

Brevard Public Schools

Stone Magnet Middle School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	19
Budget to Support Goals	0

Stone Magnet Middle School

1101 E UNIVERSITY BLVD, Melbourne, FL 32901

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

Demographics

Principal: Courtney Lundy B

Start Date for this Principal: 7/15/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 7-8
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* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (47%)
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	TS&I

* 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	10
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Stone Magnet Middle School

1101 E UNIVERSITY BLVD, Melbourne, FL 32901

<http://www.stone.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)
Middle School 7-8	Yes	78%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	62%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	C

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.

To create active citizens of the 21st century through commitment, dedication, teamwork and scholarship.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Facilitating innovation and leadership through AVID and STEAM best practices.

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
Poole, Hilary	Principal	
Wilkerson, Tia	Dean	
Bombriant, Kelly	Assistant Principal	
Franklin, Sharona	Other	
Cuthbertson, Da'Neen	Instructional Coach	
Mallak, Mark	Instructional Coach	
Grabowski, Melissa	Teacher, K-12	
Johnson-Blackwell, Karena	School Counselor	
Straus, Sarah	Teacher, K-12	
Zulinke, Michelle	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/15/2019, Courtney Lundy B

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.*

0

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.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

59

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Middle School 7-8
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* Asian Students Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (47%) 2015-16: C (47%)
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	TS&I
* 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Tuesday 10/20/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	397	394	0	0	0	0	791	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134	124	0	0	0	0	258	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	86	0	0	0	0	109	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134	83	0	0	0	0	217	

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	78	0	0	0	0	114	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	0	0	0	0	16	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	10	0	0	0	0	23	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	397	394	0	0	0	0	791	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134	124	0	0	0	0	258	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23	86	0	0	0	0	109	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134	83	0	0	0	0	217	

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36	78	0	0	0	0	114

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	10	0	0	0	0	16	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13	10	0	0	0	0	23	

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	50%	59%	54%	51%	60%	52%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	56%	54%	53%	57%	54%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%	48%	47%	43%	47%	44%
Math Achievement	50%	66%	58%	49%	65%	56%
Math Learning Gains	48%	55%	57%	42%	56%	57%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	37%	45%	51%	30%	46%	50%
Science Achievement	40%	52%	51%	38%	56%	50%
Social Studies Achievement	67%	75%	72%	64%	76%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)		Total
	7	8	
	(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
07	2019	46%	58%	-12%	52%	-6%
	2018	45%	56%	-11%	51%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	50%	63%	-13%	56%	-6%
	2018	48%	65%	-17%	58%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2019	43%	62%	-19%	54%	-11%
	2018	38%	62%	-24%	54%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	29%	43%	-14%	46%	-17%
	2018	15%	41%	-26%	45%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	38%	53%	-15%	48%	-10%
	2018	37%	55%	-18%	50%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	65%	74%	-9%	71%	-6%
2018	59%	73%	-14%	71%	-12%
Compare		6%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	80%	61%	19%	61%	19%
2018	80%	62%	18%	62%	18%
Compare		0%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	98%	60%	38%	57%	41%
2018	100%	60%	40%	56%	44%
Compare		-2%			

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	21	40	37	22	44	34	19	36	33		
ELL	22	36	36	31	28	21	10	57			
ASN	90	80		90	60						
BLK	31	46	36	28	34	29	26	55	60		
HSP	45	48	45	49	45	26	30	69	53		
MUL	57	57		60	55		31	65	74		
WHT	61	58	52	61	56	49	53	72	68		
FRL	41	48	43	42	41	35	32	60	55		

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	12	27	29	17	29	27	7	27	80		
ELL	7	29	29	23	50	50		32			
ASN	82	64		90	60				80		
BLK	26	39	36	22	33	31	16	41	63		
HSP	48	39	17	48	48	39	38	61	71		
MUL	60	48		56	50		44	77	79		
WHT	60	47	31	59	45	41	52	69	76		
FRL	39	39	32	38	40	35	29	53	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	10	32	30	7	30	24	13	25			
ELL	9	36	35	9	35	31	10	27			
ASN	79	64		86	79				90		
BLK	30	45	38	27	31	24	14	43	29		
HSP	54	57	43	46	44	32	39	66	55		
MUL	58	52		60	38	46	45	67	67		
WHT	61	55	49	60	47	31	51	74	60		
FRL	43	50	43	39	37	27	30	55	41		

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	512
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	33
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	80
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	38
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	47
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	57
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	58
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	46
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.

The data component that showed the lowest performance was in mathematics and that was by our lowest performing 25% of students. Our lowest 25% did not make any learning gains from the previous assessment. Our overall student average scores for the Geometry and Statistics & Probability sections of the mathematics assessments were 27.8% and 41.1% respectively. Geometry and Statistics & Probability were the lowest strands from our math data.

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

Middle school acceleration scores declined by 8 points when compared with the prior year. Our pass rate for CAPE industry certifications was the biggest factor in our decline in performance.

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.

Science achievement showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Our students scored 18 percentage points below the state average. Stone students had 40% of students passing the Science FSA while the state average pass rate was 58%. There range of score averages for each strand was between 65 and 67 for all of our students. When the Science data is viewed by subgroup our Black, ESE, and ELL students average pass rates were 26%, 36%, and 10% respectively.

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

ELA lowest 25% students showed the most improvements when compared to the previous year. Our ELA department worked closely with our district resource teachers to develop overall teacher clarity. Working collaboratively helped focus our work by being more efficient with remediation strategies for our lowest 25%.

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

Suspensions in general, including ISS and OSS, are a major concern and Math achievement for our current 8th graders. We had 105 of 327 of those students score a level 1 on the Math FSA.

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

1. ELL student achievement.
2. ESE student achievement.

3. Black/African-American achievement.
4. Science achievement across all subgroups.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	A targeted focus on academic achievement for all students is required by all faculty and staff members. Standards-based instruction aligned to grade level rigor will lead to achievement gains. Our student grades were not a good indicator of proficiency when compared to test results.
Measurable Outcome:	Collaborative planning among departments that will generate common learning targets that are aligned to state standards. Teachers will provide formative assessments that are tied to agreed upon learning targets. We will measure this through classroom observations and meetings with instructional coaches, ESE support staff, and administration. We will expect to see this evidenced in 80% of our classes. Teachers will receive continuous feedback throughout the school year as we assess student learning gains.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Hilary Poole (poole.hilary@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Determining success criteria for the standards ensures that activities and lessons are aligned to the standards. Teachers will work together to unpack standards and determine what students need to be able to do or understand. This will help students plan and predict, set goals, and accurately assess their own progress.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Clearly describing to students what they need to do to show what they've learned is has a very high effectiveness rating. We used strategies from the Teacher Clarity Playbook to find effective strategies to make our teaching and grading align.

Action Steps to Implement

Our ELA teachers will have planning days within their department to focus on unpacking standards and determining appropriate levels of rigor to assess selected standards. Instructional coaches will be in attendance along with district resource teachers. Classroom implementation will be supported by feedback from our instructional coaches and administration.

Person Responsible Da'Neen Cuthbertson (cuthbertson.daneen@brevardschools.org)

Our math teachers will have planning days within their department to focus on unpacking standards and determining appropriate levels of rigor to assess selected standards. Instructional coaches will be in attendance along with district resource teachers. Classroom implementation will be supported by feedback from our instructional coaches and administration.

Person Responsible Mark Mallak (mallak.mark@brevardschools.org)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus	Ensure goals and accommodations accurately reflect student's needs for academic and behavior success. We noticed that student accommodations needed to be clearly stated in student IEPs when the annual IEP reviews were conducted.
Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	All meetings and planning will be attended by all required school-related employees to ensure students accommodations are clearly stated and that all stakeholders understand how accommodations are to be delivered and how to communicate when there are issues. This will include tracking behavioral goals stated in student behavior intervention plans. Our goal is to have ALL of our student's IEPs and BIPs reflect student needs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Karena Johnson-Blackwell (johnson-blackwell.k@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Research indicates that the effectiveness of instruction is directly related to both the planning and implementation of appropriate accommodations as well as teacher development and support in this area. Functional behavior assessment-based interventions will be used to identify and track problem behaviors and strategies used to improve student behavior. (What works clearinghouse)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Constant communication with all stakeholders involved, getting students involved in their own learning by providing small lessons to create learning plans, train teachers to access students IEP, and providing support with providing accommodations.

Action Steps to Implement

Annual IEP Review (August-May 2020-2021)
 Amendments and Reviews with all stakeholders as needed (August-May 2020-2021)
 Create FBA-based behavior plans and learning plans with IEP team (August-May 2020-2021)

Person Responsible Karena Johnson-Blackwell (johnson-blackwell.k@brevardschools.org)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: We are focusing on our ELL students to close the achievement gap compared to English speaking students. We will have a strong focus on vocabulary comprehension, grammatical structures and text structures. This is a critical area as we noticed that this subgroup showed a need for ELA & Math improvement based on FSA scores.

Measurable Outcome: We expect our ELL students to be able to read sentences at a slow to normal speed using expressive tone 50% of the time.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Michelle Zulinke (zulinke.michelle@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

- Utilizing the accommodations for ELL students (bilingual dictionaries, extended time, explanation of directions, etc.)
- Sending materials and information home in native language.
- Before and After School Tutoring twice a week.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: These strategies will help with language acquisition and will be supported with our ELL resources.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: We will identify our African-American students that are underperforming and work closely with instructional coaches and teachers to close the proficiency gap compared with school and district averages in Math and ELA. Students will engage in small pull-out group work with our literacy team to increase reading skills and math skills.

Measurable Outcome:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kelly Bombriant (bombriant.kelly@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

We are working with our instructional coaches to develop our teachers abilities in data mining and analysis to drive instructional practices that are based on student achievement data. That data will lead conversations among departments and will be ongoing.

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.

Stone is using the FLPBIS model to promote positive behavior and academics. We have conducted parent and family meetings via zoom, collected surveys from our families and community members, and student surveys to drive the program. The incentives were decided with the information from our surveys and meetings. The plan includes the entire campus regarding recognition.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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