W. Melbourne Elementary School For Science

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

W. Melbourne Elementary School For Science

2255 MEADOWLANE AVE, West Melbourne, FL 32904

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

Demographics

Principal: Theresa Benson

Start Date for this Principal: 6/3/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	17%
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 Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (78%) 2017-18: A (77%) 2016-17: A (84%)
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

W. Melbourne Elementary School For Science

2255 MEADOWLANE AVE, West Melbourne, FL 32904

http://www.wmelbourne.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	No	23%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	39%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To educate and prepare today's students as strong readers, writers and mathematicians utilizing scientific discovery and the implementation of technology to meet the challenges of the world of tomorrow.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to help each child develop their full potential while becoming creative producers and self-directed, life-long learners. We will accomplish this through a commitment to excellence and collaboration between parents, staff, students and community stakeholders.

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
Benson, Theresa	Principal	School Leadership Team, Supervision of Progress Monitoring, Facilitator of Data collection and discussions, ESSA subgroup data, MTSS Team member, instructional leader of Professional Development
Rouse, Kelly	Assistant Principal	Discipline Data and Intervention, professional development, instructional coaching, subgroup data monitoring, MTSS Team member, school leadership team
Kane, Melissa	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coaching, professional development, school leadership team, data monitoring, intervention assistance and design, part of the MTSS team.
Poplar, Amy	Teacher, ESE	Serves the needs of our ESE students, professional development, school leadership team, data monitoring, co-teach with classroom teachers. part of the MTSS team.
Mistretta, Cathy	School Counselor	Serves the needs all of our students and families, professional development, school leadership team, data monitoring, ESOL contact, part of the MTSS team.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/3/2019, Theresa Benson

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.*

4

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.*

0

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

38

Total number of students enrolled at the school

543

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

2

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

2

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	72	72	72	71	88	86	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	544
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 10/8/2021

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	69	68	70	69	87	81	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	529
Attendance below 90 percent	1	2	2	2	3	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	69	68	70	69	87	81	85	0	0	0	0	0	0	529
Attendance below 90 percent	1	2	2	2	3	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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				88%	62%	57%	88%	60%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				73%	60%	58%	71%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				65%	57%	53%	67%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				84%	63%	63%	84%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				73%	65%	62%	71%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				69%	53%	51%	60%	49%	47%
Science Achievement				92%	57%	53%	95%	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	90%	64%	26%	58%	32%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	80%	61%	19%	58%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-90%				
05	2021					
	2019	90%	60%	30%	56%	34%
Cohort Comparison		-80%				
06	2021					
	2019	90%	60%	30%	54%	36%
Cohort Comparison		-90%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	82%	61%	21%	62%	20%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	79%	64%	15%	64%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				
05	2021					
	2019	90%	60%	30%	60%	30%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				
06	2021					
	2019	87%	67%	20%	55%	32%
Cohort Comparison		-90%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	92%	56%	36%	53%	39%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The progress monitoring tool we used by grade level is the i-Ready data from 2020-2021 ELA and math.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	50/86%	65/94%	68/99%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11/92%	13/87%	14/93%
	Students With Disabilities	3/100%	4/100%	4/100%
	English Language Learners	5/83%	6/86%	6/86%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	29/73%	50/86%	64/93%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6/66%	9/75%	13/87%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	3/100%	4/100%
	English Language Learners	1/100%	5/71%	6/86%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	33/46%	55/77%	65/92%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/44%	13/81%	16/100%
	Students With Disabilities	2/25%	4/50%	6/75%
	English Language Learners	2/40%	3/60%	4/80%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	23/32%	51/73%	62/87%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4/25%	12/75%	13/81%
	Students With Disabilities	3/38%	4/50%	5/63%
	English Language Learners	2/40%	4/80%	4/80%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	35/51%	54/78%	60/87%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/41%	14/64%	18/82%
	Students With Disabilities	4/24%	9/53%	12/71%
	English Language Learners	3/50%	4/66%	5/83%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	25/36%	40/58%	51/74%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5/23%	11/50%	14/64%
	Students With Disabilities	4/24%	4/24%	5/29%
	English Language Learners	2/33%	4/66%	4/66%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	69/80%	81/94%	80/93%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14/64%	18/82%	18/82%
	Students With Disabilities	5/55%	8/89%	6/66%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	1/100%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	36/42%	60/70%	80/93%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7/32%	12/55%	19/86%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	1/11%	7/77%
	English Language Learners	1/100%	0/0%	1/100%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	59/73%	74/90%	74/90%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14/66%	18/86%	18/86%
	Students With Disabilities	8/100%	8/100%	8/100%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	1/25%	1/25%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	36/44%	60/74%	69/85%
	Economically Disadvantaged	5/21%	14/66%	17/81%
	Students With Disabilities	4/50%	6/75%	6/75%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	1/25%	2/50%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	N/A
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	56/75%	61/81%	64/85%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14/74%	15/79%	14/74%
	Students With Disabilities	2/33%	2/33%	4/66%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	41/55%	50/66%	62/83%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10/53%	13/68%	14/74%
	Students With Disabilities	1/17%	2/33%	2/33%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/AN/A

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	65			65							
ELL	72	81		79	86		82				
ASN	89	81		93	80						
BLK	77			77							
HSP	91	75		93	96		100				
MUL	91			91							
WHT	84	67	61	85	85	82	80				
FRL	77	71	58	81	76		86				

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	56	37	42	54	63	67					
ELL	82	78		90	75		83				
ASN	88	83		90	72	80	73				
BLK	78	60		61	67						
HSP	91	71	64	87	76		100				
MUL	94	73		83	73						
WHT	87	71	63	85	73	68	94				
FRL	89	76		82	68	69	100				

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	53	55		50	50						
ELL	80			80							
ASN	95	81		91	77		94				
BLK	82	64		71	79	73					
HSP	91	86		87	67		100				
MUL	85			77							
WHT	86	65	63	82	70	58	98				
FRL	82	72	68	74	68	48	84				

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	80
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0

ESSA Federal Index	
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	85
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	642
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	65
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	81
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	86
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	77
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	91
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	91
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	78
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	75
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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?

WMSS performed third in the district with proficiency rates at an average of 87% at or above grade level in ELA. We are very proud of our students and teachers. However, in diving deeper, we compared our FSA scores from 2018-2019 to 2020-2021. We noticed that our current fifth graders were proficient at 82% on the ELA FSA, only 51% of our current 5th graders made a learning gain. Our current 6th graders were proficient at 92% at or above grade level on the FSA ELA, but only 83% made a learning gain as well. At WMSS, we believe that ALL students should make a learning gain in all subject areas and therefore, this is our focus for the 2021-2022 school year.

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

After analyzing our 2020-2021 FSA data and comparing it to our 2018-2019 FSA data in both ELA and math we at WMSS feel that our concentration and focus is that ALL students make a learning gain.

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

One contributing factor is the loss of instruction due to Covid 19. At the beginning of 2021, 60% of our students were e-learners and we had 40% face to face. Throughout the year students trickled back in for face to face instruction. By the end of the year, WMSS had 80% face to face instruction and 20% e-learners. We feel that the inconsistent instruction model (e-learning, hybryd, and face to face) and the increased safety protocols was a contributing factor as to why we are focusing on EVERY student making a learning gain. The new action steps that WMSS administration and faculty are taking to address this need for improvement is ensuring that EVERY student is participating in a research based and vetted enrichment or intervention program every day during our Intervention block which we call our Success Zone. Admin and teachers have analyzed data, targeted student needs through individual data chats, developed groups based on needs and strengths, and are providing research based lessons for interventions and/or enrichments to ensure all students are growing and making learning gains.

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

FSA data 3rd through 6th grade and i-Ready data K-6. WMSS is an A school based on student achievement,

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

3rd grade decreased their level ones, high percentage of parent involvement, 80% of our students come to us on grade level.

Our new focus is that ALL students will make a learning gain and show proficiency.

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

Monthly data chats to check in on student growth, monitor interventions and enrichments for effectiveness, weekly walk through by admin, training on vetted research based programs, implementing MTSS with fidelity, training teachers how to analyze, understand, and provide next steps for students.

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 opportunities will be provided to help support teachers and administrators during their PD days in August, September, and October. These days are planned for vertical articulation with math and ELA teachers to discuss standard focused alignment across all grade levels. Another component of these professional days will be discussing the MTSS process and planning action steps to better help serve our ESE population and the lowest 25% in al grade levels.

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

At WMSS, we are ensuring that every classroom is implementing Stanford Harmony with fidelity to meet the social emotional needs of every student. There is a block built in every grade levels master schedule to ensure time is allotted to teach positive social emotional skills. We are living in a pandemic, we are aware that students need additional support making sure they are in a safe place to learn and building positive relationships throughout the school.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	* WMSS performed third in the district with proficiency rates of 82% at or above grade level. * Compared FSA scores from 2018-2019 to 2020-2021. Our 2020-2021 ELA FSA data showed 82% proficiency in fifth grade. However, only 51% of our 5th graders made a learning gain. Our 2020-2021 ELA FSA data showed 92% proficiency in sixth grade. However, only 83% of our 6th graders made a learning gain.
Measurable Outcome:	In 2021 - 2022 our school plans to achieve a learning gain for every student by identifying student needs through data chats, MTSS meetings, and implementing research based interventions/enrichments for all students in all grades.
Monitoring:	*MTSS team will meet every six weeks to review data and interventions and enrichments * Teachers have implemented an intervention/enrichment block into the master schedule * Weekly admin classroom walkthroughs to monitor the process *Admin will provide coaching, professional development, and resources to strengthen this area of focus.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Theresa Benson (benson.theresa@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Aligning research based interventions and enrichments with purposeful planning and Ongoing Progressing Monitoring (OPM) Tools assessments, including 95% Phonological Awareness activities, Phonics Lesson Library, Vocab Surge Volume A, Vocab Surge Volume B, Comprehension toolkit (K-2 and 3-6), and other district approved resources. Intervention and enrichment implementation with the district decision tree has established clear expectations for students and teachers. Analyzing this data immediately after progress monitoring testing. Meeting every six weeks will allow teachers and the MTSS team to make decisions and create and adapt teacher lessons to immediately differentiate their instruction and support each and every student.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The interventions and enrichments being used has been vetted and endorsed by BPS. This system allows us to analyze our data to understand where our students are academically. It also helps us plan instructional support that is customized to each student, especially our SWD subgroup. It helps teachers and students monitor progress toward goals and improve instruction to meet students' diverse needs.
Action Steps to Implement	

1. Teachers and the MTSS team will meet every six weeks to discuss student progress with interventions and enrichments. Teachers will analyze multiple pieces of data (including standards mastery, i-ready instruction, Benchmark weekly and unit tests, and progress monitoring tools) to drive instruction. Based on the current needs, intervention and enrichment groups will be created and grouped based on current student needs. Groups will continue to change as students show a need for more support or mastery of content being taught.

Person Responsible Kelly Rouse (rouse.kelly@brevardschools.org)

2. Administration will conduct walkthroughs during scheduled Success Zone time to ensure interventions and enrichments are happening every day with fidelity. Administration will make sure processes and procedures are in place to make sure every student is working on their level of need.

Person Responsible Theresa Benson (benson.theresa@brevardschools.org)

3. Teachers will have support from the instructional coach. She will help implement and guide teachers with the research based interventions, enrichments, and progress monitoring tools. She will support teachers with the implementation process and ensure teacher have all materials needed.

Person Responsible Melissa Kane (kane.melissa@brevardschools.org)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In the 2020 school year, our students with disabilities were our highest priority. This equates to a total of 26 students identified as SWD. The beginning of the 20-21 school year i-Ready diagnostic revealed the following information regarding SWD proficiency: In ELA, only 35% of our ESE students achieved proficiency or higher, which equates to 9 out of 26 students. In Math, 15% of our ESE students achieved proficiency or higher which equates to 4 students. The beginning of the 21-22 school year i-Ready diagnostic revealed the following information regarding SWD proficiency: In ELA, only 47% of our ESE students achieved proficiency or higher, which equates to 15 out of 32 students.
Measurable Outcome:	ELA proficiency for SWD will increase from 47% to 63%. This would equate to 20 out of 32 students reaching at or above grade level. Math proficiency will increase from 15% to 50%. This would equate to 16 out of 32 students reaching at or above grade level. Along with targeted instruction and interventions, these increases will bridge the learning gaps in our ESE subgroup.
Monitoring:	*MTSS team will meet every six weeks to review data and interventions and enrichments * GenEd Teachers will work and plan with the ESE teacher and IA. We are moving towards a co-teach model * Weekly admin classroom walkthroughs to monitor the process *ESE teacher will coach and support GenEd teachers with IEPs, Accommodations, Data Collection, and research based interventions
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Theresa Benson (benson.theresa@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Aligning Standards with purposeful planning and iReady assessments, including Standards Mastery, will be implemented and utilized schoolwide. iReady implementation with the instructional toolbox has established clear benchmarks for students and teachers. Analyzing this data immediately after diagnostic testing. Online testing will allow teachers to make decisions and create teacher lessons to immediately differentiate their instruction and support each and every student.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	iReady has been vetted and endorsed by BPS. This system allows us to analyze our data to understand where our students are academically. It also helps us plan instructional support that is customized to each student, especially our SWD subgroup. It helps teachers and students monitor progress toward goals and improve instruction to meet students' diverse needs.
Action Steps to Implement	

Instruction and Remediation from Gen. Ed. Teacher, ESE resource Teacher and ESE Teacher Assistant is inclusive and Support Facilitative Model is adopted. 2018 BPIE assessments will be reviewed and incorporated to align with this area of focus (i.e. Resource teacher and teacher assistant push in to classrooms to support inclusive best practices, ESE schedule is considered prior to the building of the Master Schedule). Students will receive scaffolded instruction during a dedicated intervention block based on need.

Person Responsible	Theresa Benson (benson.theresa@brevardschools.org)

2. All students will receive grade level instruction in Tier 1. Teachers will appropriately assign individual instruction in small groups, 45 minute instruction given from i-Ready, MyPath, and customized activities found in the instructional toolbox. Through progress monitoring, teachers will collect data, analyze and presented to MTSS team to review growth and next steps. Students identified at the Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction in Reading and Math will receive additional support in 2nd and 3rd grades in our Academic Support Program after school. ASP and ESSER Funds will be utilized in hiring teachers to support students two days a week.

Person Responsible   Melissa Kane (kane.melissa@brevardschools.org)

Instructional Leadership will provide professional development and technical assistance to teachers so that students with disabilities have access to on-grade level instruction, curriculum resources, and the use of appropriate accommodations. Our MTSS Support Team will provide examples of research based interventions that teachers will use with students at these Tiered Levels.

Person Responsible   Kelly Rouse (rouse.kelly@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.

To monitor school culture and environment a proactive approach will be taken. Sanford Harmony is a proactive and positive approach to social emotional learning and a positive school relationships. Student responses revealed a lack of teacher and student relationships. Sanford Harmony is the district approved curriculum to support the social emotional needs of our students.

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.

Due to the feedback we received from our Youth Truth Survey last year, we wanted to align our procedures in and out of the classroom more positive and connected relationships with our students. Sanford Harmony is a proactive and positive approach to social emotional learning and a

positive school relationships. Student responses revealed a lack of teacher and student relationships. Sanford Harmony is the district approved curriculum to support the social emotional needs of our students. Our teachers were retrained during our 21-22 PrePlanning schedules with the SEL Team. The team consisted of teachers across the school that have a passion for the message that SEL transcends. Through conversation with teachers, motivation of teachers and students was our number one focus. In focusing on Motivation, our plan is to build positive relationships, provide frequent positive feedback and motivate students to demonstrate their best behavior through modeling and high expectation.

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

See above