Jupiter Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Jupiter Elementary School

950 TUPELO RD SW, Palm Bay, FL 32908

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

Demographics

Principal: Sherie Troisi L

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2014

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 (51%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: C (48%)
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	
* 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

Jupiter Elementary School

950 TUPELO RD SW, Palm Bay, FL 32908

http://www.jupiter.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	58%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		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.

Reaching every child, every day. (Reviewed June 2021)

Provide the school's vision statement.

Jupiter Elementary School will challenge our diverse community of learners, and establish a positive and productive school culture, set high expectations for achievement, and encourage independent, self-directed learning. (Reviewed June 2021)

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
Troisi, Sherie	Principal	As the instructional leader, Sherie Troisi provides vision and strategic focus for all stakeholders. She ensures high academic expectations for all students by holding teachers accountable through regular observations with feedback and individual teacher data chats, supervises curriculum and instruction and ensures weekly data analysis and progress monitoring are occurring. She facilitates weekly leadership team meetings to review student data (academic, behavioral and attendance) and current practices to determine professional development needs and/or additional supports for teachers and students.
Ouellette, Amber	Assistant Principal	Amber Ouellette supports classroom instruction by ensuring all teachers have the appropriate curriculum and instructional resources. She conducts regular classroom observations with feedback to improve instructional practices. Mrs. Ouellette oversees the implementation of our response to intervention and our academic support programs and oversees our new teacher mentor program. She organizes and facilitates professional development and coordinates all testing.
Mallory, Jenifer	Instructional Coach	As our Literacy Coach, Jenifer Mallory supports classroom teachers with all aspects of reading instruction. She utilizes the coaching model to support reading instruction, coordinates implementation of iReady Reading, mentors teachers and facilitates our weekly data chats.
Cirino, Stacy	Teacher, K-12	Stacy Cirino coordinates our Title I program. She supports administration with discipline, maintains discipline records and oversees our Behavior Intervention Room. Mrs. Cirino supports classroom teachers in the areas of classroom management and math instruction utilizing the coaching model and coordinates our new teacher program. Mrs. Cirino provides RtI instruction to students in need of academic support for 80% of her day.
Brennan, Nancy	Teacher, ESE	Nancy Brennan is the Lead ESE Teacher. She works with the ESE team to ensure that all students with disabilities are provided rigorous instruction designed to meet their individual needs. She monitors the academic progress of our students with disabilities and ensures that classroom teachers are aware of student accommodations.
Daniels, Chrystal	School Counselor	Chrystal Daniels coordinates our MTSS program. She supports classroom teachers with the creation and implementation of behavior plans and supports the social emotional needs of our students via individual and small group counseling.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/1/2014, Sherie Troisi L

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.*

5

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

58

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.

1

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

3

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	96	108	90	106	88	80	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	665
Attendance below 90 percent	6	16	6	11	6	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	8	2	1	0	3	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
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	29	28	21	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	104
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	30	28	36	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	118
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	2	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	3	2	9	10	22	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	67

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	6	8	5	10	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/26/2021

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	90	108	92	89	96	91	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	653
Attendance below 90 percent	64	26	20	15	16	18	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	177
One or more suspensions	5	6	4	6	3	10	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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	21	28	13	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	30	37	28	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	118

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	9	10	5	6	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	90	108	92	89	96	91	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	653
Attendance below 90 percent	64	26	20	15	16	18	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	177
One or more suspensions	5	6	4	6	3	10	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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	21	28	13	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	30	37	28	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	118

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	3	2	9	11	22	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	65

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	9	10	5	6	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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				47%	62%	57%	43%	60%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				57%	60%	58%	48%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				66%	57%	53%	39%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				48%	63%	63%	47%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				59%	65%	62%	56%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				47%	53%	51%	39%	49%	47%
Science Achievement				34%	57%	53%	44%	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	49%	64%	-15%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	48%	61%	-13%	58%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2021					
	2019	38%	60%	-22%	56%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
06	2021					
	2019	47%	60%	-13%	54%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	43%	61%	-18%	62%	-19%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	40%	64%	-24%	64%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2021					
	2019	42%	60%	-18%	60%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				
06	2021					
	2019	59%	67%	-8%	55%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	33%	56%	-23%	53%	-20%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Jupiter Elementary used iReady to progress monitor data for English Language Arts and Mathematics.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	32/30%	50/46%	76/70%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21/28%	38/51%	55/73%
	Students With Disabilities	2/8%	9/38%	11/46%
	English Language Learners	1/11%	4/44%	6/67%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	26/24%	43/40%	63/58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18/24%	29/39%	44/59%
	Students With Disabilities	3/13%	7/29%	9/38%
	English Language Learners	2/22%	3/33%	4/44%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16/17%	27/29%	47/51%
	Economically Disadvantaged	13/22%	19/33%	30/52%
	Students With Disabilities	3/16%	5/26%	11/58%
	English Language Learners	1/25%	0/0%	1/25%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	8/9%	18/20%	36/39%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6/10%	11/19%	24/41%
	Students With Disabilities	3/16%	4/21%	8/42%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	1/25%	0/0%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	20/19%	35/33%	44/42%
	Economically Disadvantaged	18/25%	28/39%	34/47%
	Students With Disabilities	1/6%	3/19%	4/22%
	English Language Learners	1/10%	1/10%	1/10%
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	6/6%	19/18%	28/26%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5/7%	12/17%	22/31%
	Students With Disabilities	2/11%	1/6%	3/17%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	1/10%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	33/38%	55/63%	64/72%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21/36%	38/66%	47/81%
	Students With Disabilities	2/12%	8/57%	9/53%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	1/17%	2/33%
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	7/8%	18/20%	39/44%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4/7%	9/16%	21/36%
	Students With Disabilities	1/6%	2/12%	5/29%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	1/17%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	23/29%	25/31%	34/43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14/32%	15/34%	22/50%
	Students With Disabilities	5/24%	7/33%	6/29%
	English Language Learners	1/10%	0/0%	1/10%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	8/10%	13/16%	25/31%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6/14%	9/20%	18/41%
	Students With Disabilities	1/5%	3/14%	6/29%
	English Language Learners	1/10%	1/10%	4/40%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	12/20%	20/43%	
	Economically Disadvantaged	8/19%	13/37%	
	Students With Disabilities	2/2%	1/11%	
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	28/29%	30/31%	42/44%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16/24%	19/29%	27/41%
	Students With Disabilities	3/15%	3/15%	5/33%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	13/14%	29/30%	38/40%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/14%	18/27%	24/36%
	Students With Disabilities	1/5%	3/15%	1/5%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	1/14%	0/0%

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	19	14	9	28	31	18	11				
ELL	17	35		19	41						
BLK	45	45	25	26	36	13	26				
HSP	28	31	36	26	42	20	7				
MUL	34	29		49	43		42				
WHT	48	54		54	52	42	44				
FRL	35	32	22	36	41	26	18				
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	28	58	53	23	59	61					
ELL	25	55		22	65						
BLK	33	49	60	36	49	38	15				
HSP	50	67	69	47	63	50	36				
MUL	52	58		67	72						
WHT	53	57	81	53	61	53	48				
FRL	42	57	65	43	57	46	27				
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	18	30	26	22	48	42	26				
ELL	29	65	67	33	46						
BLK	33	41	22	32	44	37	19				
HSP	46	50	43	54	61	45	36				
MUL	37	56		59	75						
WHT	50	50	50	51	58	37	57				
FRL	38	45	38	44	55	37	40				

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	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	63
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	323

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	23
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	35
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	31
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	32
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	39
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

Multiracial Students	
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	49
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	34
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?

Across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas Jupiter Elementary has found that growth in learning gains has been inconsistent. In 2018, 56% percent of students made learning gains in math, in 2019 the number of students making learning gains in math increased to 59%. However, in 2021 only 44% of students made learning gains in math. In ELA, we have identified a similar trend. Learning gains increased from 39% in 2018 to 66% in 2019 but then dropped in 2021 to 31%. Jupiter Elementary's African American students continue to fall below the federal index.

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

Data show that in 2018, 47% of students scored a level 3 or higher on the Florida State Assessment in math. The number of students that scored a level 3 in 2021 dropped to 40%. In 2018, 47% of students scored a level 3 or higher on the Florida State Assessment in ELA. The number of students that scored a level 3 in 2021 dropped to 41%.

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

Based on inconsistent growth and average scores consistently being below 50%, improvement in Tier 1 instruction at Jupiter Elementary is the greatest need. A large group of students consistently participated in eLearning and hybrid classrooms which negatively impacted student academic

outcomes associated with engagement and small group instruction. This predominantly impacted our African American students who had a high percentage of e-Learners.

New actions that need to be taken are increased collaborative planning and professional development to ensure that all students are receiving standards-aligned, Tier 1 instruction. We will also focus on the use of instructional time to ensure that students are fully engaged and doing the thinking that the lesson demands. Data analysis linked to core instruction will be emphasized and used to modify core instruction.

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

2020-2021 iReady Diagnostic Assessments: Based on the math end of the year i-Ready diagnostic we increased our proficiency level from 5% to 20%. Based on ELA end of the year i-Ready diagnostic we increased our proficiency level from 15% to 32%. Students in Kindergarten experienced the most gains, while our sixth grade students demonstrated the least amount of gains on the iReady Diagnostic Assessments in both ELA and math.

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

The contributing factors for this improvement include teachers ensuring students completed forty-five minutes of instruction on their instructional path in both ELA and math. Teachers used standards mastery data to determine which standards to reteach and provide intervention in.

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

Jupiter Elementary will accelerate learning by using i-Ready diagnostic data and other district assessments to diagnose essential missed learning. Learning will be accelerated by increasing ELA and math small group instruction during Tier 1. All student will receive ELA instruction using on grade level materials. (Benchmark Advance/Savvas Curriculum). The iReady Math Prerequisite Report will be used to group students and provide small group support in the prerequisite skills needed for students to be successful in core instruction.

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.

Professional development will be provided to learn how to analyze i-Ready data in order to determine gaps in student learning. Professional development will also provide resources to accelerate learning in these areas. Collaborative planning sessions will focus on Tier 1 pacing of instruction.

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

1. Summer Academic Clinic to avoid summer slide in ELA and math.
2. Book Club to increase student love for reading.
3. Continue to use VAM scores and teachers strengths for teacher placement.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Data show that in 2019, 48% of students scored a level 3 or higher on the Florida State Assessment in math. The number of students that scored a level 3 in 2021 dropped to 40%. In 2019, 59% percent of students made learning gains in math, in 2021, the number of students making learning gains in math decreased to 44%. Twenty-four percent of students scored in the "At Risk, Tier 3" category during the fall 2021 i-Ready diagnostic. Data show that in 2019, 47% of students scored a level 3 or higher on the Florida State Assessment in ELA. The number of students that scored a level 3 in 2021 dropped to 41%. In 2019, 57% percent of students made learning gains in ELA, in 2021, the number of students making learning gains in ELA decreased to 44%. Twenty-four percent of students scored in the "At Risk, Tier 3" category during the fall 2021 i-Ready diagnostic.
Measurable Outcome:	Jupiter Elementary will increase the number of students on grade level or above in ELA and math as evidenced by i-Ready assessments and Florida Standards Assessment. During the fall 2021 i-Ready diagnostic, 12% of student scored on grade level or above in math. Jupiter will increase the number of students scoring on grade level or above to 50% by the end of the year diagnostic. During the fall 2021 i-Ready diagnostic, 28% of student scored on grade level or above in ELA. Jupiter will increase the number of students scoring on grade level or above to 50% by the end of the year diagnostic. Jupiter will increase the percent of students at proficiency to 50% or higher in ELA and math and 50% or higher will make learning gains on the 2022 Florida Standards Assessment.
Monitoring:	The leadership team will attend weekly collaborative planning sessions with each grade level to monitor pacing of instruction. Professional development will be provided to meet the needs of individual grade levels. Follow up to professional development will occur during data chats and coaching sessions. On going monitoring will be done utilizing the following measures: iReady Reading/Math Diagnostic Assessments, District reading/math assessments, iReady Standards Mastery Assessments, and grade level specific common formative math assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sherie Troisi (troisi.sherie@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategy Jupiter will implement during the 2021-2022 school year is collaborative planning utilizing Eureka Math (K-2) and Ready Math (3-6) for math and Florida Benchmark Advance (K-5) and SAVVAS (6) for ELA as our Tier 1 curriculum. According to the research article, Teacher Collaboration in Perspective, "Schools that are more collaborative have been shown to have stronger student academic outcomes than schools that are less collaborative."
Rationale for Evidence-	Less than 50% of our students are proficient in ELA and math based on 2021 FSA Achievement data. This indicates a need to focus on Tier 1 instruction. Research has shown that schools with better-quality collaboration, had higher student achievement gains in math and reading. In previous years teachers have not followed the district pacing and

based Strategy:	sequencing guides nor used collaborative planning time effectively. This has lead to a decrease in student achievement. Collaborative planning for instruction and use of high quality instructional materials will support teachers to understand how to identify their students' instructional needs, and to organize instruction to maximize learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide Professional Development around the new reading series, BEST Standards, mathematical practices, iReady Math Prerequisite Data and iReady Reading implementation. (T)

Person Responsible	Sherie Troisi (troisi.sherie@brevardschools.org)

2. Provide teachers time each week during their planning time to plan collaboratively with the leadership team and coaches. (T)

Person Responsible	Amber Ouellette (ouellette.amber@brevardschools.org)

3. Analyze i-Ready data to monitor student progress and make necessary instruction adjustments.

Person Responsible	Sherie Troisi (troisi.sherie@brevardschools.org)

4. Conduct classroom observations with feedback to monitor implementation of plans.

Person Responsible	Sherie Troisi (troisi.sherie@brevardschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Data show that in 2019, 47% of students scored a level 3 or higher on the Florida State Assessment in ELA. However in 2021 this number dropped to 41%. In 2019, 57% percent of students demonstrated learning gains on the Florida State Assessment in ELA and in 2021, the number of students demonstrating learning gains decreased to 44%. Our lowest 25% demonstrating learning gains decreased from 66% in 2019 to 31% in 2021. When we look at the 2021 iReady Diagnostic 3 data for students in grades K-6, we find that in 2020, 40% of our students were one grade level below and this increased in 2021 to 49%. During these same years, the percent of students in the At Risk category increased from 12% to 19%. As we look at the initial diagnostic data for the current year, we have 49% of students one grade level below and 24% of students in the At Risk category in grades 1-6. This data indicates that we must address instruction at all levels. Focus Goal 1 addresses Core (Tier 1) instruction and Focus Goal 2 addresses interventions (Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction).
Measurable Outcome:	Jupiter Elementary will increase the number of students on grade level or above in ELA as evidenced by i-Ready, Benchmark Advance, Florida State Assessment, and other district assessments. Florida Standards Assessment scores in ELA will increase from 41% in 2021 to 50% of students scoring at level 3 or above in 2022. Jupiter will decrease the number of students scoring one grade level below from 49% to 39% on the 2022 final iReady Diagnostic Assessment and decrease the percent of students At Risk from 19% in 2021 to 10% in 2022. iReady Diagnostic 3 for students in grades K-3 will increase from 36% at proficiency in 2021 to 50% in 2022 and decrease the percent of students at risk from 20% to 10%.
Monitoring:	A digital data wall will be created by the leadership team for progress monitoring of ELA standards. The data wall will be used and referenced weekly during data chats with teachers and to monitor the progress of the MTSS system and its form seven. Data monitored includes: iReady Reading Diagnostics, iReady Usage and and Pass Rates, iReady My Path analysis for students not making progress, Standards Mastery, Benchmark Advance/Savvas Assessments, Tier 3 intervention data. The leadership team will attend weekly collaborative planning sessions with each grade level to monitor pacing of instruction for the ELA curriculum. Professional development will be provided to meet the needs of individual grade levels and follow up will occur during data chats and coaching sessions.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sherie Troisi (troisi.sherie@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategy Jupiter will implement during the 2021-2022 school year is to ensure all struggling students are receiving consistent intensive, systematic, and explicit small group instruction on foundational reading skills. (T)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Based on our iReady Diagnostic 1 results, 75% of our students are in need of Tier 2 or Tier 3 instruction. Improving our instructional delivery of intensive, systematic, and explicit instruction on foundational skills is a researched-based strategy that is proven to increase student achievement. Research indicates that struggling readers need small group instruction (intervention) that is designed to meet their specific areas of weakness in order to improve their reading skills. A comprehensive review of research literature conducted by the Institute of Education Sciences concluded that reading interventions improve reading outcomes for students at risk of struggling with typical classroom reading instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify students in the lowest 35% and create a digital data wall for all teachers and leadership team to access and monitor growth throughout the school year.

Person Responsible	Sherie Troisi (troisi.sherie@brevardschools.org)

2. Use data from iReady, district assessments and common formative assessments to form intervention groups. (T)

Person Responsible	Jenifer Mallory (mallory.jenifer@brevardschools.org)

3. Monitor student progress at weekly data chats and adjust instruction based on student needs. (T)

Person Responsible	Jenifer Mallory (mallory.jenifer@brevardschools.org)

4. Provide professional development covering the essential components of an effective RtI model.

Person Responsible	Amber Ouellette (ouellette.amber@brevardschools.org)

5. Provide training for teachers and Title I instructional assistants covering implementation of LLI, Vocabulary Surge and 95% group. (T)

Person Responsible	Jenifer Mallory (mallory.jenifer@brevardschools.org)

6. Conduct biweekly walks during RtI times to ensure intervention groups are consistently providing students with appropriate intensive, systematic instruction.

Person Responsible	Sherie Troisi (troisi.sherie@brevardschools.org)

7. Utilize MyOn -To provide a research based digital library in which students in grades K-6th are able to access a wide range of literature from home and/or school to assist them in their reading comprehension. (T)

Person Responsible	Jenifer Mallory (mallory.jenifer@brevardschools.org)

8. Offer reading and math academic support programs targeting our lowest 35% and the lowest performing subgroups including African American and English as a Second Language students.

Person Responsible	Amber Ouellette (ouellette.amber@brevardschools.org)

9. Host Title I family nights with a focus on ELA and math. (T)

| **Person Responsible** | Stacy Cirino (cirino.stacy@brevardschools.org) |

* Implement ELA collaborative planning utilizing Florida Benchmark Advance (K-5) and Savvas (6) and the follow up to assure the delivery of high quality core instruction for all students. Action steps to accomplish this are outlined in Area of Focus "Instructional Practice specifically relating to Collaborative Planning."

| **Person Responsible** | Sherie Troisi (troisi.sherie@brevardschools.org) |

Provide 4th grade students the opportunity to attend the Indian River Lagoon virtual field trip in which students utilize ELA content skills in order to understand and comprehend the science content.

| **Person Responsible** | Sherie Troisi (troisi.sherie@brevardschools.org) |

Plan a summer academic clinic to support students in general content areas in grades K - 6.

| **Person Responsible** | Stacy Cirino (cirino.stacy@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.

Jupiter Elementary School had 12.5% of students with suspensions during the 2019-2020 school year. In comparison, the state had 3.9% of students in elementary school with suspensions during the 2019-2020 school year. An area of concern is the number of out of school suspensions. Jupiter will implement Conscience Discipline, a social/emotional management program. We will also utilize a behavior intervention room supported by guidance in order to decrease the number of out school suspensions. Jupiter's Conscience Discipline committee will meet monthly to monitor data. (T)

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.

Jupiter Elementary creates a positive school culture in many ways. Title I funds are currently used to pay for a second guidance counselor. Jupiter Elementary implements the Second Step and I Can Problem Solve character education programs, which also provide a school to home connection. Jupiter provides family nights throughout the school year to create positive relationships between home and school.

Parent Survey results indicated that 73% of our families stated that email or text is the best way for them to receive important information in regards to the school or their child. Jupiter will continue to utilize these forms of communication in addition to flyers and posts on our school website and student FOCUS accounts. Sixty-two percent of families feel they were given opportunities to provide feedback into school decisions. Jupiter will continue to solicit family feedback during our Title 1 family nights and parent/teacher conferences.

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

The guidance counselor provides support and resources to students and families in need, offers support and guidance groups for students, during data chats/MTSS process she provides strategies and next steps for behavioral concerns, facilitates school and family meetings regarding attendance concerns, and helps to create positive relationships between school, families and the community. Guidance also implements bullying lessons and activities through whole group and small group instruction. (T)

Classroom teachers teach students social-emotional learning strategies through classroom morning meetings, as well as throughout the school day. Teachers also implement the research based strategy "Conscience Discipline" school-wide to create a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations.

Jupiter Title 1 staff and faculty members have Title I academic nights in ELA, Math and Science. Jupiter's PTO and staff plan social events that include; father/daughter dance, mother/son dance, spring carnival, student talent night, PRIDE awards, school concerts and teacher meet and greet.