math average of 57% proficiency for the Hispanic subgroup.

Additionally, only 25% of Sherwood's students in the SWD subgroup (grades 3-6) scored a level 3 or above on the Math FSA in 2019. This presents a 7% achievement gap in comparison to the state's FSA math average of 32% proficiency for the SWD subgroup.

Components that led to the decrease:

- *Lack of utilizing district pacing guides - addressing key math standards
- *Lack of small group instruction and math research-based interventions
- *Lack of analyzing diagnostic data for ESSA subgroups
- *Lack of consistent monitoring and understanding of ESSA subgroup performance (skill deficits)
- *Need for professional development on standards-aligned mathematics instruction
- *Need to prioritize math interventions and strategically group students to maximize learning
- *During 2019-2020, school-closures (loss of brick and mortar learning opportunities) and limited success with distance learning contributed to additional gaps for students in the Lowest 25th percentile in math

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

According to the 2019 ELA FSA, Sherwood's data component showing the most improvement was ELA Learning Gains increasing from 52% in 2018 to 67% learning gains in 2019. This data reflects a 15% increase in learning gains for Sherwood students. In addition, Sherwood's overall ELA achievement improved from 61% proficiency in 2018 to 69% proficiency in 2019. Sherwood students exceeded the district's ELA proficiency average of 62% and the state's ELA proficiency average of 57%.

New adopted actions that aided to the increase:

- *Inclusion model was adopted for grades K-6
- *Master schedule and classes were created to best meet the needs of our ESE population
- *Increased progress monitoring and data analyzation for ESSA subgroups
- *Implemented i-Ready in 2018-2019 school year for grades K-6 in the area of ELA
- *Standards-based instruction was implemented with a key focus on collaborative planning
- *Literacy Coach modeled and provided professional development on writing structures: RACES and TEA
- *Instructional Rounds were conducted for all grade levels during the 2018-2019 school year with the focus on the standards-alignment in ELA

In 2019, Champions participated in instructional rounds to continue the focus of standards/task alignment and teacher clarity. Champions collaborated with teachers to provide specific feedback with a focus on equitable learning and a Vision of Excellent Instruction (BPS Strategic Plan Objective 1). Standards Focus Boards were introduced and in early stages of implementation. We believe this instructional focus on ELA standards, task-alignment and complex content/text would continue the positive trend in ELA achievement scores.

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

Primary student retentions are a concern; 13 first grade students were retained for the 2019-2020 academic year. Early literacy is an area of continuous improvement.

Students scoring a level 1 on statewide assessments is a concern. Results on the 2019 FSA show 15% of current 4th graders, 25% of current 5th graders and 28% of current 6th graders scored a level 1 on statewide assessments. Increased referrals for the 2018-2019 school year illustrate a need for intensive support in social-emotional development.

Due to the 2020 COVID-19 school closures, potential areas of concern for the 20-21 academic year include attendance, academic achievement gaps along with unfinished learning, and the necessity for increased social-emotional learning. Social-emotional wellness is the foundation on which children develop and learn. As indicated in the 20-25 District Strategic Plan, Academic Excellence (A3) is the foundation to build equitable support for every student's social, emotional, and behavioral development as a cornerstone to academic success.

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

1. Standards aligned instruction with complex content/tasks in Math, ELA, and Science
2. Lowest 25th percentile group academic performance
3. Social Emotional Learning

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Standards aligned instruction in ELA, Math and Science Rationale

ELA:

As measured by the 2019 ELA FSA, 69% of Sherwood students in grades 3-6 earned a level 3 or above. However, 31% of our students did not score proficiently. In addition, the Lowest 25th percentile remained stagnant and also fell below district and state averages. (Sherwood 50%, District 57% and State 53%)

According to 2020 iReady Diagnostic 1 results, reading performance for Sherwood students in Tier I was 38% compared to 35% in 2019. This data represents a slight increase in overall reading progress. However, cohort data highlighted a significant gap for students in 3rd grade (56% proficient) entering the 4th grade at only 38% proficient. Meeting students' needs through scaffolding is a top priority this year as we address COVID-19/school closure learning gaps.

**Area of
Focus
Description
and
Rationale:**

Math:

Historical evidence based on Sherwood's Math FSA results demonstrates a negative three year trend. (69% proficient in 2017, 60% proficient in 2018, and 56% proficient in 2019)

According to iReady Diagnostic 1, math overall performance decreased from 23% proficient in 2019 to only 21% proficient in 2020. iReady results indicate 62% of our students are in Tier II and 17% of our students are at risk in Tier III. In addition, cohort data illustrates a significant gap for students in 2nd grade (18% proficient in 2019) entering 3rd grade at only 11% proficient. Similarly, students in 4th grade (39% proficient in 2019) entering the 5th grade fell to 34% proficient.

Sherwood's Lowest 25th percentile group demonstrated 39% scoring proficiently (level 3 and above) as measured by the Math FSA, which is below the district average of 53% proficiency and the state average of 51% proficiency.

Science:

Science achievement fell from 69% proficient in 2018 to only 59% proficient in 2019. (Gap -10%)

**Measurable
Outcome:**

*ELA FSA levels 3 and above will increase to 75%, showing a 6% increase on the FSA ELA assessment.

*Math FSA levels 3 and above will increase to 66%, showing a 10% increase from 2019 scores.

*Science will show an increase of 10%, (69% of students earning a level 3 or above on the 20-21 SSA)

**Person
responsible
for
monitoring
outcome:**

Adrea McDonough (mcdonough.adrea@brevardschools.org)

**Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

Implement standards-based instruction, aligned to the depth of the standard in ELA, Math and Science academic areas. Train teachers to utilize the district's Enhanced Standards Focus Documents to ensure grade-level standards are instructed. Keep pace with focus standards embedded in the revised SFDs. Build knowledge by engaging students in current grade level materials, tasks, and assignments that meet the rigor of the standards. Utilize Standards Mastery Assessments as a formative tool to assess student mastery of standards and to plan for re-teach standards. Implement scaffolding in ELA, Math and

Science instruction as a top priority to prepare students to better understand how to access complex content, complex text, and rigorous tasks. Utilize district assessments and iReady diagnostics to monitor student progress. Follow the BPS Elementary Leading and Learning Instructional Agreements 2020-2021, District Strategic Plan 20-25 objective 1: Academic Excellence, and the BPS Vision for Excellent Instruction.

We believe the problem is occurring because of a misalignment of the levels of the standard and task complexity in the areas of ELA, math and science. If task alignment would occur within math, ELA, and science, we believe the learning gains will increase.

**Rationale
for
Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

Stakeholders will focus on providing teacher clarity, professional development, and embedded coaching cycles with an emphasis on grade level standards and task complexity (alignment). Sherwood will engage all students with current grade level materials, tasks, and assignments that meet the rigor of the standards following the BPS Vision for Excellent Instruction.

Due to COVID-19 school closures, this year it is imperative to diagnose students' unfinished learning / achievement gaps and provide accelerated support and learning opportunities. Accelerated learning requires that students consistently receive grade-level materials (complex text), tasks and rigorous assignments aligned to the standards, along with scaffolds that make the work accessible. (TNTP 2020)

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide teacher clarity, PDD, and coaching cycles with an emphasis on grade level standards and task complexity (alignment).
2. Utilize scaffolding strategies (iReady lessons) to support ALL students' access to grade level work and rigorous writing tasks in response to reading.
3. Build vocabulary with a focus on words that are key to text comprehension.
4. Implement school-side intervention block (Target Practice) on the Master Schedule.
5. Interventionists support literacy in K-3 utilizing Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI)
6. Implement the Interactive Read-Aloud (IRA) program in grades K-2 to improve Literacy Skills.
7. Monitor iReady student progress, usage and pass rates with fidelity in ELA and Math.
8. Utilize 2020 CARES Act, ASP, and SAC funds to open a Science//Math lab during school hours.
9. Target at-risk students for 21st Century Learning program (BAS)
10. Monitor Lowest 25th percentile and ESSA subgroups
11. Implement Write Score in grades 3-6.

Person Responsible Sandra Marines (marines.sandra@brevardschools.org)

During the 2020-2021 academic year, Sherwood stakeholders will collaborate with various Academic Parent-Teacher Team (APTT) schools to begin learning about new approaches to support all students in reaching their full academic potential. Our goal is to promote family teacher collaboration to drive student learning and achievement. Sherwood's initial focus is to increase early literacy skills through improved data meetings between school and home. Sherwood teachers and leaders will utilize training to:

1. Review student progress and data
2. Establish academic goals
3. Demonstrate activities and resources to use at home
4. Work with parents from the child's class to build community

Person Responsible Rachel Caddell (caddell.rachel@brevardschools.org)

#2. Other specifically relating to Lowest 25th percentile ELA and Math

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | <p>According to 2019 Math FSA results, the lowest performance area for Sherwood was the Lowest 25th percentile where only 39% of our students scored proficiently. Sherwood's Lowest 25th percentile performed 14% behind the district average (53% proficient) and 12% behind the state average (51% proficient) in math.</p> <p>During 2020, Math i-Ready Diagnostic 1 revealed only 25% of Sherwood students in grades 1-6 earned proficient or on-grade level scores. This year, teachers are challenged with closing existing math achievement gaps along with eLearning/COVID gaps.</p> <p>Based on 2019 ELA FSA results, Sherwood's Lowest 25th percentile performed with 50% proficiency in reading. This data indicates stagnant growth; Sherwood's Lowest 25th percentile scored the same (50% proficient) on the 2018 ELA FSA. In 2019, Sherwood's Lowest 25th percentile performed 7% behind the district (57% proficient) and 3% behind the state (53% proficient) in reading.</p> <p>During 2020, Reading i-Ready Diagnostic 1 revealed only 38% of Sherwood students in grades 1-6 earned proficient or on-grade level scores.</p> |
| Measurable Outcome: | <p>Math Lowest 25th percentile will increase from 39% proficient to 49% proficient</p> <p>ELA Lowest 25th percentile will increase from 50% proficient to 57% proficient</p> |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | <p>Adrea McDonough (mcdonough.adrea@brevardschools.org)</p> |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | <p>Disaggregate data to identify skill deficits in reading and math with consistent focus (progress monitoring) on the Lowest 25th percentile. Utilize scaffolding strategies and design differentiated tasks based on individual student needs.</p> <p>During the 2020-2021 academic year, Grade Level Champions (school leadership team) will use iReady Personalized Instruction data and Personalized Instruction Monitoring Guidance to create an action plan for students, pull small groups/provide individualized instruction (reteach opportunities), conduct goal setting, reflection and data chats, and assist in developing incentives and celebrate student achievements.</p> |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | <p>We believe we did not fully disaggregate data deep enough to understand the needs and skill deficits of the students in the lowest 25th percentile. Therefore, analyzing the data further will give us more detailed information to better differentiate instruction and tasks, which will lead to learning gains.</p> |

Action Steps to Implement

1. Prioritize interventions using a school-wide intervention block -Target Practice- in the master schedule.
2. Utilize district's Enhanced Standards Focus Documents and pacing guides to ensure instruction and tasks meet the rigor of the standards.
3. Determine student understanding of reading/math prerequisites and/or substantial learning gaps based on diagnostic or formative data.
4. Monitor iReady student progress: examine pathways, usage and passing rates.
5. Disaggregate Lowest 25th percentile data collaboratively (item analysis, prerequisites, iReady, running records, DIBELS, DORF, PASI/PSI.)
6. Design differentiated tasks and scaffolding strategies based on individual/small group remediation

needs.

7. Ensure Activity teachers work with Lowest 25th percentile students in ELA and Math during open support blocks.

8. Assign school-based Champions (Instructional Leaders) to collaborate with teachers, monitor MTSS and ensure intervention services are provided with fidelity.

9. Utilize 2020 CARES Act, ASP, and SAC funds to provide additional instructional support (tutoring) for Lowest 25%.

Person Responsible Anita Winslow (winslow.anita@brevardschools.org)

#3. Other specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus-BPS Strategic Plan 20-25, Objective A3: Provide equitable supports in a safe learning environment for every student's social, emotional, and behavioral development.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Social-emotional wellness is the foundation on which children develop and learn. It is the process through which children, and adults, understand and manage emotions, set and achieve positive goals, feel and show empathy for others, establish and maintain positive relationships, and make responsible decisions. Students who receive support for social-emotional learning in schools do better academically, socially, and behaviorally.

Due to the foundational support of this cornerstone to academic success, a specific objective, A3, in the BPS Strategic Plan 20-25 is dedicated that addresses this cornerstone directly.

Due to COVID-19 school closures in 2019-2020, Sherwood stakeholders believe it is imperative to focus on providing equitable supports by prioritizing the social emotional and mental health well-being for all. School re-entry post COVID-19 is multifaceted. In addition to adjustments to physical spaces to ensure the health and safety of our students, BPS recognizes that attention to social emotional health and well-being will be a critical factor to the successful re-opening of schools. Our school community, including students, families and educators are coming from a broad range of at-home pandemic experiences. Students will require carefully structured opportunities to re-acclimate to school routines. Educators will need to utilize approaches welcoming students back and promoting a sense of safety, calm and support.

Fall 2019, Sherwood participated in the Panorama for Social Emotional Learning Survey. The results showed K-2 teachers reported only a 40% rating of students' self-management. This scale includes how well students manage their emotions, thoughts, and behaviors in different situations. Grades 3-6 (self-report) survey indicated only 43% of students were able to clearly describe their feelings.

Measurable Outcome:

January 2020, Sherwood participated in the Youth Truth Survey. The survey targeted student perceptions in terms of engagement, academic rigor, relationships, culture, and instructional methods. Sherwood's highest rated themes were Engagement and Instructional Methods. Our lowest rated theme was Culture; only 11% of our students felt we had a positive school culture in relation to their peers respecting one another.

We need to help students understand concepts of social-emotional self-management and respect for each other.

Utilize Panorama and Youth Truth Surveys:
Increase self-management survey results +20%
Increase culture and peer relationships survey results +20%

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shyrl Johnson (johnson.shyrl@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Sherwood will implement the 2020-2021 BPS Recovery Plan (Social Emotional Learning).

In addition, Sherwood will continue implementing Positive Behavior Interventions and Support (PBIS) with an additional focus on social-emotional wellness.

Stakeholders will focus on school culture and building strong relationships with peers. Students will receive character education lessons one day per week using Sanford Harmony and Second Step curriculum. Some students will receive supplemental instruction in a small groups utilizing Sanford Harmony, Second Step, Zones of Regulation or How Does Your Engine Run? strategies. Teachers will continue to teach school-wide PBIS expectations. Students who exhibit signs of social emotional stress will be referred to the School Counselor. In addition, a School Social Worker, from Lifetime Counseling Center has been assigned to our school to teach social emotional skills to small groups of students during the school day, which is part of the Mental Wellness Pathway.

**Rationale
for
Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

Students who receive support for social-emotional learning in schools do better academically, socially, and behaviorally. Due to the foundational support of this cornerstone to academic success, a specific objective, A3, in the BPS Strategic Plan 20-25 is dedicated that addresses this cornerstone directly.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Implement SEL Explicit Recovery Lessons
2. Utilize Sanford Harmony Curriculum. Weekly, thirty minute lessons will include topics such as: Identifying Feelings, Managing Feelings, Overcoming Obstacles, and Helping Others/Helping Ourselves.
3. Provide Trauma Informed Classroom/Compassion Fatigue -PDD for all faculty
4. Utilize COVID-19 Classroom Meeting Guidance
5. Implement resources and activities from: Daily Strategies to support SEL in classroom routines
6. Present "Stress and Kids" to faculty
7. Review data and screening tools with Problem Solving Teams (IPST, MTSS, Mental Health Pathways)
8. Develop and implement tiered interventions for students who need additional assistance.
9. Intentionally promote supportive adult-student relationships and a sense of belonging.
10. Focus on Positive Behavior Interventions and Support (PBIS) to improve school culture build stronger relationships among students.
11. Refer students who exhibit signs of social-emotional stress to the School Counselor
12. Utilize School Social Worker, from Lifetime Counseling Center to teach social-emotional skills

**Person
Responsible**

Anita Winslow (winslow.anita@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

According to the 2018-2019 BPIE Self-Assessment, Sherwood stakeholders committed to the following priority indicators: all paraprofessionals receive professional development on ways to support SWDs in general education; all special education teachers are collaborative members of the general education curriculum team; learning opportunities and resources are provided to families of SWDs; and Sherwood uses a team decision-making process to ensure SWDs transition to and maintain placement in the least restrictive environment. Through the above priorities, Sherwood regularly monitors progress for goals related to short-and long-term improvement efforts to implement and improve inclusive educational practices. As a result of this work, SWDs are demonstrating proficiency increases in reading. According to the 2018 ELA FSA results, SWDs demonstrated 32% proficiency with 43% illustrating ELA Learning Gains. Through improved inclusive practices during the 2019 academic year, SWDs demonstrated increased proficiency scores. SWDs jumped to 41% proficiency on the ELA FSA with 59% illustrating ELA Learning Gains. Furthermore, SWDs in the Lowest 25th percentile demonstrated growth increasing from 43% earning Learning Gains in 2018 to 50% earning Learning Gains in 2019.

Although SWDs are demonstrating increased proficiency and learning gains in ELA, Mathematic achievement does not indicate the same positive trend. This remains an area in need of continuous improvement. Federal Index for SWDs - 53%. Only 25% of Sherwood's SWD students scored proficiently on the 2019 Math FSA. This illustrates a 7% achievement gap compared to the state's average of 32% proficiency for the SWD subgroup. In 2018, 29% of SWDs demonstrated proficiency on the Math FSA assessment. However, on the 2019 Math FSA, only 25% of SWDs demonstrated proficiency.

In addition, Sherwood stakeholders are monitoring the Hispanic subgroup. Federal Index for Hispanics - 43%

Only 38% of Sherwood's Hispanic students scored proficiently on the 2019 Math FSA. This presents a 19% achievement gap in comparison to the state's average of 57% proficiency for Hispanic students.

State Measurement Goal(s):

Increase Federal Index for Students with Disabilities (SWD) to 55%.

Increase Federal Index for Hispanics to a Federal Index of 45%

Evidence-Based Strategy:

Utilize IPST/MTSS processes, Inclusion, scaffolding, and add additional activity block to include a Math/Science lab, and consistent progress monitoring.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

We believe two subgroup categories Hispanics and (SWD) students are on the edge of not meeting state benchmarks because we need to monitor their data more closely and provide interventions that specifically meet the needs of these subgroups.

Action Steps:

- 1. Monitor student progress at Teacher Data Team Meetings.**
- 2. Assign a mentor to each student as a champion who will check in bi-weekly with students.**
- 3. Leadership team will monitor students progress in core subjects on a monthly basis and discuss areas of need.**
- 4. Provide specific interventions, scaffolding and strategies to increase achievement.**
- 5. Add additional activity block to include extra support in Math/Science (lab) academic areas**

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.

Sherwood is a Positive Behavior Interventions and Support (PBIS) school.

In the midst of COVID-19 and changes that have affected all schools, we continue to be creative in how we address the needs of not only our brick and mortar students, but also our e-learners and their families as well. Sherwood Elementary earned the recognition as a “Gold” school during the 2019-20 school year. This is based on meeting all criteria and decreasing the number of ODRs, (Office Discipline Referrals). In 2020, 0% of Sherwood students earned 6 or more referrals, down from 1% in 2019. Only 1% of our total population had 2-5 referrals in 2019-20, down from 3% in the 2018-19 school year. Finally, 99% of students had 0-1 referrals from the 96% in 2018-19. All stakeholders continue to support the PBIS expectations and encourage students to: Stay on Task, Target Success, have a Positive Attitude, demonstrate Respect/Responsibility, and be Safe (STARS). E-learners are a part of this process and teachers have innovatively designed various ways to ensure students are abiding by our school-wide expectations while at home distance learning. As a result, Sherwood created a separate matrix to show how the expectations are different in an e-learning home environment.

Classroom teachers use Sanford Harmony lessons within the classroom daily. These lessons include topics such as empathy, respect, how to handle stress, conflict resolution, among others. Classroom teachers utilize Morning Meeting/Meet Up routines daily while still social distancing as per the CDC guidelines. Any student(s) who exhibit signs of social emotional stress are referred to the School Counselor.

Fall 2019, Sherwood students participated in the Panorama for Social Emotional Learning Survey. The results showed that K-2 teachers reported only a 40% rating of students' self-management. This scale includes how well students manage their emotions, thoughts, and behaviors in different situations. Grades 3-6 self-report survey results indicated only 43% of Sherwood students were able to clearly describe their feelings. Using this data, we set goals and monitor growth over time using Panorama.

January 2020, Sherwood also participated in the Youth Truth Survey. The survey illustrated how students feel about their school experiences as it relates to a respectful classroom environment. It targeted, student engagement, academic rigor, relationships, culture, and instructional methods. Culture earned the lowest rating with 11% of students feeling Sherwood had a positive school culture in terms of how peers respected one another.

Due to COVID-19 school closures in 2019-2020, Sherwood stakeholders believe it is imperative to focus on providing equitable supports by prioritizing the social-emotional and mental health well-being for all. To address survey result concerns, culture, and building stronger peer relationships and respect, Sherwood will implement the 2020-2021 BPS Recovery Plan (Social Emotional Learning).

During the 2020-2021 year, Sherwood will add a School Social Worker, from Lifetime Counseling Center.

This Social Worker will teach social-emotional skills to small groups of students during the school day, which is part of the Mental Wellness Pathway.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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