

Brevard Public Schools

John F. Turner, Senior 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	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	26
Budget to Support Goals	0

John F. Turner, Senior Elementary School

3175 JUPITER BLVD SE, Palm Bay, FL 32909

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

Demographics

Principal: Ashley Toll

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (41%)
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	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

John F. Turner, Senior Elementary School

3175 JUPITER BLVD SE, Palm Bay, FL 32909

<http://www.turner.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	98%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	65%

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.

To ensure every student reaches his or her highest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We work collaboratively as a community of learners to provide a safe, structured, and caring environment where all students are engaged learners who believe they can achieve.

Revised: August 2020

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
Toll, Ashley	Principal	Serves as an instructional coach, analyzes and shares data with stakeholders, manages the school leadership team, and maintains the school budget.
Keller, Sara	Assistant Principal	Serves as an instructional leader, shares curriculum updates and best practices, monitors and analyzes data, leads MTSS and prepares for state testing at the school.
Arnold, Megan	Parent Engagement Liaison	Serves as Title I Coordinator to oversee interventions, family and stakeholder engagement, maintains budget and Title I compliance. 80% of the day is spent working with students in ELA intervention, 20% of the day is spent planning family engagement, maintaining budget and reviewing Title I compliance.
McKenzie, Chantell	Reading Coach	Serves as an instructional leader in the area of ELA. Provides modeling, feedback and support to teachers. Supports the MTSS process by monitoring data and helping to provide interventions to students. Supports teachers to improve their craft through professional development.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Ashley Toll

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

50

Total number of students enrolled at the school

575

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

9

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

12

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	71	87	75	68	68	63	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	520
Attendance below 90 percent	9	15	11	10	5	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
One or more suspensions	6	3	1	1	2	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	2	5	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	4	8	3	5	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
2021 FSA ELA Level 1's	0	0	0	3	13	14	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
2021 FSA Math Level 1's	0	0	0	2	22	15	42	0	0	0	0	0	0	81

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	5	10	11	9	15	16	40	0	0	0	0	0	0	106

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	6	7	3	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/26/2021

2020-21 - As Reported**The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:**

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	74	70	61	73	60	74	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	484
Attendance below 90 percent	2	2	0	0	1	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
One or more suspensions	0	6	6	1	0	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	14	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	15	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	1	0	0	14	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	6	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	74	70	61	73	60	74	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	484
Attendance below 90 percent	2	2	0	0	1	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
One or more suspensions	0	6	6	1	0	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	14	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	15	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	1	0	0	14	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	6	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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				45%	62%	57%	48%	60%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				53%	60%	58%	50%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				60%	57%	53%	43%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				44%	63%	63%	45%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				57%	65%	62%	50%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				41%	53%	51%	44%	49%	47%
Science Achievement				43%	57%	53%	41%	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	46%	64%	-18%	58%	-12%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	47%	61%	-14%	58%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
05	2021					
	2019	42%	60%	-18%	56%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
06	2021					
	2019	40%	60%	-20%	54%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	49%	61%	-12%	62%	-13%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	51%	64%	-13%	64%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2021					
	2019	39%	60%	-21%	60%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
06	2021					
	2019	29%	67%	-38%	55%	-26%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	39%	56%	-17%	53%	-14%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Students in K-6 will use the i-Ready Diagnostics to progress monitor. They will take 3 assessments during the school year. 5th grade science is monitored through district created science assessments.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	11	16	29
	Economically Disadvantaged	27	51	68
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	25
	English Language Learners	0	100	35
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	28	19	25
	Economically Disadvantaged	16	41	51
	Students With Disabilities	0	50	25
	English Language Learners	25	25	50
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	13	28	34
	Economically Disadvantaged	6	23	35
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	9	18	33
	Economically Disadvantaged	10	13	26
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	25
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	43	70	75
	Economically Disadvantaged	22	44	56
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	6	28	46
	Economically Disadvantaged	15	30	41
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	30	48	60
	Economically Disadvantaged	44	64	77
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	100
	English Language Learners	0	0	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	9	34	59
	Economically Disadvantaged	8	28	46
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	50

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	21	24	27
	Economically Disadvantaged	30	50	63
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	50
	English Language Learners	0	0	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	10	21	24
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	30	73
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	42	20	42
	Economically Disadvantaged	41	15	41
	Students With Disabilities	33	9	25
	English Language Learners	20	28	14
Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	44	47	51
	Economically Disadvantaged	26	29	35
	Students With Disabilities	13	0	13
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	9	32	50
	Economically Disadvantaged	15	29	26
	Students With Disabilities	13	0	25
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	26	44	47	16	21	44	21				
ELL	31	41		31	39	50	18				
BLK	43	37	30	29	10		25				
HSP	41	34		40	24		29				
MUL	45			36							
WHT	46	35	50	44	28	38	32				
FRL	36	36	43	36	22	32	36				
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	24	53	63	27	54	45	25				
ELL	28	39	60	41	58	53					
BLK	33	57	64	36	60	42	23				
HSP	35	42	58	40	51	45	31				
MUL	44	40		44	60						
WHT	54	58	62	48	57	28	55				
FRL	43	49	58	43	55	36	42				
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	28	37	33	23	50	50	18				
ELL	33	57		38	43						
BLK	28	30	23	30	36	43					
HSP	40	53	73	42	38	20	10				
MUL	46	28		32	36		70				
WHT	57	60	50	52	60	63	50				
FRL	47	47	42	43	47	43	37				

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	38
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	60
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	306

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	39
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	29
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	38
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	41
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

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	39
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	38
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

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

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

Due to Covid-19, we saw a drop in proficiency in most subject areas and grade levels. Proficiency went down 11% in science, down 5% in math, and down 1% in ELA. Learning gains also dropped in ELA and Math. In math, learning gains went down 36% and went down 16% in ELA.

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

Math shows the greatest need for improvement. Student proficiency went down 5% while learning gains in math went down 36%. 5th grade math showed the greatest decline from 2019 FSA scores. In 2019 5th grade was 39% proficient and in 2021 they went down by 20% to only 19% proficient. ELA shows a need for improvement in 5th grade as well. 5th grade went from 42% proficient to 23% proficient in ELA.

Science also showed a decline. Proficiency dropped from 43% proficient to 32% proficient in science.

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

Due to constant quarantines and lack of true e-learning participation, many students did not make learning gains and dropped to level 1's and 2's from being proficient.

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

Third grade reading went from 36% proficient in 2019 to 46% proficient on the 2021 FSA.

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

All 3 of the third grade teachers were new to the grade level. They worked collaboratively to plan standard-based lessons and monitored student progress through the standards mastery program through i-Ready.

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

Effective PD on what learning acceleration looks like. Bi-Weekly data chats to focus on intervention. Teachers will use i-Ready pre-requisite lessons in small groups to be successful in the tier 1 core instruction.

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

Pre-planning will have learning acceleration PD's to support teachers in learning what it should look like in the classroom. A large focus for PD will be intervention strategies and how to use data to drive instruction.

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

Before and afterschool tutoring will continue this year. We will focus on math, ELA, and science.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The 2021 FSA math data show a priority need to focus on math instruction. In 2019, we showed a proficiency level of 44%, we decreased by 5% in 2021 to 39% proficient. Our largest decrease was in the area of math learning gains. In 2019, we saw 57% of students making learning gains in math. In 2021, we decreased by 36% to only have 21% of students making learning gains in math.
Measurable Outcome:	School wide Math scores will increase as a result of teachers collaboratively planning and the implementation of standards based instruction in all classrooms for all students with the utilization of the Eureka math program. In the 20-21 school year, 21% of students scored a learning gain and 39% of students in grades 3-6 were proficient on the Math FSA. The goal for 21-22 school year is to increase students showing a learning gain to 41% and students meeting proficiency to 45% on the Math FSA.
Monitoring:	i-Ready diagnostics 1-3 will monitor student achievement in math. Data from Eureka mid-module and end of module assessments will also be used to analyze student progress.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ashley Toll (toll.ashley@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilization of collaborative planning with standards aligned quality resources. Collaborative planning allows teachers to improve clarity in the Eureka lessons and organize their instruction in a way that keeps them on pace with one another and the district pacing guides.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidence supports that teaching strategies increase when teachers are given time to collaborate with peers and build their skills utilizing quality materials. This strategy when paired with administration and coach walkthroughs, immediate feedback, and common assessments can yield great results for all learners.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Continue to implement Eureka math program in all classrooms K-5 to increase student depth of knowledge on math standards.

Person Responsible Ashley Toll (toll.ashley@brevardschools.org)

2. Teachers will collaboratively plan with district and school based administration and coaches utilizing the Eureka Math resources in order to increase the standards based instruction and move to the next level of deeper mathematical knowledge for all students.

Person Responsible Ashley Toll (toll.ashley@brevardschools.org)

3. Teachers will use feedback from administrative and coaches observations to improve instruction.

Person Responsible Ashley Toll (toll.ashley@brevardschools.org)

4. Teachers will plan and deliver lessons with increased student talk/discourse within lessons in all subject areas. They will also implement the use of exit tickets to inform reteaching needs.

Person Responsible Ashley Toll (toll.ashley@brevardschools.org)

5. Continue the use of the i-Ready instructional program for math. Use Title I funds for professional development for i-ready and substitutes. (T)

Person Responsible Ashley Toll (toll.ashley@brevardschools.org)

6. Use the i-Ready Standards Mastery program to monitor standards based instruction. Teachers will utilize data and reteach standards when needed.

Person Responsible Ashley Toll (toll.ashley@brevardschools.org)

7. CARES Act/ASP funding will be used to form small groups for before or after school intervention to fill Math learning gaps.

Person Responsible Ashley Toll (toll.ashley@brevardschools.org)

8. Plan a Family Math night to help parents understand how to help their child at home. (T)

Person Responsible Ashley Toll (toll.ashley@brevardschools.org)

9. Hire a Math Interventionist (T) through Title I funds to support intervention efforts and monitor data.

Person Responsible Ashley Toll (toll.ashley@brevardschools.org)

10. The BSI will walk school with administrator team to give feedback and look for next steps.

Person Responsible Ashley Toll (toll.ashley@brevardschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teacher learning and growth are dependent upon frequent interaction, dialogue, and reflection between themselves, instructional coaches and administration.
Measurable Outcome:	School wide ELA scores will increase as a result of teachers collaboratively planning and the implementation of standards aligned instruction in all classrooms for all students. In school year 20-21, 37% of students scored a learning gain and 44% of students in grades 3-6 were proficient on the ELA FSA. The goal for 21-22 school year is to increase students showing a learning gain to 41% and students meeting proficiency to 45% on the ELA FSA.
Monitoring:	The leadership team will monitor data from classroom walkthroughs, i-Ready diagnostics, as well as the new benchmark curriculum assessments. This data will be analyzed in bi-weekly data team meetings.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Chantell McKenzie (mckenzie.chantell@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilization of collaborative planning with standards-aligned curriculum. Teachers will use standard focus boards as a resource in the classroom. SFB's and collaborative planning are critical for ongoing instruction (effect size 0.64), explaining content (0.70), and the assessment of student learning (effect size 0.64). Teachers and students will have clear learning targets, a clear understanding of what students are expected to know and be able to do.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidence supports that teaching strategies increase when teachers are given time to collaborate with peers and build their skills utilizing quality materials. Standard focus boards are also used to increase the teacher's understanding of the standard and remain focused on the standard throughout the lesson. These strategies when paired with administration walkthroughs, immediate feedback, and data driven lessons, will increase student achievement in ELA.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will collaboratively plan with district and school based-coaches quarterly to map out ELA standards aligned curriculum including complex text, tasks, questions, exit ticket for understanding, including scaffolding and utilizing the enhanced focus documents. These planning sessions will be led by literacy coach, Chantel McKenzie, who is being supported by Debbie Wood. Turner will utilize lessons and assessment from Standards-Mastery to define the depth of the standards. Title I will fund substitutes. (T)

Person Responsible Ashley Toll (toll.ashley@brevardschools.org)

2. Teachers will collaboratively work with school literacy coach and district ELA support team to increase understanding and implementation of best practices in writing strategies for instruction.

Person Responsible Chantell McKenzie (mckenzie.chantell@brevardschools.org)

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

Person Responsible Ashley Toll (toll.ashley@brevardschools.org)

4. Turner will utilize i-Ready programs for ELA and Math and the professional development that aligns with the program. Teachers will monitor student progress through i-Ready, and the new Benchmark Advanced end of unit assessments. District assessments, Running Records, and other monitoring tools to guide and plan for standards based instruction. (T)

Person Responsible Chantell McKenzie (mckenzie.chantell@brevardschools.org)

5. School based leadership team and teachers will collaboratively plan implementation of school wide intervention based on frequent student data analysis.

Person Responsible Ashley Toll (toll.ashley@brevardschools.org)

6. Teachers will plan lessons with increased written response to text to increase student achievement in ELA.

Person Responsible Chantell McKenzie (mckenzie.chantell@brevardschools.org)

7. Turner will continue to use the writing program embedded within Benchmark Advanced, to improve writing across content areas.

Person Responsible Chantell McKenzie (mckenzie.chantell@brevardschools.org)

8. Hire Title I interventionists from Title I funds to support intervention for ELA. (T)

Person Responsible Ashley Toll (toll.ashley@brevardschools.org)

9. Title I teacher hired to pull intervention groups. All small groups will have white boards to help with student engagement. (T)

Person Responsible Megan Arnold (arnold.megan@brevardschools.org)

10. Hired Literacy Coach (.5 T) to support ELA.

Person Responsible Ashley Toll (toll.ashley@brevardschools.org)

11. Use Standards Mastery program from i-Ready to monitor standards based instruction. Teachers will monitor the data and utilize results to follow up with reteach.

Person Responsible Chantell McKenzie (mckenzie.chantell@brevardschools.org)

12. CARES Act/ASP funding will be used to form small groups for before or after school intervention to fill ELA learning gaps.

Person Responsible Sara Keller (keller.sara@brevardschools.org)

13. Plan a Literacy Night to help parents understand how to help their child at home (T).

Person Responsible Chantell McKenzie (mckenzie.chantell@brevardschools.org)

14. Purchase i-Ready ELA workbooks for teachers to support standards based instruction for small groups. (T)

Person Responsible Ashley Toll (toll.ashley@brevardschools.org)

15. i-Ready training and professional development will be provided to all Turner teachers to support the implementation of the program (T).

Person Responsible Ashley Toll (toll.ashley@brevardschools.org)

16. Three Title I Teachers will support tier 2 and tier 3 ELA intervention. (T)

Person Responsible Ashley Toll (toll.ashley@brevardschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Teacher learning and growth are dependent upon frequent interaction, dialogue, and reflection between themselves, instructional coaches, and administrators.

Measurable Outcome:

Fifth Grade SSA scores will increase as a result of teachers collaboratively planning and the implementation of standards based instruction and standards based hands-on science labs in all classrooms. In 20-21 school year 32% of students in 5th grade were proficient on the State Science Assessment. The goal for the 21-22 school year is to increase students meeting proficiency to 45% on the SSA.

Monitoring:

Administrative walkthroughs and the monitoring of common assessment data will support the desired outcome of 45% proficiency on the SSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ashley Toll (toll.ashley@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Collaborative planning with the utilization of the Five E model for hands on science instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Evidence supports that teaching strategies increase when teachers are given time to collaborate with peers and build their skills utilizing quality materials. This strategy when paired with administration walkthroughs, immediate feedback, and common assessments can increase student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will collaboratively plan with district and school based science coach, utilizing the standards aligned science resources created by Michelle Ferro, in order to increase standards based instruction.

Person Responsible

Sara Keller (keller.sara@brevardschools.org)

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

Person Responsible

Sara Keller (keller.sara@brevardschools.org)

3. Michelle Ferro will work closely with school Science Coach and the 5th grade team to model implementation of the Five E science instruction within all classrooms and the utilization of standards aligned science instruction for all grade levels.

Person Responsible

Sara Keller (keller.sara@brevardschools.org)

4. Science Blitz will be planned and implemented prior to the SSA. Students will review 3rd and 4th grade standards during rotations.

Person Responsible

Sara Keller (keller.sara@brevardschools.org)

5. Utilizing the Brevard SSA Review Part 1 and 2 to look for deficiencies in science from previous grade levels. Science Coach will use this data to pull text that aligns with the standard to use in small reading groups as well as create labs to fill the gaps.

Person Responsible Sara Keller (keller.sara@brevardschools.org)

6. Use Title I funds to bring the Orlando Science Center to Turner for a family science night. (T)

Person Responsible Sara Keller (keller.sara@brevardschools.org)

7. Purchase the Lagoon Quest virtual field trip program for our 4th graders. (T)

Person Responsible Sara Keller (keller.sara@brevardschools.org)

8. Utilize a school science coach to support teachers and monitor science data. (T)

Person Responsible Sara Keller (keller.sara@brevardschools.org)

9. Science coach will teach hands on activities that align with standards in grades 3-5. (T)

Person Responsible Sara Keller (keller.sara@brevardschools.org)

10. Use Education Galaxy to promote science lessons in the classroom and use data to progress monitor standards being covered.

Person Responsible Sara Keller (keller.sara@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.

Using the Safe Schools for Alex website, Turner is listed in the "very low" category for incidents occurring per 100 students. An area for improvement could be our suspension rate. We have a suspension rating of 11 compared to the state average of 3.9. A new school social worker was hired this year at Turner who has created more social/emotional groups than we have had in the past. We are hopeful that by supporting students social and emotional needs, we can decrease behaviors in the classroom.

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.

The BPS parent survey revealed that Turner's communication with parents was an area of strength. A weekly email from the principal and monthly school newsletter helped parents stay up to date with deadlines and upcoming activities. An area of improvement was planning activities on different days of the week or even morning meetings. During the 20-21 school year, we focused on virtual meetings so that more parents could participate.

In alignment with the BPS strategic plan, Goal 1, Obj. 3 (Provide equitable supports in a safe learning environment for every student's social, emotional, and behavioral development.), Turner provides social and emotional small groups for students in need. Teachers also utilize morning meetings, Sanford Harmony curriculum, and the use of SWPBIS for classroom management and positive behavior support.

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

All teachers are trained in Conscious Discipline, Morning Meetings, and Sanford Harmony programs. The school counselor and social worker, work closely with teachers, students, and parents to ensure that all social and emotional needs are taken care of.