

Brevard Public Schools

Quest 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 | 21 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Quest Elementary School

8751 TRAFFORD DR, Melbourne, FL 32940

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

Demographics

Principal: Karry Castillo A

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

| | |
|--|---|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-6 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2020-21 Title I School | No |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 20% |
| 2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: A (76%) 2017-18: A (76%) 2016-17: A (74%) |
| 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 |

Quest Elementary School

8751 TRAFFORD DR, Melbourne, FL 32940

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

School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2020-21 Title I School | 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School PK-6 | No | 20% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 28% |

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

<https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission, at Quest, is for educational excellence in a nurturing 21st century environment that promotes exemplary character, independent thinking, and a desire for lifelong learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

A collaborative learning community on a journey to reach its highest potential.

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 |
|-----------------|---------------------|---|
| Boyd, Christine | Principal | As an administrator, we review data, reflect on best practices, and develop professional development based on data. This is done with a Shared Leadership approach, including SAC, PTO, parent forums, Leadership Team, Staff Meetings, and engaging all stakeholders in the process of school improvement. Once input is collected, the team moves for solidifying the goals and benchmarks to achieve those goals. |
| Phillips, Tauna | Assistant Principal | As an administrator, we review data, reflect on best practices, and develop professional development based on data. This is done with a Shared Leadership approach, including SAC, PTO, parent forums, Leadership Team, Staff Meetings, and engaging all stakeholders in the process of school improvement. Once input is collected, the team moves for solidifying the goals and benchmarks to achieve those goals. |
| Kostka, Julie | Instructional Coach | The Instructional Coach plays an essential role assisting administration in reviewing multiple data sources throughout the school year. They assist on reflecting on best practices, are involved in and support professional developments for staff, as well as supporting parents through the literacy process of their child. The instructional coach provides input for the SIP and carries these goals into her coaching model for teachers. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Saturday 7/1/2017, Karry Castillo A

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.*

7

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

39

Total number of students enrolled at the school

580

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

1

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

1

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 | 69 | 82 | 101 | 103 | 88 | 94 | 102 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 639 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 1 | 8 | 10 | 5 | 8 | 10 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| 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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 23 |
| LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA MATH | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 9 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 26 |

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

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

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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 6/29/2021

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 84 | 109 | 123 | 116 | 114 | 123 | 109 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 778 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| 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 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 84 | 109 | 123 | 116 | 114 | 123 | 109 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 778 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| 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 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

| School Grade Component | 2021 | | | 2019 | | | 2018 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | | | | 81% | 62% | 57% | 85% | 60% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 67% | 60% | 58% | 69% | 54% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 65% | 57% | 53% | 70% | 46% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 88% | 63% | 63% | 89% | 62% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 79% | 65% | 62% | 74% | 59% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 67% | 53% | 51% | 74% | 49% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 82% | 57% | 53% | 72% | 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 | 79% | 64% | 15% | 58% | 21% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 82% | 61% | 21% | 58% | 24% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -79% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 88% | 60% | 28% | 56% | 32% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -82% | | | | |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 75% | 60% | 15% | 54% | 21% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -88% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 87% | 61% | 26% | 62% | 25% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 86% | 64% | 22% | 64% | 22% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -87% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 85% | 60% | 25% | 60% | 25% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -86% | | | | |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 93% | 67% | 26% | 55% | 38% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -85% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 81% | 56% | 25% | 53% | 28% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

iReady Data: ELA and Math

Science: Grade 5 Review Part 1 and 2

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 32% | 50% | 73% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 16% | 40% | 48% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 10% | 20% | 40% |
| | English Language Learners | 25% | 31% | 56% |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 26% | 42% | 62% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 12% | 28% | 40% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 20% | 25% | 30% |
| | English Language Learners | 31% | 38% | 50% |
| | | | | |
| Grade 2 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 45% | 61% | 77% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 39% | 50% | 67% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 25% | 25% | 50% |
| | English Language Learners | 36% | 54% | 73% |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 30% | 58% | 70% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 6% | 45% | 50% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 15% | 40% | 50% |
| | English Language Learners | 1% | 36% | 55% |
| | | | | |

| Grade 3 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 69% | 85% | 89% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 50% | 82% | 82% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 29% | 57% | 62% |
| | English Language Learners | 17% | 33% | 33% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 26% | 59% | 79% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 18% | 45% | 55% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 5% | 19% | 43% |
| | English Language Learners | 17% | 17% | 67% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Grade 4 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 56% | 73% | 76% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 31% | 62% | 62% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 13% | 19% | 25% |
| | English Language Learners | 22% | 56% | 56% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 29% | 58% | 75% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 8% | 38% | 58% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0% | 19% | 44% |
| | English Language Learners | 11% | 33% | 56% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |

| Grade 5 | | | | |
|--------------------------|-------------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 56% | 68% | 79% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 55% | 59% | 73% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 28% | 39% | 56% |
| | English Language Learners | 20% | 80% | 20% |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 48% | 67% | 82% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 41% | 59% | 73% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 17% | 39% | 67% |
| | English Language Learners | 20% | 80% | 80% |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science | All Students | | | 65% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | | | 53% |
| | Students With Disabilities | | | 45% |
| | English Language Learners | | | 33% |
| | | | | |
| Grade 6 | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students | 62% | 70% | 82% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 48% | 52% | 78% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 35% | 41% | 53% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 0% | 100% |
| | | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics | All Students | 59% | 72% | 82% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 45% | 52% | 67% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 29% | 41% | 59% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 100% | 100% |
| | | | | |

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 | 45 | 61 | 42 | 46 | 49 | 36 | 35 | | | | |
| ELL | 72 | 100 | | 85 | 92 | | | | | | |
| ASN | 95 | | | 90 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 57 | 58 | | 73 | 62 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 67 | 70 | | 74 | 63 | | 40 | | | | |
| MUL | 75 | 65 | | 78 | 65 | | 58 | | | | |
| WHT | 81 | 77 | 68 | 83 | 69 | 53 | 76 | | | | |
| FRL | 67 | 68 | 59 | 73 | 61 | 63 | 57 | | | | |
| 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 | 51 | 54 | 37 | 68 | 74 | 55 | 63 | | | | |
| ELL | 70 | 52 | | 92 | 70 | 75 | | | | | |
| ASN | 89 | 58 | | 97 | 92 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 70 | 79 | | 82 | 79 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 80 | 60 | 65 | 80 | 69 | 55 | 83 | | | | |
| MUL | 80 | 62 | | 92 | 84 | 70 | | | | | |
| WHT | 82 | 69 | 66 | 89 | 79 | 71 | 80 | | | | |
| FRL | 63 | 58 | 45 | 70 | 65 | 43 | 76 | | | | |
| 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 | 55 | 53 | 53 | 64 | 67 | 61 | 46 | | | | |
| ELL | 72 | 68 | | 92 | 68 | | | | | | |
| ASN | 85 | 71 | | 93 | 67 | | 91 | | | | |
| BLK | 79 | 50 | | 88 | 71 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 84 | 67 | 55 | 87 | 78 | 54 | 76 | | | | |
| MUL | 76 | 69 | | 78 | 76 | | 63 | | | | |
| WHT | 87 | 70 | 75 | 90 | 73 | 78 | 70 | | | | |
| FRL | 74 | 65 | 63 | 82 | 75 | 80 | 63 | | | | |

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 | 70 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|------|
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 71 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 557 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 100% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 45 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 84 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Native American Students | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | 93 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 63 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 63 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

| Multiracial Students | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | 68 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Pacific Islander Students | |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 74 |
| 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 | 64 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

Analysis

Data Analysis

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

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

When looking at 2021 iReady progress monitoring data, our students with disabilities scored significantly lower than our grade level averages across all grades. Even though their scores are lower, the gains made were similar to their peers.

When comparing our FSA school total points from 2018 (533) to 2021 (486), Quest dropped 47 points. When looking at the 2021 FSA ELA data, our school average was at a 75%; fourth grade scored the lowest with a 77% average while fifth grade scored the highest with an 83% average. Our lowest 25% had an ELA school average of 57%. Our students with disabilities scored significantly lower than our grade level averages across all grades.

On the Science Assessment, we saw a 10 point drop and feel this is due to inconsistent eLearning attendance as well as limited hands on due to eLearning.

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

Our students with disabilities demonstrate the greatest need for improvement. Grade 4 students in ELA proficiency (upcoming 5th graders) were 51% lower than the grade level average.

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 the pandemic, the contributing factors for the 2021 school year include students e-learning and not following the push-in model. For the 2022 school year the push-in model for ESE and ESOL services will be in place as well as students will no longer be e-learning. This is important because the impact on achievement is greater when students are serviced with their grade level peers (when deemed appropriate).

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

According to our progress monitoring our English Language Learners showed the most improvement in both ELA and mathematics.

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

The contributing factors to this improvement include more ESOL Endorsed teachers at the school site as well as gaining an ESOL teacher.

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

A new ELA curriculum will be implemented this school year as well as a the push in model for the majority of our ESE population. Tier 1 instruction will include guided reading small groups for those students who need extra remediation/ acceleration in ELA and math, and ASP will be held to help students meet grade level expectations.

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.

Teachers will be trained on the new ELA curriculum and B.E.S.T. standards throughout the school year focusing on the data-based needs of our students. All classroom teachers servicing ESE students will be trained in the coteach model (if they have not already attended the training) to ensure successful implementation of the push-in model.

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

Our school based instructional coach will support students and teachers to ensure sustainability. This will include teacher support during planning as well as in delivery of quality instruction such as modeling effective whole and small group lessons.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

| | |
|---|---|
| Area of Focus Description and Rationale: | <p>According to our 2021 iReady progress monitoring data, our students with disabilities scored between 23% and 51% lower than their grade level peers in ELA. In Math our ESE students scored between 15% and 36% lower than their peers. As most of these students fall in our lowest 25% it is imperative that we focus on this group.</p> <p>This year we are using FIN's Best Practices for Inclusion Scheduling to address inclusive education for our ESE students least restrictive environment. 2020-21 classroom walk-throughs show that the majority of teachers are using complex text to support their instruction; however, there is a need to focus on tasks aligned to the full intent of the standard in 21-22. Collaborative data chats have become embedded and focus on multiple sources of data to make instructional decisions for both tier 1 and tier 2. This will continue as a focus this year and will include ESE student data and growth.</p> <p>We will additionally be addressing those students who show gaps from our iReady Diagnostic in September from Distant Learning due to COVID.</p> |
| Measurable Outcome: | <p>In 2022, our ESE subgroup will increase their Spring iReady ELA proficiency from 44% to 60%.</p> <p>In 2022, our ESE subgroup will increase their FSA ELA proficiency from 37% to 55%.</p> <p>In 2022, our ESE subgroup will increase their Spring iReady, Math proficiency from 42% to 60%.</p> <p>In 2022, our ESE subgroup will increase their FSA Math proficiency from 39% to 55%.</p> |
| Monitoring: | <p>This Area of Focus will be monitored through MTSS Data Chats held every 6 weeks and administration walk-throughs.</p> |
| Person responsible for monitoring outcome: | <p>Christine Boyd (boyd.christine@brevardschools.org)</p> |
| Evidence-based Strategy: | <p>MTSS Data Chats/ monitoring with ESE teachers, General Ed teachers, and administration will occur regularly. Collaborative planning between General Ed and ESE teachers focused on grade level assessments will increase teacher clarity in their instruction.</p> |
| Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: | <p>Teacher clarity is imperative for successful instruction. Hattie's effect size for organizing instruction (.64), explaining content (.70), and assessment of student learning (.64) make this an important area to focus on.</p> |

Action Steps to Implement

Classroom teachers (including ESE) will be trained in the new ELA curriculum and BEST standards throughout the school year. In addition, training will be provided for teachers in the co-teach model for those who have not previously attended the training.

Person Responsible Christine Boyd (boyd.christine@brevardschools.org)

Teachers will post or communicate learning targets to students throughout all academic lessons.

Person Responsible Christine Boyd (boyd.christine@brevardschools.org)

Teachers will implement Eureka and follow district pacing with fidelity. Zearn and iReady will be used for math intervention.

Person Responsible Christine Boyd (boyd.christine@brevardschools.org)

Administration will look for use of the new ELA curriculum during walkthroughs. Complex text, as well as task/ BEST alignment, will also be looked for during walkthroughs. Written feedback will be provided to teachers after walk-throughs and observations.

Person Responsible Christine Boyd (boyd.christine@brevardschools.org)

Instructional coach will provide support during collaborative planning in all academic areas. Coach will also model/ coteach as needed.

Person Responsible Julie Kostka (kostka.julie@brevardschools.org)

Data chat meetings will focus on Tier 1 & 2 ELA and math student data and will address the needs of all students (including ESE/ gifted/ ESOL/ etc).

Person Responsible Tauna Phillips (phillips.tauna@brevardschools.org)

Tutoring will support students 1-2 grade levels below in ELA and math.

Person Responsible Christine Boyd (boyd.christine@brevardschools.org)

Following the FIN's Best Practices for Inclusive Scheduling, schedule our ESE students accordingly.

Person Responsible Christine Boyd (boyd.christine@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.

When comparing our school 2019 data to the state, we had .33 incidents per 100 students which was lower than the state average of 1.0 incidents per 100 students. One area of concern at Quest is students reporting unfounded bullying.

We are starting year two of Concious Discipline at Quest and feel that this staff training along with the use of Sanford Harmony lessons and morning meetings in the classrooms will help create a more positive school culture at Quest. We also held a discipline assembly at the beginning of the year for our students and discussed the difference between bullying and other discipline issues. We hope that this will decrease the incidents at Quest and will monitor by pulling AS400 data on a monthly basis.

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.

Quest will address a positive school culture and environment in many ways this year. Quest teachers are on their second year of Conscious Discipline training and our school SEL implementation plan includes SEL in academic areas and SEL self-assessment. School-wide, classroom teachers will meet and greet the students at classroom doorways in the mornings, will hold class meetings, and will be providing Sanford Harmony lessons in their classroom according to their grade-level created SEL pacing guide. Quest guidance will be holding whole and small groups focused on SEL areas and providing students with strategies. Our military social worker will be supporting the needs of our large military population. There will be a focus at Quest school-wide to reconnect with families by encouraging parent/family engagement and having room parent volunteers.

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

Our students took the Youth Truth Survey in January 2020 with a 96% response rate and in January 2021 with a 71% response rate (due to Covid/eLearning). Overall, the results both years indicated Quest promotes a positive culture (79th percentile), but that Quest needs to work on building relationships (28th percentile). The positive student school culture is evidenced by our annual Quest Fest (years prior to Covid), our Walk-a-thon Fundraiser, and other school-wide activities that are held in conjunction with our PTO. This year we will be holding a BMX assembly in conjunction with PTO which highlights character building. To support academic rigor, we have provided curriculum nights for our families, the opportunity to participate in the BPS Science Fair, and other challenging academic activities for our students. These events create a community feeling at Quest and are well attended. Our classroom teachers, administration, and other school staff communicate with our families weekly via Smore.com, Blackboard Connect, e-mail, Facebook, and google classroom.

On the Teacher Insight Survey, the area of peer culture (relationships) 7.5 was below the district top quartile average of 7.7. At the back to school training, the teachers determined areas to improve this include to problem solve as a team by having open conversations, having optional peer observations, and modeling respectful relationships that includes smiling and saying hello in the hallway. The teacher leadership team will be addressing these concerns at their leadership team meetings.

On the Parent Insight Survey, question 7 asked, "Do you feel welcome at your child's school?" 70 responses (13.3%) stated no. We feel that this is due to the disconnect with our families last year as they were not allowed on campus and after school events were cancelled. Parents answered that top engagement ideas from questions 12 and 18 include Family Fun Nights, Academic Support (esp reading and math strategies), and volunteer opportunities. This year we added Room Parents (and class

volunteers) to support our school, and we are hoping that we will be able to schedule/hold more family events once the Covid outbreak is over.