

Brevard Public Schools

Atlantis Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	20
Positive Culture & Environment	26
Budget to Support Goals	0

Atlantis Elementary School

7300 BRIGGS AVE, Cocoa, FL 32927

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

Demographics

Principal: Erica Back D

Start Date for this Principal: 1/23/2018

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)	96%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (56%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: C (52%)
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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	20
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Atlantis Elementary School

7300 BRIGGS AVE, Cocoa, FL 32927

<http://www.atlantis.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	84%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	25%

School Grades History

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

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 meet the individual, educational, and social needs of all students through high expectations; therefore, promoting citizens of character and life-long learners in a positive and safe environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Working together to launch life long learners with excellence as our standard.

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
Clarke, Jennifer	Principal	<p>To provide a common vision among all stakeholders through a consistent mission and vision. Academic implementations will be data driven through thoughtful decision making processes. I will coordinate the facilitation of the MTSS process among all responsible stakeholders, as a faculty and staff we will monitor our MTSS processes, and I will ensure interventions and documentations meet expectations with fidelity. I will identify the needs of our staff through professional development and ensure collaborative planning time that is inclusive of all grade levels. Classroom walks will be conducted consistently with communication to the leadership team as a means of assessing needs. Schedules are maintained and inspected for quality assurance through a staff outlook calendar in order for all employees to view and maintain current information regarding school meetings and events.</p>
Kraus, Danielle	Assistant Principal	<p>Assist the principal in providing a common vision among all stakeholders, support the implementation of data driven decisions, monitor the coordination of facilitating the MTSS process among all responsible stakeholders, monitor the MTSS facilitation with school faculty, monitor fidelity of the intervention process and appropriate documentation procedures, provide school based need identified professional development to all staff, ensure collaborative planning time is inclusive of all grade level peers and participation is continuous and scheduled, daily classroom walks are completed with a specified schedule for each administrator to follow, and leadership team meetings are conducted each Friday to discuss upcoming needs and events. Maintaining the staff outlook calendar that has been created and shared for all employees to view and maintain current information regarding school meetings and events. Communicate with parents as a proactive resolve to disciplinary measures and coordinate the social/emotional needs of students with the guidance counselor.</p>
Stripp, Michelle	Other	<p>Title 1 Coordinator, Literacy Interventionist, and Parent and Family Involvement Coordinator. Identifies systematic patterns of student needs to identify appropriate and evidenced-based intervention strategies. Leading professional development, monitor i-Ready fidelity, passage rates, data development for progress monitoring. Monitor Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions, communicate MTSS data with Literacy Coach, School Psychologist and Support Specialist, and attend weekly leadership team meetings and weekly PLC's.</p>
Dieckmann, Jamie	Instructional Coach	<p>Mentoring new classroom teachers through lesson modeling, lesson plan design, lesson structures, and facilitation of peer observations. Working through the coaching cycle with struggling teachers and/or teachers that are new to their subject area, collaborative planning, lesson designs, and peer mentor. Leading professional development, monitor i-Ready fidelity, passage rates, data development for progress monitoring. Monitor Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions, facilitate the MTSS process, coordinate MTSS</p>

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		meetings with faculty and parents, attend weekly leadership team meetings and weekly PLC's.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 1/23/2018, Erica Back D

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

54

Total number of students enrolled at the school

621

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

8

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

6

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	74	92	102	66	74	84	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	597
Attendance below 90 percent	18	24	16	10	11	20	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	127
One or more suspensions	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	14	10	6	5	6	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA ELA	0	0	0	1	9	14	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	54
LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA MATH	0	0	0	3	16	21	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	80

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	2	1	3	3	6	14	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	58

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	3	6	8	3	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/13/2021

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	84	101	82	80	81	97	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	603
Attendance below 90 percent	10	12	8	10	13	12	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	12	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	2	3	1	3	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	84	101	82	80	81	97	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	603
Attendance below 90 percent	10	12	8	10	13	12	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	6	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	12	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	2	3	1	3	0	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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				59%	62%	57%	58%	60%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				64%	60%	58%	53%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				59%	57%	53%	43%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				61%	63%	63%	64%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				57%	65%	62%	66%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				46%	53%	51%	50%	49%	47%
Science Achievement				48%	57%	53%	56%	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	60%	64%	-4%	58%	2%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	58%	61%	-3%	58%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				
05	2021					
	2019	56%	60%	-4%	56%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				
06	2021					
	2019	59%	60%	-1%	54%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				

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	72%	61%	11%	62%	10%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	48%	64%	-16%	64%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
05	2021					
	2019	35%	60%	-25%	60%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
06	2021					
	2019	79%	67%	12%	55%	24%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	49%	56%	-7%	53%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

i-Ready Diagnostic was used for grades 1-6 as a progress monitoring tool for Fall, Winter, and Spring.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	93/57%	93/75%	93/85%
	Economically Disadvantaged	93/57%	93/75%	93/85%
	Students With Disabilities	27/46%	27/46%	27/23%
	English Language Learners	0%	0%	0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	93/1%	93/0%	93/0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	93/0%	93/0%	93/0%
	Students With Disabilities	27/0%	27/0%	27/0%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	101/20%	101/43%	101/60%
	Economically Disadvantaged	101/20%	101/43%	101/60%
	Students With Disabilities	26/12%	26/27%	26/50%
	English Language Learners	1/100%	0/0%	1/100%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	101/0%	101/0%	101/0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	101/0%	101/0%	101/0%
	Students With Disabilities	26/0%	26/0%	26/0%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	66/1%	66/1%	66/12%
	Economically Disadvantaged	66/1%	66/1%	66/12%
	Students With Disabilities	17/07%	17/0%	17/0%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	66/1.5%	66/0%	66/0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	66/1.5%	66/0%	66/0%
	Students With Disabilities	17/6%	17/0%	17/0%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	68/10%	68/10%	68/23%
	Economically Disadvantaged	68/10%	68/10%	68/23%
	Students With Disabilities	22/11%	22/0%	22/0%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	68/0%	68/0%	68/0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	68/0%	68/0%	68/0%
	Students With Disabilities	22/0%	22/0%	22/0%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	84/5%	84/4%	84/4%
	Economically Disadvantaged	84/5%	84/4%	84/4%
	Students With Disabilities	22/5%	22/5%	22/5%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	84/0%	84/0%	84/1%
	Economically Disadvantaged	84/0%	84/0%	84/0%
	Students With Disabilities	22/0%	22/0%	22/0%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Students With Disabilities	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 6				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	105/6%	105/3%	105/6%
	Economically Disadvantaged	105/6%	105/3%	105/6%
	Students With Disabilities	21/0%	21/0%	21/0%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	105/1%	105/0%	105/0%
	Economically Disadvantaged	105/0%	105/0%	105/0%
	Students With Disabilities	21/0%	21/0%	21/0%
	English Language Learners	0/0%	0/0%	0/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	105/1%	105/0%	105/0%

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	17	30	26	24	32	19	5				
BLK	24			22							
HSP	53	57		45	46						
MUL	50	60		65	80						
WHT	54	38	33	55	42	22	34				
FRL	46	42	29	44	42	25	25				
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	22	50	57	31	43	30	32				
BLK	35	42		24	42						
HSP	48	60		59	44		67				
MUL	60	68	70	60	53		43				
WHT	61	65	63	63	60	54	49				
FRL	52	62	56	56	53	43	45				
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	33	38	35	47	61	50	25				
BLK	43	50		43	40						
HSP	56	71		68	67						
MUL	55	48		52	48		50				

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
WHT	60	52	40	67	69	50	56				
FRL	51	46	39	61	64	49	42				

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	39
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	275
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	22
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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

Asian Students	
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	23
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	50
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	64
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	40
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	36
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?

Students with disabilities demonstrated the least amount of growth across all grade levels with only 38% of those students attaining proficiency in ELA. In ELA our Lowest 25% decreased their proficiency from 59% proficient to 33% proficient. In Math our Lowest 25% decreased proficiency from 46% proficient to 24% proficient. Overall our Lowest 25% student group demonstrated the greatest loss among the percent proficient.

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

2021 FSA Math proficiency demonstrated the greatest need for improvement based on our overall achievement decreasing from 61%(2019) overall proficiency to 54%(2019) overall proficiency. In 2019 48% of 5th graders scored a level 3 or higher and 35% of 6th graders scored a level 3 or higher. In 2021 37% of 5th graders scored a level 3 or higher on FSA Math. This is reflective of a 11% point drop from one year to the next. Our overall math proficiency is below the district average across overall proficiency, learning gains, and lowest 25% learning gains. Atlantis Science achievement scores has been trending down over the last three years with a current proficiency rate of 29%. Our previous science proficiency rate in 2019 was 48%. Atlantis is identified as a RAISE school due to 5th grade ELA scores as demonstrated by student proficiency dropping from 55% to 48% proficiency. Overall ELA scores decreased due to a lack of student engagement and rigorous tasks.

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

There has been an increase in the number of students identified as having a disability. This is also leading to an increase in the number of students with a proficiency gap of 1 or more grade levels below the grade level expectations. The students that require Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions will receive direct support from both the classroom teacher and the Title 1 interventionists.

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

Economically disadvantage students demonstrated increased proficiency in their ELA scores. Specifically 4th grade and 6th grade demonstrated growth in proficiency levels in both i-Ready and FSA data.

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

4th grade students utilized informational text through Write Score lessons during the daily scheduled writing block. The use of vocabulary surge as an intervention tool in the intermediate grade levels provided a focus on prefixes/suffixes, root words, Greek/Latin roots, all in alignment with the Standard Focus Documents.

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

Grades K-6 will provide strong Tier 1 ELA (new curriculum implementation) with scaffolding, diagnostic assessments to determine achievement gaps. All grade levels will provide tiered intervention support to substantially deficient students with the support of the Title 1 interventionists. The Literacy Coach will provide support to teachers during the ELA block through lesson modeling, planning guidance, and professional development. Weekly progress monitoring and bi-monthly standards mastery will occur in order to maintain standards achievement and monitor proficiency goals.

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.

1. i-Ready Math goal setting and standards mastery
2. MTSS procedural supports
3. Literacy Intervention supports and program fidelity
4. Vertical alignment with standards/planning across K-6 grade levels
5. Professional Development on high quality instructional materials.

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

Additional academic support is being provided after school for 1 hour, two days per week, provided by classroom teachers. We are focusing on grades 3-4 science standards with current 5th grade students. The students will engage in hands-on science activities and written responses. Our science scores have declined over the last four years demonstrating a deficit in science mastery of the standards from grades 3 and 4.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA scores have demonstrated a pattern of decline in recent years, also declining in specific subgroups in which we did not meet the district average. Students have specifically declined in the areas of writing and comprehension. Vocabulary and phonics are also indicated as an immediate need for support based on initial diagnostic data. The primary area of focus is in grades 5 & 6 ELA due to a proficiency rate of 44% on the 2021 FSA ELA. In our subgroups of concern Students With Disabilities have demonstrated that only 26% of those students are demonstrating proficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	65% of our below grade level students will increase their ELA achievement proficiency to "on or above grade level" passing rate for the 2021-2022 school year. We will also work with our Lowest 25% students to increase from 33% being proficient to 55% scoring on or above grade level on ELA FSA. 5th grade ELA scores will increase from 44% to 54% proficient.
Monitoring:	We will monitor the ELA proficiency rates through weekly data meetings, standards mastery, i-Ready diagnostic data, district assessment data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jamie Dieckmann (dieckmann.jamie@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<p>Tier 1 (Core) Curriculum is on the 2021 approved Florida Instructional Materials Adoption list.</p> <p>Florida Benchmark Advance 2022 (K-5) ©2022, Florida Edition myPerspectives Florida English Language Arts Grade 6, ©2022, 1st Edition</p> <p>Tier 2</p> <p>Explain how the use of the programs/materials/strategies is supported by strong evidence, moderate evidence, or promising evidence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • i-Ready is supported by Promising Evidence according to Evidence for ESSA. **iReady: This approach helps educators accelerate growth and grade-level learning. These tools provide rigorous and motivating reading and mathematics instruction that: *Personalize pathways to growth with precise instruction that is guided by i-Ready Assessment data, * Motivate students to persist in building their skills and *Provide scaffolded support that meets the needs of all students. • Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) is supported by Moderate to Strong Evidence according to Evidence for What Works Clearinghouse (WWC). • Lexia Core Strong level of evidence, as defined by ESSA (Hurwitz & Vanacore, 2020) https://tinyurl.com/yv3temac • Teachers will 95 Percent Group Interventions and Read Naturally to provide intensive, systematic and explicit instruction on foundational skills utilizing evidence-based practices as listed in the IES" Practice Guides Assisting Students with Struggling with Reading: Response to Intervention and Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective Intervention Practices. Effect size: Response to Intervention – 1.29, Interventions for Learning Needs .77, Phonics Instruction: .70, Feedback .70, Scaffolding .82, Repeated Readings .75, Rehearsal and Memorization .73, Vocabulary Programs .62, Direct Instruction .60 <p>Tier 3</p> <p>Explain how the use of the programs/materials/strategies is supported by strong evidence, moderate evidence, or promising evidence.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rewards is supported by Moderate Evidence according to Evidence for ESSA https://tinyurl.com/3hbk7tps • Lexia Core Strong level of evidence, as defined by ESSA (Hurwitz & Vanacore, 2020)

<https://tinyurl.com/yv3temac>

- Visualizing & Verbalizing Promising level of evidence, as defined by ESSA (Lindamood-Bell, 2020). <https://tinyurl.com/35yrpa4z>

- Teachers will 95 Percent Group Interventions, Barton Reading and Spelling Program, to provide intensive, systematic and explicit instruction on foundational skills utilizing evidence-based practices as listed in the IES" Practice Guides Assisting Students with Struggling with Reading:

Response to Intervention and Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective Intervention Practices. Effect size: Response to Intervention – 1.29, Interventions for Learning Needs .77, Phonics Instruction: .70, Feedback .70, Scaffolding .82, Vocabulary Programs .62, Direct Instruction .60

**Rationale
for
Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

The decrease in ELA scores is related to the level of task complexity within the ELA coursework. If the tasks are aligned with the standards and the writing prompts include an increased complexity the ELA scores should increase.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Integrate informational text, complex text, and writing across the curriculum with fidelity throughout the school year.
2. Teachers will use skill appropriate resources for Tier 1 and Tier 2 instruction.
3. Instructional Coach will attend professional development on supportive coaching cycle.
4. Instructional Coach will provide ELA professional development and support teachers in grades K-6.
5. Grades 4-6 will use Voyager Sopras focusing on vocabulary and multisyllabic words as an intervention for prefixes/suffixes. (T1)
6. Benchmark oral reading records, print versions for grades K-2 as an assessment. (T1)
7. 3 Title I teachers and 1 IA will support the implementation of a schoolwide intervention program. (T1)
8. Professional development will be provided to K-6 teachers focusing on ELA topics with planning and implementation. (T1)
9. Purchase of materials to support instruction within the ELA block. (T1)
10. Students with disabilities will receive supports through inclusive instruction from both the ESE and Gen.Ed teacher on a daily basis.
11. Curriculum nights will be provided for each grade level by the classroom and ESE teachers, through Zoom, posted on the school website for future reference by families.
12. Anne Skinner is working with the intervention team in forming Tier 2 and Tier 3 groups of students.

Person Responsible Jamie Dieckmann (dieckmann.jamie@brevardschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Standard aligned tasks will be implemented to increase math proficiency. Our Math FSA proficiency decreased from 63% to 52% of students demonstrating proficiency by scoring a level 3 or higher. The lowest 25% students demonstrated proficiency levels in 24% of the students. Students with disabilities continue to decrease in proficiency as less demonstrated by only 26% of those students achieving proficiency on the 2021 Math FSA. Black and African American students demonstrated that 30%
Measurable Outcome:	During the 2021-2022 school year we will increase our Math proficiency on FSA by increasing to 60% proficiency and scoring above the district average. We will also demonstrate growth in our learning gains by increasing from 45% learning gains to over 50% proficiency in learning gains. The goal for our Lowest 25% students will increase proficiency from 24% to 35% proficiency on Math FSA for the 2022 FSA. Students With Disabilities will also increase to 35% proficiency from 26% proficiency on the 2022 Math FSA.
Monitoring:	i-Ready diagnostics, standards mastery, summative and formative assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jennifer Clarke (clarke.jennifer@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Classroom walks, observations, professional development opportunities, purchase of the Eureka homework helpers to assist families with math support at home. The Eureka math curriculum will be used with fidelity each day with teachers adhering to the Eureka pacing guide. Each month one PLC will be dedicated to the monitoring of the Eureka pacing in each grade level and the progress monitoring of students in grades K-6. Students at Atlantis arrive at varying ability levels. Driven by the i-Ready Diagnostic, lessons in Mathematics provide tailored instruction that meets students where they are and encourages them as they develop new skills. Tools for instruction provide actionable, in-the-moment resources for addressing skill gaps in small group and one-on-one settings.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The decrease in math proficiency is the cause of a lack of fidelity to the Eureka program. The use of the hands-on manipulatives and the assigned homework supports the mastery of the daily lesson. Mastery of the standard and foundational skills will be achieved with teacher fidelity to the Eureka curriculum and timeline.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Eureka daily lessons will utilize the standard aligned tasks that are associated with each module, incorporating hands-on manipulatives for practice, weekly sprints, daily exit tickets, and homework practice problems.
2. Eureka exit tickets will be utilized daily as a formative assessment with students, the teacher will then review exit tickets as a method of reteach/review for the students.
3. Focused training on how to frame the math block into instruction and reteaching with district Math resource teacher.
4. Coordinated use of i-Ready math program for differentiated math supports with students with disabilities and black and African American students.
5. Teachers will utilize hands on, multi sensory games in the classroom to support all subject areas.
6. Title 1 will purchase 6th Grade Great Minds assessment packs. (T1)
7. Purchase of materials for support of math instruction in grades K-6. (T1)
8. Student With Disabilities will receive supports through inclusive instruction provided by the ESE teacher

and the Gen Ed teacher daily in the classroom.

9. Black and African American Students will received targeted intervention support in the form of Tier 2 and

Tier 3 instruction.

10. Feedback provided to teachers based on classroom observations in order to support spiral review strategies.

11. Grade level curriculum nights providing strategies for Eureka supports at home.

12. Data chats with students and teachers during spiral review of math standards.

13. i-Ready predictability math reports will be used to form prerequisite skills.

Person
Responsible Jennifer Clarke (clarke.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus	Standard Aligned Tasks to Increase Science Proficiency
Description and Rationale:	Science proficiency rates have declined from 56% (2018), 49% (2019), to 29% (2021) in the last three years. This is a progressive decline in science proficiency among multiple 5th grade cohorts. Not only do our overall science percentages rank far below the district average of 55%, but also the state average of 57%. All of our reportable subgroups ranked below the district and state averages.
Measurable Outcome:	During the 2021-2022 school year our science proficiency rates will increase from 29% to 50%. Of the 84 5th grade students we will have 42 of those students achieve proficiency on the Science FSA. The 5th grade students will also complete the science mini assessments as a method of standards mastery progress monitoring throughout the year.
Monitoring:	District created science assessments that will be administered via UNIFY with students results uploaded into Performance Matters.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Danielle Kraus (kraus.danielle@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Classroom walks, observations, professional development sessions provided by Michelle Ferro, district created standard based science assessments, hands-on science lab each week within the classroom, and school science fair providing support to the nature of science standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The decrease in science scores is related to the level of task complexity within the science content. If the tasks are aligned with science standards and writing tasks include an increased complexity the science scores should increase.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Each 5th grade teacher will utilize the district created formative science assessments each quarter in order to monitor student mastery of the science standards. Instruction will be modified for review/reteaching based on the assessment results.
2. Teachers are monitoring SSA data among grades 3-6 and planning with teachers to determine areas of need.
3. Families will have availability to use at home activities to supplement the areas of need within the science standards through science lab packets and online supplemental instructional support that can be accessed at home.
5. 4th Grade students will participate in a Lagoon Quest field trip. (T1)
6. Purchase of materials to support science instruction in grades K-6. (T1)
7. ASP funds will be used to provide science workshops focusing on 3rd and 4th grade science standards to the Lowest 25% students in 5th grade.
8. Feedback provided to teachers based on classroom walks with a focus on strategies for supporting Students With Disabilities, Lowest 25% Students, and Black and African American Students.
9. PENDA science activities will be used throughout the science block for supplemental support to Stemsopes curriculum.
10. Michelle Ferro will provide support to the 5th grade science teacher through planning sessions and

data
review.

11. Atlantis will participate in Harris Science Saturdays during the spring semester.

Person Responsible Danielle Kraus (kraus.danielle@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.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.

The Safe Schools for Alex data base indicates Atlantis Elementary School has .3 suspensions per 100 students which is below the state average of 1.0 incidents per 100 students. In order to sustain this low suspension rate in the 2021-2022 school year, teachers and staff will continue to implement our school-wide PBIS program which is embedded within the school culture and community. Atlantis will also continue to partner with Lifetime Counseling Services in providing social emotional supports to students in need and/or experience crisis. These strategies include: support from the district social worker, intervention services provided by the guidance counselor, clear and concise school-wide expectations, teacher training and implementation support, and informational training for families in providing continuous support with PBIS strategies outside of the school environment.

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.

Community Business Partners, Faith Based Partners, Character assemblies, Fun Run, Morning Mile, Family Game/PE Night, Science Fair, Ocean Day with first grade, National Physical Education Week, National Literacy Week, Kindergarten Roundup, and Grade level requested events. The students will build relationships with the stakeholders, thus creating a school and community relationship that support the needs of our students. Each group of volunteers is contributing to our school culture by providing educational opportunities related to career development, social interaction, and community awareness. Our families will have an awareness of resources available to them, as well as, a networking system that has been established in the community and school. According to the parent survey, Atlantis parents and community members would like school events that vary throughout the school day and during the evening

hours. The Atlantis community has a diverse population with availability that is not consistent. Feedback indicated that parents who work did not feel connected to the school because many events take place during the school day. We have accommodated this request by scheduling events at varying times through the day and evening hours. The leadership team has collaborated with Geovonne Blum and Ginny Gleason in forming family engagement events that will promote collegiality among 6th graders and focus on our lowest 25% students in the meeting their needs.

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

Principal - Coordinator of community relations and organization of community engagement

Assistant Principal - Volunteer coordinator and community event organizer

Literacy Coach - Content specialist/liaison

Title 1 Team - Family engagement event coordinators, parent involvement

PBIS Team - student positive behavior supports

PTO - student/parent events, SAC members

First United Methodist Church of Port St. John - community partner

Coastal Community Church - community partner