

Brevard Public Schools

# Surfside Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>17</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>18</b>

# Surfside Elementary School

475 CASSIA BLVD, Satellite Beach, FL 32937

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Kassie Erenstoff R**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-6
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	25%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (75%) 2015-16: A (70%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</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 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](http://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

---

<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>Title I Requirements</b>	<b>0</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>18</b>

# Surfside Elementary School

475 CASSIA BLVD, Satellite Beach, FL 32937

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

## School Demographics

<p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School KG-6</p>	<p><b>2019-20 Title I School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p><b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">24%</p>
<p><b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b> (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">14%</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.**

Surfside Elementary School provides a safe and positive environment where high quality education occurs for all students.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Surfside Elementary will create a challenging, positive learning environment that promotes excellence and group achievement. Staff, students, and parents will work together to encourage children to realize their maximum potential for learning, problem solving, and responsible citizenship.

### 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
Erenstoff, Kassie	Principal	Mrs. Erenstoff establishes high expectations for all students. She monitors instruction and data for all grade levels. She facilitates collaborative planning and assists in MTSS training and implementation. Her job duties include coaching Mrs. Seibert and Mrs. Oehlmann in their job duties and assisting all staff in helping students achieve their very best.
Seibert, Tracy	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Seibert oversees curriculum, assessment, and discipline. She assists with school improvement, monitors student progress and learning gains, reflects on data and develops professional data based on the data. She oversees the MTSS processes and training for Surfside and assists in coaching Mrs. Oehlmann and our instruction staff.
Oehlmann, Patricia	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Oehlmann oversees teacher mentoring and coaching. She supports administration and teachers with state, district, and school-based assessments, iReady for grades K-6, data collection and progress monitoring of student academic and behavior interventions, and provides PD for teachers.

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**

Wednesday 7/1/2020, Kassie Erenstoff R

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

5

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

33

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-6
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2019-20 Title I School</b>	No
<b>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	25%
<b>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (75%) 2015-16: A (70%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Southeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

**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	67	49	44	68	71	52	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	434
Attendance below 90 percent	1	1	2	8	6	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

**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	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Monday 9/14/2020

**Prior Year - As Reported**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	57	50	72	73	55	80	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	459
Attendance below 90 percent	2	12	17	13	14	18	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	2	2	2	0	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	8	5	11	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**Prior Year - Updated**

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	57	50	72	73	55	80	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	459
Attendance below 90 percent	2	12	17	13	14	18	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	2	2	2	0	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	8	5	11	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	69%	62%	57%	80%	63%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	54%	60%	58%	65%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	57%	53%	63%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	79%	63%	63%	86%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	76%	65%	62%	81%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	68%	53%	51%	81%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	77%	57%	53%	71%	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	72%	64%	8%	58%	14%
	2018	72%	63%	9%	57%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	71%	61%	10%	58%	13%
	2018	81%	57%	24%	56%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	78%	60%	18%	56%	22%
	2018	82%	54%	28%	55%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
06	2019	54%	60%	-6%	54%	0%
	2018	82%	63%	19%	52%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		-28%				
Cohort Comparison		-28%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	70%	61%	9%	62%	8%
	2018	65%	62%	3%	62%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	82%	64%	18%	64%	18%
	2018	81%	59%	22%	62%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		17%				
05	2019	71%	60%	11%	60%	11%
	2018	77%	58%	19%	61%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison		-10%				
06	2019	87%	67%	20%	55%	32%
	2018	95%	68%	27%	52%	43%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	76%	56%	20%	53%	23%
	2018	67%	57%	10%	55%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
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	31	45	40	34	60	53					
HSP	75	30		75	60						
WHT	70	56	54	81	79	79	79				
FRL	58	42	43	69	73	73	73				
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	50	57	42	44	43	39					
HSP	92	64		92	73						
MUL	70			60							
WHT	79	62	61	80	72	63	65				
FRL	70	59	62	72	66	62	60				
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	62	67	58	55	67	69					
HSP	77			77							
MUL	92	80		92	100						
WHT	79	63	61	86	79	81	67				
FRL	77	71	75	83	93	94	45				

**ESSA Data**

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

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68
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	473
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
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
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Native American Students</b>	
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
<b>Asian Students</b>	
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
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
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
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	60

Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	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	62
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.**

Our overall lowest data component was ELA. We dropped from 80% proficient in 2018 to 69% proficient in 2019. In addition to this, our learning gains in ELA were also low. Overall only 54% of students made learning gains in ELA. Only 50% of the students considered to be in the lowest 25% made learning gains.

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

Our overall lowest data component was ELA. We dropped from 80% proficient in 2018 to 69% proficient in 2019. There has been a steady decline over the last three years. In 2017, 87% of students were proficient in ELA. This is a reduction of 18 percentage points over three years. In addition to low FSA ELA scores, our overall percentage of students proficient on iReady ELA has also

dropped. In 2018, at the beginning of the year 5% of students were identified as At Risk Tier 3 on the beginning of the year iReady assessment. This has steadily increased, and this year, we have 9% of our students identified as At Risk. Additionally, the percentage of students in Tier 1 has dropped as well. In 2018, we had 75% of students in the green Tier 1 section of iReady at the beginning of the year. In 2019, this number dropped to 64% and this year we are at 51%. The decline in scores continues to go in the negative direction. In addition to all of this, our student noted on the Youth Truth Survey last year that Academic Rigor was an issue. They ranked us in the lowest percentile of zero.

**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.**

Our greatest gap was in learning gains for ELA. We were below the state and district average for overall learning gains, as well as learning gains within our lowest 25% of students. In the category of overall learning gains in ELA, we are four percentage points below the state and six percentage points below the district. With regards to learning gains in our lowest 25%, we are three percentage points below the state and seven percentage points below the district.

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

The area that showed the most improvement was science. We increased ten percentage points from 2018 to 2019 on the SSA.

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

The first area of concern in our EWS is the number of students retained. In 2019, nine students were retained. In 2020, eleven students were retained. Both years had five kindergarteners retained. Additionally, the number of students achieving a level one on the FSA is higher than it should be. There are currently ten students on campus who scored a level one on the FSA.

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

1. Strengthen Core ELA Instruction
2. Refine the MTSS Process to Increase Intervention
3. Promoting an inclusive school environment
- 4.
- 5.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

In reviewing the data for Surfside, we noticed that our ELA scores have steadily declined over the last three years. This decline in scores has occurred not only in FSA, but also in iReady. This dip in scores was exacerbated by the current pandemic and loss of instruction for students in the spring of 2019. The decline in scores, coupled with the pandemic issues, requires us as a school community to to elevate core ELA instruction as well as address the intervention needed to help students close achievement gaps. In addition, our students noted that we need to increase academic rigor (Youth Truth Survey). Enhancing CORE ELA instruction will address this concern.

**Measurable Outcome:**

By January 2020, Surfside will increase the percentage of students in Tier 1 on iReady ELA from 31% (end-of-year view) to 50%. By May 2021, this percentage will increase to 70%.

On the 2021 FSA ELA, the percentage of students proficient will increase from 69% to 75%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Kassie Erenstoff ([erenstoff.kassie@brevardschools.org](mailto:erenstoff.kassie@brevardschools.org))

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

We will implement collaborative planning as the vehicle to to help improve our core ELA instruction. During structured collaborative planning, we will work with teams to design standards-aligned core ELA instruction.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Through the use of structured collaborative planning, we will work to design and implement standards-aligned instruction in all of our ELA classrooms. As we know from studies like The Opportunity Myth, they key to showing growth in students is having instruction and tasks fully aligned to standards. It will be our goal this year to focus on the instructional component and support our teachers as they seek to fully align their instruction in ELA with the Florida Standards. Discussions during collaborative planning will focus on the intent of the standards, misconceptions and how that standard will specifically be taught and assessed.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Teachers, administrators and literacy coach will participate in biweekly collaborative meetings during planning time to analyze formative and summative assessment data and develop rigorous, standards aligned tasks that align to the Focus Standard.
2. Administrators and the literacy coach will provide school-wide professional development for all staff on inclusive practices, CORE ELA instructional techniques and resources, collaborative planning structures and the Vision for Excellent Instruction.
3. Administrators and literacy coach will identify specific personalized professional development for teachers as needed.
4. The literacy coach will model, observe and provide feedback to teachers (coaching cycle).
5. Administration will complete walkthroughs and provide feedback to teachers on instructional practices.

**Person Responsible**

Kassie Erenstoff ([erenstoff.kassie@brevardschools.org](mailto:erenstoff.kassie@brevardschools.org))



**#2. Other specifically relating to MTSS**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** The MTSS process at Surfside needs additional structures in place in order to help teachers feel successful and to in turn close achievement gaps for students. By refining the MTSS process at Surfside, we hope to see improvement for all students, but specifically our students in the lowest 25%, many of which fall into the Students with Disabilities (SWD) subgroup.

**Measurable Outcome:** The percentage of students in the lowest 25% making learning gains will increase from 50% to 60%.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Tracy Seibert (seibert.tracy@brevardschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** We will refine the process for identifying students in need of intervention and work collaboratively with teams to develop and implement interventions. By fine-tuning this process it will allow us to address individual needs of students and help close gaps in student learning.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** We selected this goal after reviewing our data and discuss the process for MTSS currently in place at Surfside with the leadership team. Our hope is to support our teachers through this process, shedding light not only on the why behind strong intervention, but assisting them in implementing this process. This will be closely tied to collaborative planning.

Research Reviewed - A Framework for Coherence by American Institute for Research

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Grade level teams with support of administration and literacy coach will utilize research based resources such as 95% Group and iReady Teacher Toolbox to plan, implement and provide a 30 minute intervention block to meet the individual needs of each student. Teachers will provide explicit instruction for their lowest 25% students.
2. MTSS monthly meetings will be held to analyze progress monitoring data and adjust interventions and intervention groups.

**Person Responsible** Kassie Erenstoft (erenstoft.kassie@brevardschools.org)

**Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities**

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

**We listed three areas of focus and will be addressing both of those this year. While we know there are other items that will need to be addressed, these are our priorities this year.**

**Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment**

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Our motto this year at Surfside is One Team, One Heart, Surfside Strong. It is our goal to develop a team-focused mindset, in which we rely on each other for support and guidance. Our team is comprised of faculty, staff, families and the community. We seek input from various groups such as PTO, SAC and community relationships. This year our entire administrative team is new, along with various parts of our office staff. We maintain an open door policy, seek feedback on school leadership and communication from all stakeholders and are striving daily to cultivate a warm, inviting and student-centered learning environment throughout the campus. It is through a cohesive team approach that we will be able to help all kids succeed.

**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: Other: MTSS	\$0.00
<b>Total:</b>			<b>\$0.00</b>