Dr. W.J. Creel Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Dr. W.J. Creel Elementary School

2000 GLENWOOD DR, Melbourne, FL 32935

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

Demographics

Principal: Nicole Gaumond

Start Date for this Principal: 7/18/2018

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	
* 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

Dr. W.J. Creel Elementary School

2000 GLENWOOD DR, Melbourne, FL 32935

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

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-6	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	53%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	D

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.

As a school family, Dr W.J. Creel's mission is to empower each other to S.O.A.R. to greatness!

Provide the school's vision statement.

Together We Will Achieve Greatness!

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Gaumond, Nicole	Principal	Mrs. Gaumond oversees and monitors schoolwide data. She meets with teachers bi-weekly using MTSS and data chats to increase learning gains for all students. She participates in classroom learning walks with the admin team and Title One coaches utilizing the four T's as look-fors (Target, Text, Task, Talk). Additionally, she meets with SAC once per month to gain stakeholder input and promotes student/family engagement activities.
Back, Erica	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Back oversees and monitors schoolwide data and curriculum. She meets with teachers bi-weekly using MTSS and data chats to increase learning gains for all students. She participates in classroom learning walks with admin team and Title One coaches utilizing the four T's as look-fors (Target, Text, Task, Talk). Additionally, she monitors math, science, and social emotional strategies schoolwide. She also attends monthly SAC meetings to gain stakeholder input. Lastly, she works closely with our ELL teacher to ensure those students are receiving their services.
Scott, Tera	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Scott oversees and monitors schoolwide data and curriculum. She meets with teachers bi-weekly using MTSS and data chats to increase learning gains for all students. She participates in classroom learning walks with admin team and Title One coaches utilizing the four T's as look-fors (Target, Text, Task, Talk). Additionally, she monitors ELA, social studies, and social emotional strategies schoolwide. She also attends monthly SAC meetings to gain stakeholder input. Lastly, she ensures new teachers receive support from trained mentors.
Droll, Courtney	Math Coach	Mrs. Droll is responsible for ensuring the math curriculum is followed with fidelity in the classroom as outlined by district pacing guides. She will review data and monitor mid and end of module assessments in Grades K-5 and standards mastery data in Grade 6. She will provide professional development opportunities that address instructional needs based on the data that is collected and analyzed. She is also our Title One coordinator. She ensures that our school is in compliance with all Title One mandates and organizes all associated events.
Herold, Kristi	Teacher, ESE	Mrs. Herold works with teachers, administration, coaches, and parents to facilitate implementation of the Multi-Tiered System of Supports and ensure the MTSS process, protocols, timelines, and implementation plans are implemented with fidelity and meet the needs of our students. Mrs. Herold provides training on the MTSS process at grade level meetings and sits in on student data chats bi-weekly. She schedules and runs all MTSS meetings with teachers, administrators, and coaches. She also serves as the LEA for all IPST meetings.
Dias, Kimberly	Reading Coach	Mrs. Dias will support all K-6 staff in the implementation of the ELA curriculum that supports the Florida B.E.S.T. Standards. She will work directly with teachers providing classroom-based coaching cycles,

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		collaborative one-on-one support, and facilitating teacher professional development. She will work closely with teachers to assess student progress and determine the need for additional reinforcement or adjustments to instructional techniques. A focus will be placed on enhancing the teachers' ability to provide instruction that builds students' sense of engagement. Mrs. Dias will also work with administration to collect, analyze, interpret, and use data to guide instructional decisions.
Bernard, Carmen	Attendance/ Social Work	Mrs. Bernard is responsible for social emotional curriculum. She provides SEL/Conscious Discipline supports to our teachers, students, and families. Mrs. Bernard oversees our Positive Referral incentive as a proactive measure to showcase positive behaviors on campus.
Shoff, Mary	Science Coach	Mrs. Shoff will support K-6 teachers in the implementation of the science curriculum that supports the standards. She will work directly with teachers providing science lab-based co-teaching models. A focus will be placed on enhancing the teachers' ability to provide instruction that builds students' sense of engagement. She will work closely with the district resource teacher to ensure teachers are utilizing the 5E model of instruction. Mrs. Shoff will also work with administration to collect, analyze, interpret, and use data to guide instructional decisions.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/18/2018, Nicole Gaumond

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
70

Total number of students enrolled at the school
733

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
14

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
11

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	108	89	91	98	102	94	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	669
Attendance below 90 percent	11	23	9	7	20	12	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
One or more suspensions	3	5	7	7	4	8	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Course failure in ELA	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	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA ELA	0	0	0	3	26	29	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA MATH	0	0	0	3	35	30	35	0	0	0	0	0	0	103

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	1	1	27	24	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	74

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	11	12	3	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated
Friday 8/27/2021

2020-21 - 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	81	94	110	95	100	78	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	663
Attendance below 90 percent	7	6	6	13	7	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
One or more suspensions	0	6	5	4	4	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in ELA	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	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	10	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	17	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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	6	12	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

2020-21 - 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	81	94	110	95	100	78	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	663
Attendance below 90 percent	7	6	6	13	7	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
One or more suspensions	0	6	5	4	4	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in ELA	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	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	10	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	17	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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	6	12	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				51%	62%	57%	52%	60%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				48%	60%	58%	41%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				34%	57%	53%	26%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				44%	63%	63%	46%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				57%	65%	62%	45%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				35%	53%	51%	27%	49%	47%
Science Achievement				29%	57%	53%	43%	57%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments
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	2021					
	2019	58%	64%	-6%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	54%	61%	-7%	58%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
05	2021					
	2019	41%	60%	-19%	56%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
06	2021					
	2019	52%	60%	-8%	54%	-2%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	38%	61%	-23%	62%	-24%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	52%	64%	-12%	64%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
05	2021					
	2019	27%	60%	-33%	60%	-33%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				
06	2021					
	2019	55%	67%	-12%	55%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-27%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	30%	56%	-26%	53%	-23%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

iReady ELA and Math Diagnostic Scores

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	22 / 31%	44 / 57%	60 / 71%
	Economically Disadvantaged	17 / 29%	33 / 52%	45 / 68%
	Students With Disabilities	4 / 33%	6 / 50%	9 / 64%
	English Language Learners	2 / 20%	3 / 27%	5 / 45%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	14 / 21%	30 / 39%	47 / 56%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9 / 16%	24 / 38%	32 / 48%
	Students With Disabilities	2 / 20%	4 / 31%	4 / 29%
	English Language Learners	1 / 10%	4 / 36%	4 / 36%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6 / 7%	13 / 14%	27 / 28%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6 / 9%	11 / 15%	20 / 28%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 6%	2 / 12%	5 / 31%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6 / 7%	11 / 12%	21 / 22%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5 / 7%	8 / 11%	15 / 21%
	Students With Disabilities	3 / 18%	2 / 12%	4 / 25%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	1 / 13%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	21 / 23%	32 / 34%	43 / 43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14 / 19%	19 / 25%	29 / 39%
	Students With Disabilities	2 / 10%	3 / 14%	6 / 27%
	English Language Learners	3 / 33%	3 / 33%	2 / 20%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	13 / 14%	27 / 28%	35 / 36%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8 / 11%	17 / 23%	24 / 32%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 5%	3 / 14%	5 / 23%
	English Language Learners	0 /0%	2 / 22%	3 / 30%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	33 / 36%	39 / 42%	58 / 60%
	Economically Disadvantaged	28 / 37%	34 / 45%	46 / 61%
	Students With Disabilities	2 / 13%	3 / 19%	4 / 25%
	English Language Learners	3 / 38%	2 / 25%	2 / 22%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	2 / 2%	16 / 17%	31 / 32%
	Economically Disadvantaged	1 / 1%	14 / 18%	27 / 36%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	3 / 19%	3 / 19%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	1 / 11%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	33 / 35%	35 / 36%	42 / 42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	22 / 32%	24 / 34%	28 / 39%
	Students With Disabilities	3 / 17%	3 / 16%	4 / 21%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15 / 16%	37 / 39%	48 / 48%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9 / 13%	23 / 33%	30 / 43%
	Students With Disabilities	2 / 11%	4 / 21%	5 / 26%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	1 / 17%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students			
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities			
	English Language Learners			

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	26 / 34%	33 / 41%	33 / 39%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18 / 30%	25 / 40%	22 / 34%
	Students With Disabilities	2 / 12%	5 / 28%	6 / 32%
	English Language Learners	1 / 33%	1 / 33%	0 / 0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	10 / 13%	22 / 28%	26 / 31%
	Economically Disadvantaged	8 / 13%	15 / 24%	19 / 29%
	Students With Disabilities	2 / 12%	2 / 11%	2 / 11%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	1 / 33%	2 / 50%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	21	39	38	24	33	19	19				
ELL	37	59		42	53						
BLK	33	35	23	28	30	23	19				
HSP	42	54	50	43	57						
MUL	51	71		31	44						
WHT	48	49	55	46	39	18	32				
FRL	38	42	33	34	38	21	24				
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	16	28	26	10	33	37	8				
ELL	35	34	29	41	56	27					
BLK	39	48	30	29	46	30	13				
HSP	44	41	30	36	49	27	25				
MUL	47	37		35	50						
WHT	58	52	41	52	64	41	37				
FRL	46	44	34	37	52	35	22				
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	13	24	26	13	32	28					
ELL	32	38	36	32	38	40					

			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
BLK	36	30	18	28	30	14	13				
HSP	50	44	38	41	43	40	41				
MUL	51	34		38	27	27	55				
WHT	56	43	24	52	52	29	47				
FRL	44	38	27	37	41	24	34				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	40
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	38
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	320
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	46
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	

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%	

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	27
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	48
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	49
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	

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%	

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	41
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	33
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Due to learning loss from distance learning in 19-20 and the multiple modes of learning in 20-21 (in person, hybrid, and/or virtual), we saw a decrease in student proficiency and in students who achieved a learning gain. We also noted that our subgroups saw a higher rate of learning loss compared to their peers.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

In 2019, the lowest performing data area was our lowest 25% subgroup for both ELA and math. In 2019, 34% of students in the lowest 25% category scored proficient in ELA and 35% of students in the lowest 25% category scored proficient in math. However, after receiving the updated 2020 FSA scores our lowest area's would be Math lowest 25%, learning gains, and proficiency. The 2020 assessment showed 40% of students showing proficiency which was a drop from 44% in 2019. The school's math learning gains also fell from 57% in 2019 to 41% in 2020 and lowest 25% population went from 35% in 2019 to 29% in 2020.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Some contributing factors to this need for improvement were instructional models in classrooms. Teachers were utilizing more whole group instruction, rather than small group differentiated instruction. In the 19-20 and 20-21 school years, we implemented reading interventions with the lowest 25% of students. We hired Reading Interventionists (T) to serve these students in a pull out intervention model. Data was monitored weekly and discussed at monthly meetings where students moved through groups based on their progress. Classroom teachers worked with the Reading Coach to give common assessments (iReady Standards Mastery) and would then reteach skills as needed in ELA. In math, classroom teachers worked with the Math Coach (T) to implement standards-based Tier 1 instruction using a rigorous standards-based curriculum. During the 20-21 school year the similar model utilized for ELA growth will be implemented during math. Teachers will use 30 minutes of their core 90 minute math block to accelerate for upcoming skills. We have also added a math intervention time of 30 minutes a day to target lowest 25% students to begin to reteach skills lost or not gained in previous years. We will be working closely with Tim Keeney to train staff on the utilization of the IReady pre-requisite crosswalk and the tool box for planning for acceleration and intervention groups for math.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

In 2019, the area that showed the most improvement was the learning gains category for both ELA and math. In 2019, 48% of students showed a learning gain in ELA and 57% of students showed a learning gain in math. The new 2020 FSA results show improvements in ELA learning gains form 48% in 2019 to 49% in 2020. In the area of ELA lowest 25% learning gains there was an improvement from 34% in 2019 to 47% in 2020.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Administration, District Instructional Coaches, and Teachers worked closely together to analyze and own student data to guide instruction. During data conversations with all teachers subgroup data was

analyzed and additional supports put in place based on subgroups and lowest 25% population. Teachers used this data to design and implement standards-based instruction that met the needs of their students. Teachers had access to more standards-based curriculum resources as well as planning time with District Instructional Coaches. We also ensured an increased focus on reading intervention time for all students within the lowest 25% and utilization of more frequent progress monitoring to ensure student movement through groups supported the growth they were achieving.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

In order to accelerate student learning, teachers will need to be trained on the new ELA B.E.S.T. Standards as well as the new standards-based curriculum that was adopted for the 21-22 school year. This will enhance student learning in Tier 1 ELA instruction. In math, teachers will use a new instructional model to enhance student learning. They will implement standards-based core instruction in the math block using whole group and small group models. Teachers in K-6 will also have an additional 30 minutes of math intervention each day to accelerate student learning. Reading and Math Interventionists (T) will be pulling groups out of classrooms to deliver research-based interventions based on student needs after data meetings with administration, coaches, and teachers. School-based Instructional Coaches (T) will provide support to teachers during Working Wednesday planning days, as well as through grade level meetings and coaching cycles with grade levels and individual teachers. Professional development will be given to all teachers from i-Ready (Tim Keeney) on how to best utilize the pre-requisite crosswalk for acceleration and using the teacher toolbox for intervention.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Teachers will have multiple opportunities to attend professional development on the new ELA B.E.S.T. Standards, as well as the new ELA curriculum that was adopted by the district. Teachers will also participate in grade level or individual Coaching Cycles with school-based Instructional Coaches (T). Professional development will be given to all teachers from i-Ready (Tim Keeney) on how to best utilize the pre-requisite crosswalk for acceleration and using the teacher toolbox for intervention.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Teachers will have an increased knowledge of appropriate resources to utilize for both acceleration and intervention that will ensure sustainability of improvement. School based coaches will continue to work closely with teachers in coaching cycles to continue to grow all instructional practices within the building. The continuous growth and refining of our intervention plan to to meet all subgroup areas will also be key in ensuring long term sustainability. We will also continue monthly classroom walkthroughs will district school improvement staff as well as monthly check-ins with the State Coach for the RAISE program. Our literacy coach will work closely with the state coach as we move throughout the year with the new standards and keeping a focus on early literacy within the primary grades.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teacher learning and growth are dependent upon frequent interaction, dialogue, and reflection between themselves, instructional coaches, and administration.
Measurable Outcome:	School-wide ELA scores will increase as a result of teacher collaboratively planning and the implementation of the B.E.S.T. standards utilizing an aligned, researched-based curriculum in all classrooms. In 2021, 49% of students scored a learning gain and 44% of students in grades 3-6 were proficient on the ELA FSA. The goal for 2021 is to increase students showing a learning gain to 59% and students meeting proficiency to 54% on the ELA FSA. In 2021, 47% of students in the lowest 25% category scored a learning gain. The goal for 2022 is to increase students in this category to a 52% learning gain.
Monitoring:	Teachers will monitor student progress in ELA on the iReady Diagnostic three times per year, as well as the iReady Growth Monitoring twice a year. Teachers in Grade K will utilize PASI and KLS assessments and teachers in Grades 1-2 will utilize PSI and ORR to monitor student progress on foundational reading skills. Teachers in Grades 3-6 will utilize Standards Mastery to monitor student progress on focus standards for instruction. Teachers in Grades 1-6 will monitor student reading fluency utilizing the DORF. Teachers in Grades 3-6 will monitor student progress in writing utilizing the Write Score Assessment (T) three times per year. Teachers will also monitor bi-weekly or end of unit assessments within the Saaves and Benchmark program to plan for instruction based on student understanding of new content.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Tera Scott (scott.tera@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilization of collaborative planning with standards-aligned, research-based quality curriculum resources.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidence supports that teaching strategies increase when teachers are given time to collaborate with peers and build their skills utilizing quality materials. This strategy when paired with administration walk throughs, immediate feedback, and common assessments can yield great results for all learners.

Action Steps to Implement	

Teachers will collaboratively plan with district and school based-coaches (T) quarterly to map out ELA standards aligned curriculum including complex text, tasks, questions, and exit ticket for understanding.

Person Responsible	Tera Scott (scott.tera@brevardschools.org)

Teachers will collaboratively work to increase understanding and implementation of best practice writing strategies for instruction. The Write Score online platform (T) will be used as a progress monitoring tool for writing in grades 3-6.

Person Responsible	Kimberly Dias (dias.kimberly@brevardschools.org)

Teachers will use frequent feedback from coaches and administration observations to improve instruction.

Person Responsible   Tera Scott (scott.tera@brevardschools.org)

A data room will be utilized by the Title One team and admin to monitor ongoing progress of iReady, Standards Mastery, PASI, and PSI assessments school wide. (T)

Person Responsible   Kimberly Dias (dias.kimberly@brevardschools.org)

Teachers will monitor student progress through iReady, Standards Mastery, PASI, PSI, KLS, Running Records, and Oral Reading Fluency to guide and plan for standards based instruction.

Person Responsible   Kimberly Dias (dias.kimberly@brevardschools.org)

School wide intervention will continue by utilizing iReady, PASI, PSI, and ORR data to focus on individual student needs facilitated by additional teachers, interventionists, and IA's. (T)

Person Responsible   Kimberly Dias (dias.kimberly@brevardschools.org)

Monthly data and MTSS meetings with teachers will continue and will focus on the lowest 25% population as well as ESSA sub-categories identified under 41%.

Person Responsible   Kimberly Dias (dias.kimberly@brevardschools.org)

Teachers will utilize BrainPop and Flocabulary as an integrated resource to enhance core curriculum. (T)

Person Responsible   Kimberly Dias (dias.kimberly@brevardschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teacher learning and growth are dependent upon frequent interaction, dialogue, and reflection between themselves, instructional coaches, and administrators.
Measurable Outcome:	School-wide math scores will increase as a result of teachers collaboratively planning and the implementation of standards based instruction in all classrooms for all students with the utilization of the Eureka math program. In 2021, 41% of students scored a learning gain and 40% of students were proficient on the Math FSA. The goal for 2022 is to increase students showing a learning gain to 51% and students meeting proficiency to 50%.In 2021, 29% of students in the lowest 25% category scored a learning gain. The goal for 2022 is to increase students in this category to a 39% learning gain.
Monitoring:	Teachers will monitor student progress on the iReady Math Diagnostic three times per year. Teachers in Grades K-5 will monitor student progress utilizing the Eureka Math Mid and End of Module Assessments. Teachers in Grade 6 will monitor student progress utilizing Standards Mastery.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Erica Back (back.erica@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilization of collaborative planning with standards-aligned, research-based quality resources. Teachers will also utilize acceleration lessons from the i-ready pre-requisite document to prepare students for upcoming math topics before teachers teach these topics. Teachers will monitor lowest 25% and use i-ready lessons to fill the gaps within this groups math instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidence supports that teaching strategies increase when teachers are given time to collaborate with peers and build their skills utilizing quality materials. The strategy when paired with administration walk-throughs, immediate feedback, and common assessments can yield great results for all learners.

Action Steps to Implement

Continue to implement Eureka program in classrooms K-5 to increase student depth of knowledge on standards. Teachers in Grade 6 will implement Big Ideas as well as Ready Math to build on their students' foundational math knowledge.

Person Responsible	Courtney Droll (droll.courtney@brevardschools.org)

Math coach (T) will work with teachers on pacing and planning so that grade levels can stay on pace with the district and collaboratively plan utilizing the Eureka, Big Ideas, and Ready Math resources in order to increase the standards based instruction and move to the next level of deeper mathematical knowledge for all students.

Person Responsible	Courtney Droll (droll.courtney@brevardschools.org)

Teachers will plan quarterly with their team, district coach, and math coach (T) for whole group and small group math instruction as well as math interventions. Teachers will plan as a team weekly so they can support each other and work together to plan ahead and prep materials for lessons.

Person Responsible Courtney Droll (droll.courtney@brevardschools.org)

Teachers will use frequent feedback from coaches and administration to improve instruction.

Person Responsible Erica Back (back.erica@brevardschools.org)

Math coach (T) will work with teachers and/or grade levels to model and co-teach lessons. The math coach will also provide coaching cycles for teachers as needed or requested.

Person Responsible Courtney Droll (droll.courtney@brevardschools.org)

Math coach (T) will facilitate PD opportunities for teachers including, but not limited to, schoolwide PD, grade level PD, and voluntary math book studies (T).

Person Responsible Courtney Droll (droll.courtney@brevardschools.org)

Math coach (T) will work with grade level teams to track exit ticket data (formative assessment) and use that data to look at student successes and areas to grow before mid and end of module assessments and to make decisions about students to work with during math intervention and continue to target students who need extra support.

Person Responsible Courtney Droll (droll.courtney@brevardschools.org)

Monthly data and MTSS meetings with teachers will continue and will focus on the lowest 25% student population as well as ESSA categories identified under 41%.

Person Responsible Erica Back (back.erica@brevardschools.org)

Math coach (T) will have math materials and manipulatives available for teacher check out and support grade level teams in gathering materials for lessons ahead of time. (T)

Person Responsible Courtney Droll (droll.courtney@brevardschools.org)

Teachers in Grades K-5 will utilize mid and end of module assessment scores and teachers in Grade 6 will utilize Standards Mastery scores for common assessment data tracking.

Person Responsible Courtney Droll (droll.courtney@brevardschools.org)

Teachers in Grades K-6 will have an additional 30 minutes of math intervention to accelerate student learning.

Person Responsible Courtney Droll (droll.courtney@brevardschools.org)

Teachers will utilize BrainPop and Flocabulary as an integrated resource to enhance core curriculum. (T)

Person Responsible Courtney Droll (droll.courtney@brevardschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teacher learning and growth are dependent upon frequent interaction, dialogue, and reflection between themselves, instructional coaches, and administration.
Measurable Outcome:	Schoolwide Science scores will increase as a result of teachers collaboratively planning and the implementation of standards based instruction in all classrooms with the district created Science resources aligned to standards based instruction. In 2020, 32% of 5th grade students were proficient on the SSA. The goal for the 2021-2022 school year is to increase the percentage of students proficient on the SSA to 42%.
Monitoring:	Teachers and science coach will monitor PENDA and district created science pre and post assessments throughout the year to ensure understanding of each standard.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mary Shoff (shoff.mary@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Collaborative planning with the utilization of the Five E model for hands on science instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidence supports that teaching strategies increase when teachers are given time to collaborate with peers and build their skills utilizing quality materials. This strategy when paired with administration walkthroughs, immediate feedback, and common assessments can yield great results for all learners.

Action Steps to Implement

1.A Science coach (T) will be added to the Title One team as a school-based resource for teachers and students.
2.Teachers will plan collaboratively with grade-level team and Science coach (T) using the standards aligned science resources created by the district. This collaboration will aid in increasing standards-based instruction and a deeper science knowledge for all students.
3.Teachers will use consistent feedback from coaches and administrative observations to improving classroom instruction.
4. Addition of Generation Genius (schoolwide) and PENDA for science interactive instruction grades 3rd - 5th. (T)
5. Science coach will model and coach teachers on standards aligned science instruction during science lab and provide feedback for teacher growth.
6. Teachers will utilize district science assessments as teaching tools for data chats and test taking skills after the assessment has been completed.
7. Teachers will utilize BrainPop and Flocabulary as an integrated resource to enhance core curriculum. (T)

Person Responsible Mary Shoff (shoff.mary@brevardschools.org)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The 2021 school grade components report determined that we did not meet the 41% target in the areas of students with disabilities, English language learners, and Black/African American students.
Measurable Outcome:	Students With Disabilities - Increase from 20% to 41% English Language Learners - Increase from 25% to 41% Black/African American - Increase from 34% to 41%
Monitoring:	
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Carmen Bernard (bernard.carmen@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Conscious Discipline has achieved CASEL's SELect Program designation, recognizing Conscious Discipline as a leader in impactful social and emotional learning (SEL). Conscious Discipline meets CASEL's SELect Program designation, the highest designation for evidence-based programs. Conscious Discipline is an evidence-based, trauma-informed approach. The Harvard study's authors say, "Conscious Discipline provides an array of behavior management strategies and classroom structures that teachers can use to turn everyday situations into learning opportunities."
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	A collaborative problem planning approach will be utilized to make data driven instructional decisions to ensure that the needs of all students are being addressed. Additionally, school-based collaborative teams will focus on identified groups of under-performing students in an effort to provide unified and accelerated support. Additionally, Conscious Discipline can play a central role in our school's approach to promoting student social and emotional learning to close learning gaps.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Increase inclusion opportunities to include all core content areas.
2. Instructional Leader(s) will lead the MTSS/Data bi-weekly meetings as the key person(s) responsible for the oversight and coordination of goals and action steps related to inclusive best practices.
3. All data will be inclusive of reviewing all ESSA sub-categories.
4. Extended common planning for teachers to have in-depth collaboration on standards aligned instruction.
5. iReady (Title One) data will determine schoolwide intervention groups for targeted specific instruction with ongoing progress monitoring utilizing district common assessments.
6. Conscious Discipline Anchor School with in person coaching and schoolwide implementation to ensure

all students feel connected and play an important role within our school community

7. Administration will monitor instructional engagement w/in the subgroups during classroom walkthroughs and observations

Person Responsible   Carmen Bernard (bernard.carmen@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

SY19-20 (lagging data) in the SafeSchools for Alex data base shows Dr. W.J. CREEL with 11.4 suspension per 100 students which above state average. However, it is a decrease in our school data from 18-19 that showed suspension rates of 13.4 per 100 students. The root cause of many major behavior referrals is related trauma and social emotional risk factors. In SY21-22, teachers and staff are dedicated to implementing PBIS initiatives described in the 2nd Area of Focus mentioned above. These strategies include: Conscious Discipline training, social worker support, guidance intervention, positive incentives, clear schoolwide expectations, teacher training and implementation support, and zones of regulation training for families/teachers.

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.

During our bonus pre-planning week, teachers had the opportunity to attend a two day training with a Conscious Discipline trainer. (Teachers who were not in attendance will be given this information through webinars and online training.) Teachers were given strategies for building community within their classrooms and school leaders were given strategies for building relationships and community school-wide. Data has shown that our teachers want this support in their classrooms so they are better prepared to help their students not only academically, but socially and emotionally as well.

In Year 2 of Conscious Discipline, we have made some changes to support teachers and students to ensure successful implementation. We have a designated time in our schedules for Brain Start Smarts and Wish Wells, which will allow our students to be in a good mindset for the rigorous academic instruction throughout the day. This will also allow our students to be better equipped to acquire the knowledge, attitudes, and skills necessary to recognize and manage their emotions, demonstrate caring and concern for others, establish positive relationships with peers and adults, make responsible decisions, and positively

navigate challenging social situations through the utilization of Caring School Community and Conscious Discipline. Our School Support Team worked over the summer to create plans for each grade level to support teachers with planning their SEL lessons and focus skills each day. We have also started a Student Ambassador group to give students opportunities for leadership on campus and to be role models for their peers. This program will be sponsored by members of our School Support Team. We will continue to utilize the state website (RtI-B) to track data and areas of need.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Teachers: Follow the Caring School Community and Conscious Discipline Plans created by our School Support Team and implementing Brain Smart Starts, Wish Wells, and other Conscious Discipline strategies in their classrooms. Communicate with parents about student progress in social emotional and academic areas.

Coaches (T): Embed modeling Conscious Discipline strategies while working in classrooms with teachers in their specific content area.

Title 1 Team (T): Share information on school social media site and host parent and family engagement events that highlight social emotional learning strategies that parents can use at home to make a home-school connection.

Parents: Attend information sessions about Conscious Discipline, communicate with child's teacher about social emotional as well as academic progress, and reinforce positive strategies and attitudes about self and school at home.

Leadership Team: Support faculty and staff with Conscious Discipline by providing training and coaching opportunities, as well as materials to support implementation in the classroom. Model Conscious Discipline strategies at faculty meetings and provide connection opportunities for faculty and staff to build school community among the adults as well.

Business Partnerships: Attend and support community events related to social emotional well-being.