

Brevard Public Schools

Tropical 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	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	24

Tropical Elementary School

885 S COURTENAY PKWY, Merritt Island, FL 32952

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

Demographics

Principal: Neleffra Marshall A

Start Date for this Principal: 6/10/2019

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	51%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: A (67%) 2016-17: A (68%) 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	24

Tropical Elementary School

885 S COURTENAY PKWY, Merritt Island, FL 32952

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-6</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">49%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">25%</p>

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.

Inspiring, Leading and Learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To foster an atmosphere that inspires young people to become lifelong learners and positive collaborators through engaging instruction, equipping them with enduring academic and social understandings necessary for a fulfilling, successful future.

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
Marshall, Neleffra	Principal	As the Principal, Dr. Marshall routinely observes instruction and provides feedback for teachers to improve instructional practices. She leads weekly Team Chat Meetings, where grade level, class, and individual student data is disaggregated, analyzed, and monitored by the Leadership Team and grade level teachers. Dr. Marshall ensures that student and staff safety is a top priority. She works to ensure instructional time is protected daily, in order to maximize student learning opportunities.
Wehrly, Katherine	Assistant Principal	As the Assistant Principal, Mrs. Wehrly is responsible for curriculum, providing meaningful professional development, completing instructional and support staff evaluations, handling discipline, and scheduling. She frequently visits classrooms to observe instruction and provide feedback to teachers, in order to improve instructional practices. She works collaboratively with the Instructional Coach to provide meaningful Professional Development that will change teaching practices, thus impacting student achievement. As part of the Leadership Team, she participates in weekly Team Chat Meetings, where grade level, classroom, and individual student data is disaggregated and analyzed. Mrs. Wehrly works alongside Dr. Marshall to ensure student and staff safety is a top priority.
Simon, Lindsay	Instructional Coach	As the Instructional Coach, Mrs. Simon works to ensure teachers have the resources needed to provide standards-based instruction. She works alongside Mrs. Wehrly to provide meaningful Professional Development to staff, based on student data and teacher input. She is an integral part of the IPST (Individual Problem Solving Team) that monitors student interventions. Mrs. Simon participates in weekly Team Chat Meetings, where grade level, classroom, and individual student data is desaggregated, analyzed, and monitored by the Leadership Team. Ms. Simon works through the Coaching Cycle with teachers at all grade levels to model lessons, observe instruction, and provide constructive feedback to teachers.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/10/2019, Neleffra Marshall A

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.*

8

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

50

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)	51%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: A (67%) 2016-17: A (68%) 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	81	95	79	110	88	113	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	670
Attendance below 90 percent	3	8	15	18	18	22	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	109
One or more suspensions	0	3	3	0	1	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	10	17	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	22	25	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	66
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	4	0	4	16	23	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	58

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	9	7	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/16/2020

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	111	104	132	96	124	111	115	0	0	0	0	0	0	793
Attendance below 90 percent	58	61	46	43	40	44	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	357
One or more suspensions	4	3	2	12	11	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	14	6	25	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	17	14	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	50

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	

Students with two or more indicators	4	2	0	19	8	22	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
--------------------------------------	---	---	---	----	---	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	

Retained Students: Current Year	17	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
---------------------------------	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
-------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

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	

Number of students enrolled	111	104	132	96	124	111	115	0	0	0	0	0	0	793
-----------------------------	-----	-----	-----	----	-----	-----	-----	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----

Attendance below 90 percent	58	61	46	43	40	44	65	0	0	0	0	0	0	357
-----------------------------	----	----	----	----	----	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	-----

One or more suspensions	4	3	2	12	11	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
-------------------------	---	---	---	----	----	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	14	6	25	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
-------------------------------	---	---	---	----	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	17	14	9	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
---------------------------------	---	---	---	----	----	---	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

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	

Students with two or more indicators	4	2	0	19	8	22	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
--------------------------------------	---	---	---	----	---	----	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	

Retained Students: Current Year	17	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
---------------------------------	----	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	----

Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
-------------------------------------	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---

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	72%	62%	57%	75%	63%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	67%	60%	58%	65%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	57%	53%	51%	52%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	71%	63%	63%	79%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	74%	65%	62%	71%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	53%	51%	61%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	66%	57%	53%	77%	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	63%	64%	-1%	58%	5%
	2018	66%	63%	3%	57%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	66%	61%	5%	58%	8%
	2018	65%	57%	8%	56%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	77%	60%	17%	56%	21%
	2018	69%	54%	15%	55%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		8%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				
06	2019	75%	60%	15%	54%	21%
	2018	76%	63%	13%	52%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	57%	61%	-4%	62%	-5%
	2018	62%	62%	0%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	66%	64%	2%	64%	2%
	2018	63%	59%	4%	62%	1%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	68%	60%	8%	60%	8%
	2018	87%	58%	29%	61%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-19%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
06	2019	85%	67%	18%	55%	30%
	2018	79%	68%	11%	52%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	64%	56%	8%	53%	11%
	2018	77%	57%	20%	55%	22%
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	47	48	40	38	55	52	26				
ELL	55	55		45	73						
BLK	33	50		33	50						
HSP	64	54	31	62	71	75					
MUL	68	50		78	79						
WHT	76	72	70	74	75	60	67				
FRL	62	64	58	57	68	61	56				

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	38	52	51	50	57	58	39				
ASN	92	70		100	82						
BLK	40	36		40	55						
HSP	55	63	56	56	68	50	50				
MUL	74	74		76	78		55				
WHT	72	63	47	77	75	64	85				
FRL	60	59	48	64	69	59	67				

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	42	30	48	50	33	53				
ELL	30	50		50	40						
ASN	71	58		93	75						
BLK	41	36		59	64						
HSP	60	59	45	71	63	42					
MUL	81	65		78	75						
WHT	78	67	59	81	72	65	78				
FRL	66	58	51	69	65	56	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	67
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	470
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
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	57
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	42
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	60
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	69
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	71
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	61
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.

Math Data- On the initial iReady diagnostic for the 2020-2021 school year, 77% of students assessed are considered not meeting proficiency in Math. 20% of students assessed are considered substantially deficient, with 6% of students being three or more grade levels below. Within subgroups, 96% of Black/African American Students did not demonstrate mastery of grade level standards, with 58% of those students considered substantially deficient. In 2018-2019, Math Achievement on FSA showed the lowest performance. Within subgroups, Math Achievement for Students with Disabilities (38%) and Black Students (33%) were the lowest. Prior to the 2019-2020 school year, administration did not require, only encouraged, the implementation of Eureka. This was a contributing factor to 2018-2019's low performance on FSA. 2019-2020 was the first year of consistent implementation of the Eureka curriculum across all grade levels. This subgroup data for Black/African American Students is one of the highest achievement gaps in Brevard County Public Schools.

ELA Data- On the initial iReady diagnostic for the 2020-2021 school year, 56% of students assessed are considered not meeting proficiency in ELA. Within subgroups, 85% of Black/African American Students did not demonstrate mastery of grade level standards. Within Tropical's FSA ELA data, the lowest subgroups' overall achievement was 47% for Students with Disabilities and 33% for Black Students' Achievement. Inconsistent implementation of standards-based instruction leads to gaps in students' learning and the inability for students to master grade-level standards.

Tropical's Data Component that showed the lowest performance are subgroups: Black/African American and Students with Disabilities.

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

Our 5th grade math achievement declined by 19% from the 2017-2018 to the 2018-2019 school year. The lack of consistent standards-based instruction through implementing the Eureka curriculum in grades K-5 contributed to this decline. Additionally, the increase of Level 1s in ELA and Math was significant. In 2017-2018, 11% of students assessed on FSA scored a Level 1. In 2018-2019, 26% of student assessed on FSA scored a Level 1. Over 64% of Level 1s in ELA and Math in 2018-2019 were in fifth and sixth grades. Expectations on standards-based instruction and the implementation of a rigorous, engaged classroom in ELA and Math, has not been clear and consistent, which contributed to the decline. In addition, tiered interventions and intensive instructional support for our lowest 25% and ESSA subgroups have not been implemented with fidelity.

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 school data with the state average, our 2018-2019 third grade Math FSA had the greatest gap in achievement. Tropical scored 5% below the state average. The inconsistency in standards-aligned math instruction and utilization of common, rigorous, standards-based assessments across the grade level contributed to this gap in data. Additionally, per BPS Assessment Data, there is a significant gap in ELA data points between white students and black students (41%). This data also indicates that when comparing Students with Disabilities to Non-SWD, there is a 30% gap in ELA data points, which is a decrease from the prior year of 39% points.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was our percent of students achieving learning gains, from 63% to 67%, specifically within our lowest 25% of students, which increased from 51% to 59%. Our school focused on Team Chats, which required teachers to identify the learning gains of their own previous year's students, as well as identify the lowest 25% of students in their classroom. Conversations consistently revolved around how we were providing necessary interventions to our lowest 25% of students, in order to close achievement gaps. In addition, the rate of attendance below 90% rate dropped from 45% in 2018-2019 to 16% in 2019-2020. Tropical Elementary made significant efforts to increase student attendance by following through with communicating attendance requirements with families and setting specific parameters and guidelines for when a student was chronically absent. School absentee data was displayed as a way to promote awareness to students missing instructional time.

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

When analyzing our EWS from 2019-2020, there are two areas of potential concern. We need to continue decreasing the number of students receiving one or more suspensions (decrease of 27 students between 2018-2019 and 2019-2020). Additionally, we need to target the number of students receiving a Level 1 on their FSA ELA or Math. In 2017-2018, 11% of students earned a Level 1 in either subject. In 2018-2019, 15% of students earned a Level 1 in either subject.

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

1. Decrease achievement gap of SWD and Black/African American students, as indicated on iReady EOY Diagnostic
2. Increase percentage of students making learning gains on Math FSA, overall Math Achievement on FSA, and overall proficiency on Math iReady
3. Decrease number of students earning a Level 1 in ELA or Math
4. Increase Science Achievement on SSA
5. Decrease number of students receiving one or more suspensions

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Description of Area of Focus: By ensuring Tropical's daily instructional practices in ELA are rigorous and standards-based, the percentage of students making learning gains will increase and overall student achievement in ELA will be directly impacted.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Rationale for Area of Focus: Over the past four years, based on FSA ELA Data, ELA Achievement has been inconsistent, ranging from 70% proficiency to 75% proficiency, with an average of 72% proficiency. When looking at ESSA subgroup data on the 2018-2019 FSA ELA Assessment, only 48% of SWD and 50% of black students demonstrated learning gains in ELA.

According to Tropical's 2019-2020 iReady Winter Diagnostic Data, 44% of students assessed did not meet grade-level proficiency in ELA. Based on 2020-2021 Beginning of Year Diagnostic Data, 57% of students are not meeting grade-level proficiency in ELA.

In analyzing these iReady data components, Tropical's 2018-2019 FSA ELA Achievement, and ESSA Subgroup Data of Learning Gains, it is evident that improving our instructional practices and standards-aligned instruction is a critical need for the 2020-2021 school year.

Measurable Outcome:

ELA proficiency will increase from 72% to 80% on the 2020-2021 FSA ELA Assessment. With the overall proficiency increasing, the overall number of students scoring a Level 1 will decrease, also. Within ESSA Subgroups, 60% of SWD and 65% of Black/African American students will demonstrate learning gains in ELA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Neleffra Marshall (marshall.neleffra@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Teachers will provide rigorous, standards-aligned direct instruction to all students. Additionally, targeted tiered interventions will be provided to students in our lowest performing ESSA subgroups.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

In order to ensure rigorous, standards-aligned direct instruction is occurring for all students, teachers will frequently review district provide Standards Focus Documents and Pacing Guides to make sure the instruction that is occurring mirrors the expectations. Targeted interventions based on students' specific needs (John Hattie's Effect Size, Response to Intervention, 1.07) will occur during SMART time (specifically allotted time frame for interventions).

Action Steps to Implement

1. Monthly Collaborative Planning will occur between the Literacy Coach, Classroom Teachers, and ESE Teachers. Through these collaborative planning sessions, the team will utilize the Enhanced Standards Focus Documents to ensure learning activities meet the rigor and depth of the grade-level standards. These collaborative planning sessions will include ESE Teachers, to ensure Tropical is continuing to show growth within the BPIE implementation components (2018-2019 BPIE- Partially Implementing a school wide approach for planning and implementing UDL across all instructional and non-instructional school contexts).

Person Responsible

Lindsay Simon (simon.lindsay@brevardschools.org)

2. iReady Standards Mastery will assess focus standards and will be completed multiple times throughout the year (two per nine week period). This will serve as an opportunity for teachers to reflect on current instructional practices and re-teach standards as appropriate. Teachers will utilize instructional materials

from the Teacher's Toolbox in iReady and specific Scaffolding Comprehension lessons from iReady, ensuring exposure to grade-level complex texts.

Person Responsible Lindsay Simon (simon.lindsay@brevardschools.org)

3. Literacy Coach will model lessons for teachers and will provide feedback to teachers, through the Coaching Cycle. Coaching sessions will comprise of the planning of a lesson, delivering instruction, and assessing. Coaching sessions will prioritize student engagement and focus on exposing all students to complex and rigorous content, indicated as a needed priority on Tropical Elementary's Youth Truth Survey.

Person Responsible Lindsay Simon (simon.lindsay@brevardschools.org)

4. Providing interventions with fidelity to targeted ESSA subgroups will be a priority for this school year. Teachers will work with Administration to identify students that fall into one (or more) of the targeted ESSA subgroups. Interventions will begin immediately to ensure that we are working to close any gaps in learning. ESE teachers will be providing tiered MTSS interventions, as well as General Education teachers.

Person Responsible Neleffra Marshall (marshall.neleffra@brevardschools.org)

5. Academic Support Program will be implemented and will target students in ESSA subgroups. Sessions will be held after regular school hours, in order to not interfere with learning opportunities. Sessions will be offered in person, or virtually, with a goal-oriented focus of closing instructional gaps.

Person Responsible Katherine Wehrly (wehrly.katherine@brevardschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Description of Area of Focus: Data indicates a need to increase the fidelity with which Eureka is being implemented. Ensuring learning objectives and goals are clearly posted, and referred to often throughout the lesson, will help with teacher clarity and students understanding the intended outcome of the instruction.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Rationale for Area of Focus: School wide FSA Math Achievement Data dropped 3% points, from 74% to 71%, between 2018 and 2019. On the 2019 FSA, 55% of SWD made a learning gain, and 50% of Black/African American students made a learning gain. On the Winter iReady Diagnostic in 2019-2020, 55% of students assessed did not meet grade-level proficiency in Math. On the 2020-2021 iReady Diagnostic, 76% of students assessed are considered below grade level expectations. Within ESSA subgroups, 97% of Black/African American students did not meet grade-level proficiency on the Math Diagnostic.

By ensuring Tropical Elementary teachers increase the fidelity to which Eureka's standards-aligned instruction is occurring, the percentage of students meeting grade-level proficiency will increase.

Measurable Outcome:

Math data will indicate a 5% point increase on the 2020-2021 FSA Assessment, which will result in an overall achievement of 76%. Within ESSA subgroups, 65% of SWD will make a learning gain and 60% of Black/African American students will make a learning gain. Additionally, on the iReady End of Year Diagnostic, the 76% of students not meeting grade-level proficiency will decrease to 65% of students. The percentage of Black/African American Students achieving grade-level proficiency on the iReady End of Year Diagnostic will increase by 20%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Neleffra Marshall (marshall.neleffra@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Teachers will provide rigorous, standards-aligned instruction through the implementation of the Eureka curriculum with fidelity. Additionally, teachers will provide interventions to students that are struggling with grade-level content. ESE Teachers will work alongside general education teachers to provide specific interventions to students, in order to close gaps in conceptual understanding.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Teachers will clearly and effectively communicate the intentions of specific instruction (John Hattie's Effect Size, Teacher Clarity, 0.75) through posting Essential Questions or "I can" statements in student-friendly language. Questions and "I can" statements will be regularly updated to reflect current content being taught in classrooms.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will frequently review district-provided pacing guides and the 2020-2021 enhanced Standards Focus Documents. Through collaborative planning sessions, the analysis of these documents and reflection on the implementation of embedded content in the classroom will become a common practice.

Person Responsible

Lindsay Simon (simon.lindsay@brevardschools.org)

2. Tropical teachers and the Leadership Team will collaborate to analyze and disaggregate student data collected on common grade level assessments (Eureka Mid-Module and End of Module Assessments) during Team Chats, in order to determine students' mastery of grade-level standards. Conversations will

be focused on student progress and current practices in place that ensure students' understanding of grade level content.

Person Responsible Lindsay Simon (simon.lindsay@brevardschools.org)

3. Administration will provide frequent feedback on the standards-aligned instructional outcomes (via Essential Questions, "I can" statements, etc.) that are posted in the classroom. Feedback conversations will focus on how the instructional outcomes are regularly referred to and student learning is monitored during classroom instruction.

Person Responsible Neleffra Marshall (marshall.neleffra@brevardschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Description of Area of Focus: Tropical Elementary will increase the amount of, and rigor of, science standards-based instruction in all grade levels.

Rationale for Area of Focus: Tropical's 5th Grade Science Achievement dropped from 77% on the 2018 SSA to 64% on the 2019 SSA. This 13% drop in points reflects inconsistent expectations of direct standards-based science instruction, as well as embedded science instruction as a daily practice. Within our ESSA subgroup of Students with Disabilities, only 26% of students assessed achieved mastery on the 2019 SSA.

Measurable Outcome:

On the 2021 SSA, 75% of students will demonstrate mastery of grade-level benchmarks that are assessed on the 5th grade Statewide Science Assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Neleffra Marshall (marshall.neleffra@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Increased Science instruction will be a focus for the 2020-2021 school year by ensuring standards-based instruction is occurring in all grade levels. There is a high need to build students' foundational science skills and conceptual understanding in the primary grades.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

On the District-Provided Summative Part 1 SSA Review, data indicates that 78% of current fifth graders have not mastered 3rd and 4th grade benchmark standards, which are heavily addressed on the 5th grade SSA.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Tropical Elementary will implement district-provided common assessments that reflect students' mastery of grade level standards. These common assessments will be required school-wide and progress will be tracked through Performance Matters software.

Person Responsible

Katherine Wehrly (wehrly.katherine@brevardschools.org)

2. Specific grade level/classroom and student data will be monitored and disaggregated during Team Chat meetings. During these conversations, the team will work to identify potential gaps in students' understanding of grade level content and will collaborate to ensure students receive necessary rigorous instruction in science.

Person Responsible

Katherine Wehrly (wehrly.katherine@brevardschools.org)

3. The Academic Support Program will provide interventions and additional instruction on 3rd and 4th grade benchmark standards that will be assessed on the 2021 SSA, in order to close gaps in students' understanding.

Person Responsible

Katherine Wehrly (wehrly.katherine@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Another priority that will be focused on this year is decreasing the number of students receiving one or more suspensions. Tropical Elementary is an anchor school for Conscious Discipline in Brevard Public Schools. Teachers participated in Conscious Discipline Professional Development during pre-planning and will continue to gain exposure to it throughout the school year. Through the implementation of these research-based strategies and techniques, our overall discipline will decrease, specifically the number of students being suspended. In conjunction with implementing Conscious Discipline school-wide, Tropical Elementary will also provide direct instruction in Social and Emotional Learning through our Guidance Counselor and the Monique Burr Foundation Curriculum.

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.

Tropical Elementary has a positive school culture and environment that values student, parent, and teacher input.

As presented in the Youth Truth Survey for 2019-2020, 87% of students surveyed believe that their teacher cares about them very much, which is 6% higher than the average for the District. Tropical's student responses placed our school in the 79th percentile, indicating that our strength is building strong and supportive relationships between students and teachers. Our largest opportunity for growth is in student engagement, scoring in the 55th percentile. To align with the BPS Strategic Plan, it is imperative that we increase overall student engagement, in order to promote Academic Excellence and "provide every student a learning environment that empowers them to reach their full potential."

As indicated in the Winter 2019 Insight Survey, Peer Culture was the highest domain score. A score of 7.8, showed additional evidence of the importance of culture and relationships at Tropical Elementary. Additionally, 83% of teachers surveyed agreed that the actions of the school leadership team play an influential role in setting school priorities and goals, which promote an overall positive school environment.

When reviewing the 2019-2020 BPS Elementary Parent Survey, 87% of the 119 responses indicated yes, they feel welcome at our school.

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: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00