

Brevard Public Schools

Sabal 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 | 21 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 29 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Sabal Elementary School

1401 N WICKHAM RD, Melbourne, FL 32935

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

Demographics

Principal: Lauren "Paige" Trosset

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2020

| | |
|--|--|
| 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 (44%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: B (55%) |
| 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 | 21 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Sabal Elementary School

1401 N WICKHAM RD, Melbourne, FL 32935

<http://www.sabal.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 | 99% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 47% |

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.

Motivate, Encourage, Inspire.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Sabal will positively impact our community by delivering the highest quality education in a caring student-centered environment.

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 |
|------------------|---------------------|---|
| Hobson, Laura | Assistant Principal | The role of the assistant principal is to ensure the MTSS/IPST Team is fulfilling its functions. Cultivate leadership by coaching staff members through the coordination of the Leadership Team. Create a positive climate throughout the school campus. Serve as the data leader by monitoring, analyzing, and planning for school improvement. |
| Conti, Beth | Reading Coach | The role of the coaches is to monitor the academic progress of students that are receiving interventions. Provide professional development and coaching to teachers on Tier 1 Core instructional planning, instruction, and assessment. This will be accomplished by supporting in the monitoring ongoing progress of the effectiveness of the intervention program delivery in addition to weekly lesson student for new ELA standards/benchmarks and our Benchmark and Savvas curriculum. Additionally, our literacy coach is part of a coaching cadre with the support from Just Read Florida and BPS Content Specialist to reflect, develop and implement coaching techniques to support best instructional practices in ELA. |
| Garcia, Jeanette | Instructional Coach | Mrs. Garcia will serve in a unique role this year as a half-time Math Coach and a half-time Math intervention teacher. One role is to monitor the academic progress and provide intervention for students identified as needing math intervention. This will be accomplished by monitoring bi-monthly ongoing progress of the effectiveness of the intervention program delivery. Mrs. Garcia will also provide coaching and professional development for teachers on Tier 1 Core instruction. |
| Kadlec, Corey | Teacher, K-12 | The role of the Title I teacher is to provide support for tier 2/3 students in Reading and Math. Additionally to provide parent support by increasing participation in school related activities offered throughout the year. |
| Wilson, Matt | Behavior Specialist | Behavior Specialist for ESE Support- Mr. Wilson will assist with school wide behavior intervention and supports as needed. He will provide professional development on trauma informed care and compassion fatigue. He will also assist with identifying intervention strategies for behavior plans. |
| Trosset, Paige | Principal | The principal will improve instruction by cultivating the vision and mission as the instructional leader of the school. Communicate and get input from all stakeholders regarding the vision and mission. Cultivate leadership by coaching staff members through the coordination of the Leadership Team. Create a positive climate throughout the school campus. Serve as the data leader by monitoring, analyzing and facilitating planning for improvement. |
| Pape, Caroline | School Counselor | Duties and responsibilities include supporting school-wide SEL initiatives. An active member of the Conscious Discipline Action Team. Counseling students and and supporting families through all aspects of social emotional learning. |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|------|----------------|---------------------------------|
|------|----------------|---------------------------------|

IPST Facilitator and active member of the IPST team in supporting academic, social emotional, and behavioral success for ALL students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/1/2020, Lauren "Paige" Trosset

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.*

1

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

47

Total number of students enrolled at the school

512

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

4

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

9

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 | 56 | 71 | 58 | 68 | 77 | 82 | 64 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 476 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 4 | 15 | 6 | 11 | 13 | 14 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 3 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 7 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| 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 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 28 | 33 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 89 |
| LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA MATH | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 30 | 34 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 102 |

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 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 24 | 21 | 21 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 |

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 | 10 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 |
| 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

Tuesday 8/31/2021

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 | 78 | 69 | 69 | 89 | 73 | 62 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 512 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 5 | 22 | 19 | 17 | 25 | 17 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 121 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 11 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 20 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 |
| | 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 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |

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 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

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 | 78 | 69 | 69 | 89 | 73 | 62 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 512 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 5 | 22 | 19 | 17 | 25 | 17 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 121 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 4 | 4 | 6 | 3 | 6 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 11 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 20 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 46 |
| | 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 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 5 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |

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 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

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% | 51% | 60% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 57% | 60% | 58% | 41% | 54% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 51% | 57% | 53% | 46% | 46% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 48% | 63% | 63% | 59% | 62% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 47% | 65% | 62% | 67% | 59% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 24% | 53% | 51% | 57% | 49% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 35% | 57% | 53% | 37% | 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 | 44% | 64% | -20% | 58% | -14% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 52% | 61% | -9% | 58% | -6% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -44% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 43% | 60% | -17% | 56% | -13% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -52% | | | | |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 44% | 60% | -16% | 54% | -10% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -43% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 33% | 61% | -28% | 62% | -29% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 47% | 64% | -17% | 64% | -17% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -33% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 51% | 60% | -9% | 60% | -9% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -47% | | | | |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 53% | 67% | -14% | 55% | -2% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -51% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 37% | 56% | -19% | 53% | -16% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

We utilized i-Ready as our progress monitoring tool for both ELA and Math for all grade levels.

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 27 | 55 | 78 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 27 | 36 | 41 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 33 | 25 | 42 |
| | English Language Learners | 22 | 33 | 33 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 32 | 42 | 56 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 18 | 29 | 41 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 17 | 25 | 25 |
| | English Language Learners | 11 | 22 | 22 |

| Grade 2 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 18 | 55 | 78 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 17 | 22 | 37 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 25 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 12 | 20 | 33 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 12 | 22 | 37 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| Grade 3 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 21 | 35 | 53 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 22 | 33 | 4311 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 9 | 9 | 18 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 21 | 30 | 33 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 11 | 20 | 22 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 18 | 18 | 18 |
| | English Language Learners | 8 | 8 | 0 |

| Grade 4 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 38 | 50 | 53 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 35 | 42 | 42 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 8 | 0 | 23 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 14 | 30 | 42 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 13 | 25 | 38 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 8 | 8 |
| | English Language Learners | 8 | 8 | 17 |

| Grade 5 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 33 | 34 | 40 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 26 | 24 | 35 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 8 | 24 | 20 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 19 | 31 | 37 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 12 | 27 | 35 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 12 | 16 |
| | English Language Learners | 7 | 14 | 7 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science | 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 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |

| Grade 6 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 31 | 36 | 41 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 19 | 26 | 26 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 23 | 29 | 33 |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 9 | 23 | 28 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0 | 8 | 0 |
| | English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |

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 | 20 | 30 | 33 | 26 | 36 | 40 | 15 | | | | |
| ELL | 32 | 31 | 8 | 24 | 46 | | 30 | | | | |
| BLK | 25 | 50 | | 22 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 28 | 31 | 8 | 21 | 42 | 33 | 33 | | | | |
| MUL | 22 | | | 24 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 54 | 54 | 29 | 48 | 48 | 41 | 45 | | | | |
| FRL | 35 | 37 | 27 | 33 | 41 | 36 | 33 | | | | |
| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 21 | 42 | 37 | 19 | 30 | 27 | 7 | | | | |
| ELL | 30 | 59 | 64 | 37 | 41 | 29 | | | | | |
| BLK | 30 | 40 | | 40 | 40 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 37 | 50 | 45 | 41 | 48 | 37 | 21 | | | | |
| MUL | 40 | 27 | | 45 | 47 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 54 | 64 | 56 | 51 | 46 | 16 | 40 | | | | |
| FRL | 41 | 54 | 53 | 43 | 46 | 20 | 31 | | | | |
| 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 | 15 | 36 | 42 | 31 | 46 | 42 | 23 | | | | |
| ELL | 24 | 42 | 54 | 39 | 71 | 60 | | | | | |
| BLK | 40 | 30 | | 73 | 90 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 32 | 45 | 56 | 41 | 69 | 69 | 17 | | | | |
| MUL | 48 | 40 | | 52 | 50 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 57 | 39 | 37 | 62 | 67 | 50 | 47 | | | | |
| FRL | 44 | 39 | 43 | 53 | 63 | 55 | 33 | | | | |

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 | 41 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 6 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 49 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 325 |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|-----|
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 29 |
| 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 | 31 |
| 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 | 32 |
| 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 | 30 |
| 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 | 23 |
| 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 | 46 |
| 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 | 35 |
| 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?

Core Content Areas and Grade Level Trends: Add in specific numbers for increase/decrease

Third grade proficiency decreased from 44% to 38% on the FSA for ELA. Fourth grade proficiency dropped from 52% to 37% on the FSA for ELA. Fifth grade proficiency dropped from 43% to 40% on the FSA for ELA. Sixth grade ELA proficiency showed a slight increase from 44% to 47% .

3rd-6th grade Math proficiency levels are at 39% or lower. Third grade showed a slight increase from 33% to 38%, but 4th-6th grade showed significant decrease in proficiency percentage. Fourth grade decreased from 47% to 39%. Fifth grade decreased from 51% to 34%. Sixth grade decreased from 53% to 38%.

5th grade Science showed a slight increase increase in proficiency rate from 37% to 39%.

Last year's EOY Final i-Ready ELA Diagnostic showed 49% of students demonstrating proficiency. The Final i-Ready Math Diagnostic showed 40% of students demonstrating proficiency.

This year's BOY i-Ready ELA Diagnostic for grades 1-6 showed 24% of students demonstrating proficiency. The BOY i-Ready Math Diagnostic for grades 1-6 shows 15% of students demonstrating proficiency.

Lowest 25% of students making learning gains in ELA decreased from 51% to 23%.

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

Lowest 25% Learning Gains ELA
Proficiency rates for our targeted subgroups
Overall ELA proficiency
Overall Math proficiency

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

Contributing factors to this need for improvement include the number of students who participated in e-Learning, the number of students quarantining due to COVID protocols, increase in overall student and staff absences for the 2020-2021 school year. We also had a delay in starting schoolwide intervention groups due to COVID protocols. Another contributing factor to the need for improvement would be addressing the social emotional needs of our students, staff and families.

New actions being put into place is closely monitoring student data to ensure adequate progress and following the MTSS process to ensure sufficient supports and intervention. We will restructure our collaborative planning process.

We will implement new learning from Conscious Discipline and Trauma Informed Training.

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

6th Grade ELA proficiency showed a 3% increase from 44% proficient to 47% proficient.

3rd Grade Math proficiency showed a 5% increase from 33% proficient to 38% proficient.

5th Grade Science proficiency showed a 4% increase from 35% proficient to 39% proficient.

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

New weekly collaborative planning structures focused on S.T.A.R. (Standard, Task, Assessment, Reflection/Response) contributed to ELA gains.

Our Title 1 Math Intervention teacher pushed in to support students and teachers in the classroom during the math instructional block.

Our 5th grade team and activity collaborated to review Science academic vocabulary in the 2nd semester. The 5th grade team collaborated to implement hands on Science labs on a regular basis to increase student engagement and understanding of science concepts. A 5th grade teacher hosted a before school Science review/tutoring group to support learning.

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

- Weekly planning for the new ELA curriculum implementation
- Lexia to support with differentiated intervention
- PENDA Science to support understanding of Science concepts
- Title 1 Math Intervention Teacher will continue to push in to the math block to support our students

of highest need

- Adding ASP (Academic Support Program) for Math 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.

- Weekly Lesson Study with new ELA curriculum and B.E.S.T. Standards and Benchmarks
- Vertical Cross-grade discussion around B.E.S.T. Standards and Benchmarks
- Literacy Coach collaborating with teachers to complete coaching cycles focused on ELA instructional strategies
- Conscious Discipline training and coaching support to ensure engagement and success for ALL students

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

We will continue with our Academic Support Program prioritizing our students of greatest need in grades 3-6 for reading and math tutoring and support.

We will continue with a school wide Walk to Intervention scheduled into the master school to support all students.

We will continue weekly collaborative planning and lesson study and quarterly extended planning with a focus on B.E.S.T. standards and benchmarks and instruction and implementation.

We will utilize funding to work towards 1:1 ratio for student computers focusing on grades 3-6 to continue the implementation of Lexia, i-Ready, and PENDA. (T)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Instruction must be clearly aligned to grade level standards in order to increase student academic success. The 2021 FSA data shows a need to improve instructional practices to increase student achievement in ELA, as 44% of students are scoring at or above proficiency levels. The i-Ready Reading Diagnostic completed in September 2021 shows that 277 students are deficient in one of more areas and require Tier 2/3 interventions. Of those 277 students, 105 students have been identified as substantially deficient and require Tier 3 interventions.

Measurable Outcome: By end of year Diagnostic 3 in Reading, the goal is to have at least 60% of our students on grade level. On 2022 FSA the goal is to have 60% scoring level 3 or higher. In the learning gains component for our students in the lowest quartile our goal is to move from 23% of students making a learning a learning gain in ELA to 50%.

Monitoring: We will utilize i-Ready diagnostic data in Winter and Spring to determine appropriate continued supports for Tier 2/3 intervention. We will utilize weekly, unit, and standards mastery assessments to determine appropriate supports and differentiation for acceleration and remediation during Tier 1 instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Paige Trosset (trosset.paige@brevardschools.org)

TNTP's research findings show that students need scaffolds and supports in place in order to close instructional gaps. According to Achieve the Core, utilizing higher order thinking and questioning, teaching vocabulary in context, and providing visual supports are key strategies when supporting learners with complex text. Incorporating all components of ELA Core Instruction into the 90 minute reading block will ensure instruction and support for ALL students.

Evidence-based Strategy: Our Tier 1 (Core) Curriculum adopted by Brevard Public Schools is on the approved Florida Instructional Materials Adoption List. "Florida Benchmark Advance" 2022 for K-5 and "myPerspectives Florida English Language Arts" 2022 1st Edition for Grade 6.

At Sabal Elementary we utilize i-Ready, Lexia and Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) to meet the needs of our students needing Tier 2 instruction and intervention. I-Ready tools personalize pathways to help accelerate growth and grade-level learning and access.

For Tier 3 instruction, teachers will utilize 95 Percent Group Interventions, and Barton Reading and Spelling to provide intensive, systematic and explicit instruction on foundational skills utilizing evidence based practices as listed in the IES practice guides assisting students struggling in reading.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Tier 1: 44% of students at Sabal Elementary are proficient in ELA based on the 2021 FSA ELA Achievement data. Implementing high quality ELA instructional materials with fidelity will support the explicit instruction of vocabulary, phonics, phonemic awareness, fluency and comprehension. High quality reading instruction requires that teachers understand more than simply what to teach. Collaborative planning for instruction and use of high quality instructional materials will support teachers in understanding how to identify their students' instructional needs, select appropriate materials, organize instruction to maximize learning, and differentiate instruction to meet individual needs of students.

Tier 2: Students at Sabal arrive with varying ability levels. Driven by the i-Ready Diagnostic,

lessons in reading and math provide tailored instruction that meets the students where they are in their learning journey and encourages them as they develop new skills. With 54% of students at Sabal below proficiency levels on either the i-Ready Diagnostic or the FSA, a tiered model of intervention and support is needed. Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS) is a school model that uses data driven problem solving and incorporates system level change to address both academic and social/emotional needs of students. We commonly utilize Lexia and LLI depending on identified areas for improvement. LLI increases reading volume by engaging students in large amounts of successful daily reading and teachers explicitly teach vocabulary, fluency and comprehension to maximize growth. Lexia aims to build foundational reading skills through personalized learning including the six components of reading: Phonological awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension and structural analysis.

Tier 3: 20% of students at Sabal have skill gaps in foundational reading and are in Tier 3 intervention. 95 Percent Group instructional materials are uniquely designed to provide targeted instruction in specific skills. The diagnostic screeners are aligned with the instructional materials and continuum of skills allowing teachers to begin instruction at the students lowest skill deficit.

Action Steps to Implement

Weekly Impact planning meetings and lesson study will be utilized to take a deep dive into the alignment of the B.E.S.T. Standards/Benchmarks, text, and task utilizing the components of the new ELA curriculum with fidelity to ensure an ELA block with incorporates all aspects for the Science of Reading. The literacy coach will facilitate professional development through lesson studies including modeling, practice, and feedback on how to utilize resources and high yield instructional strategies to increase student engagement.

Person Responsible Beth Conti (conti.elizabeth@brevardschools.org)

Instructional coaches and administration utilize the observation and feedback developed collaboratively with administration, teachers, and coaches, based on collective instructional agreements and "look-fors" in alignment with Brevard's Vision for Excellent Instruction, to provide coaching support regarding grade level trends and areas of need.

Person Responsible Paige Trosset (trosset.paige@brevardschools.org)

Two Title 1 Teachers and one Instructional Assistant utilize research based intervention based on the decision tree during our school-wide Walk to Reading outside of the 90 minute reading block, to help support and provide intervention with our Tier 2/3 students. (T) We implement Multi-tiered systems of support (walk to intervention) for all students and small group tutoring (ASP), to include explicit systematic instruction in phonics, fluency, vocabulary, comprehension.

Person Responsible Corey Kadlec (kadlec.corey@brevardschools.org)

We will facilitate professional development with a focus on meeting the needs of our identified subgroups not meeting the federal index of 41% or higher (Students with Disabilities, ELL, Black/African American, Hispanic, Multiracial, and Economically Disadvantaged)- teachers will create action steps to directly address instruction, engagement, or belonging. We will include training for teachers on conducting authentic student data chats and goal setting for improvement.

Person Responsible Laura Hobson (hobson.laura@brevardschools.org)

We will develop and implement a plan for mentoring and regular progress monitoring for our lowest quartile of student in our IMPACT meetings.

Person Responsible Paige Trosset (trosset.paige@brevardschools.org)

We will utilize video technology (Swivl) to create a professional development library with exemplary instructional practices and model best practice within the ELA instructional block. (T)

Person Responsible Beth Conti (conti.elizabeth@brevardschools.org)

We will utilize weekly, unit, and standards mastery assessments to determine appropriate supports and differentiation for acceleration and remediation during Tier 1 instruction. In addition to Tier 1 instruction we will utilize our ASP program to accelerate learning including scaffolding, previewing, and advance organizers to support independent thinking.

Person Responsible Laura Hobson (hobson.laura@brevardschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Math has been identified as an area of focus due to the loss of instruction from many students quarantined throughout the school year. The i-Ready Math Diagnostic completed in September 2021 shows 85% of students in grades 1-6 are below grade level at this time. The 2021 FSA Math shows that only 39% of students were meeting or exceeding proficiency.

Measurable Outcome: By end the year, our goal is for 60% of our students on grade level on both the i-Ready EOY Diagnostic and the FSA for Mathematics.

Monitoring: We will utilize i-Ready diagnostics in Winter and Spring to progress monitor all math domains. We will also utilize Eureka mid-module and end of module assessments to progress monitor after direct instruction of standards. Teachers utilize daily exit tickets to help drive instruction for small group intervention.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Paige Trosset (trosset.paige@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Research indicates that targeted instruction and intervention leads to increased student achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Our student data shows a need for specific, differentiated instruction in math domains that do not match the pacing of standards being taught during math core instruction in the classroom. Our classroom teachers, Title 1 Math Intervention teacher, and ESOL IA's will conduct small group targeted instruction in math within a schedule 90 minute block for Math.

Action Steps to Implement

Students will utilize various online adaptive programs will be utilized in classrooms including i-Ready. I-Ready consultant/trainer will facilitate small group grade level PD focused on providing intervention and incorporating i-Ready instruction into small groups for math instruction.

Person Responsible: Laura Hobson (hobson.laura@brevardschools.org)

Instructional Math Coach will facilitate planning, model, observe and provide feedback to teachers regarding Tier 1 core instruction. (T)

Person Responsible: Jeanette Garcia (garcia.jeanette@brevardschools.org)

For consistency of instruction, we purchased Eureka math instructional materials for our 6th grade teachers and students. We have been implementing Eureka math for the past 4 years, and wanted to remain consistent in our curriculum decisions. (T)

Person Responsible: Corey Kadlec (kadlec.corey@brevardschools.org)

Our Title One math intervention teacher utilized i-Ready and FSA data to determine students with the greatest need for support and created a schedule to push in to support with small group instruction in the math block. (T)

Person Responsible: Jeanette Garcia (garcia.jeanette@brevardschools.org)

We will collaborate with the District Content Specialist for planning, modeling, observation and feedback with a specific focus of increasing student engagement, discourse and hands-on learning in the math block.

Person Responsible Jeanette Garcia (garcia.jeanette@brevardschools.org)

We will utilize exit tickets, mid- and end of module assessments to determine appropriate supports and differentiation for acceleration and remediation during Tier 1 instruction. In addition to Tier 1 instruction we will utilize our ASP program to accelerate learning including scaffolding, vocabulary instruction, and independent thinking.

Person Responsible Laura Hobson (hobson.laura@brevardschools.org)

We will utilize video technology (Swivl) to create a professional development library with exemplary instructional practices and model best practice within the Math instructional block. (T)

Person Responsible Jeanette Garcia (garcia.jeanette@brevardschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Instructional Practice and Planning for Science- On the 2021 SSA 39% of Sabal's fifth graders met proficiency or higher.

Measurable Outcome: Our goal is to increase our Science proficiency from 39% to 60% by the end of the school year.

Monitoring: We will utilize the District Science Assessments in 5th grade to progress monitor the standards mastery. We will also utilize PENDA science data to help with differentiation and small group instruction and re-teaching when needed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Laura Hobson (hobson.laura@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will collaboratively plan for implementation of the 5E model with Science instruction including hands on and STEM learning labs. Teachers will facilitate collaborative inquiry discussions guiding students to use academic vocabulary.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Sabal's SSA data shows that most of our students are not getting to the depth of understanding with regard to science concepts.

Action Steps to Implement

Our GSP teacher will co-teach and co-plan with our 4th, 5th, and 6th grade teachers to facilitate and implement hands on learning with a focus on STEM Learning Labs. (T)

Person Responsible Laura Hobson (hobson.laura@brevardschools.org)

We will implement and monitor the use of the PENDA computer based program to support science instruction in the classroom. We will utilize PENDA data for one on one student conferencing and goal setting for improvement in addition to progress monitoring for instructional decision making.

Person Responsible Jeanette Garcia (garcia.jeanette@brevardschools.org)

We will plan and implement a Hands On Science Blitz for our fifth graders to ensure review of 3rd and 4th grade science standards that will be assessed on the 5th Grade State Science Assessment.

Person Responsible Laura Hobson (hobson.laura@brevardschools.org)

We will collaborate monthly with the District Content Specialist to support planning, modeling, observation and feedback specifically focused on the state standards for science and including the 5E Model for science instruction.

Person Responsible Laura Hobson (hobson.laura@brevardschools.org)

We also purchased Discovery Streaming and Brain Pop to help support science instruction and student engagement for K-6. (T)

Person Responsible Corey Kadlec (kadlec.corey@brevardschools.org)

We will utilize video technology (Swivl) to create a professional development library with exemplary instructional practices and model best practice within the Science instructional block. (T)

Person Responsible Laura Hobson (hobson.laura@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.

In comparison to statewide discipline data, Sabal reported 1.1 discipline incidents per 100 students. When compared to all elementary schools statewide Sabal is in the HIGH category. Sabal is ranked 1,004 out of 1,395 elementary schools across the state of Florida. We are ranked 41 out of 54 in Brevard for discipline incidents. This data shows a need for continuous improvement in building our school culture and climate for behavior among our students.

Sabal is in year two in the development of becoming an anchor school for Conscious Discipline implementation in grades PreK-6. Research shows Conscious Discipline improves the social emotional skills of both students and teachers, student academic readiness and achievement as well as school climate. Data from 2021 discipline referrals, parent and teacher surveys, the Youth Truth Survey, and teacher feedback reflect that student disruptions in the classrooms interrupted and affected the ability to maintain an optimal learning environment.

It is our goal to attain a school-wide decrease in behavior referrals by 5% in the second year of implementation of conscious discipline. Parent, student and teacher surveys will show more positive responses and feedback regarding a positive learning environment for all.

Conscious Discipline provides a comprehensive, trauma-informed social emotional program that is based on current brain research, child development information and developmentally appropriate practices. All aspects of Conscious Discipline focus on creating a safe, connected environment for children to learn and practice the skills needed for healthy social, emotional and academic development. Conscious Discipline methodology has been recognized by SAMHSA's National Registry of Evidence-based Programs and Practices (NREPP), and it was named a national model for character education by the Florida State Legislature. Research shows that Conscious Discipline decreases aggression, impulsivity and hyperactivity while creating a positive environment in the school or home. In schools, Conscious Discipline has been shown to decrease discipline referrals while increasing teaching time and academic achievement.

Research shows Conscious Discipline improves the social emotional skills of both students and teachers, student academic readiness and achievement as well as school climate. It is our goal to give teachers the tools to build positive relationships with students and the strategies to regulate their own feelings to address and support the needs of our students struggling with appropriate emotional or behavioral communication.

Monthly faculty PLCs are focused on learning and implementing Conscious Discipline strategies. All classrooms have 30 minutes embedded into schedule for morning meetings for building positive school and classroom environments. Administration will observe, monitor, and provide feedback as needed.

We will host a Conscious Discipline Parent Night in January 2022 in collaborative partnership with our families for consistent practices between school and home. (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.

Data from 2021 discipline referrals, parent and teacher surveys, the Youth Truth Survey, and teacher feedback reflect that student disruptions in the classrooms interrupted and affected the ability to maintain an optimal learning environment. As a school we are working on strengthening our positive school culture through Conscious Discipline and PBIS. Parents have also expressed a desire for communication and partnership in their children's school experience. As we learn and grow with our Conscious Discipline training as a staff, we will bridge communication at home by hosting a Conscious Discipline night for parents and families.

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

Though our APTT (Academic Parent Teacher Team) Meetings twice a year, parents participate in class analysis of data and learn strategies to help support their children at home through standards aligned materials.

Our SAC meets monthly to discuss school data and plan for continuous school improvement.

Our PTO works with our teachers to plan for student and teacher recognition through PBIS celebrations and events.

The school engages families, students, and all faculty in a shared understanding of academic and behavioral expectations as well as high-quality instruction.

Leaders demonstrate how those beliefs manifest in the school building. For example: •Collaborative planning is solutions-oriented and based in data aggregated data • Student work is displayed throughout school • All students are enrolled in college- and career-ready prep curriculum . The administration ensures that teachers have resources, training, and ongoing support to meet them and provides frequent, constructive feedback, and actively makes themselves available to teachers and staff. The leadership team actively solicits staff feedback on school-wide procedures and creates opportunities for teachers to assume leadership roles. They also structure the master schedule to include collaborative planning and ensure it is rooted in data on student progress and interests.