

Brevard Public Schools

Ralph M Williams Junior 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 | 22 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 23 |

Ralph M Williams Junior Elementary School

1700 CLUBHOUSE DR, Rockledge, FL 32955

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

Demographics

Principal: Susan Schroeder M

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

| | |
|--|--|
| 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) | 41% |
| 2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: A (64%) 2016-17: B (59%) |
| 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 | 23 |

Ralph M Williams Junior Elementary School

1700 CLUBHOUSE DR, Rockledge, FL 32955

<http://www.williams.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 | 37% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | No | 38% |

School Grades History

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

Together with our families and community partners, Williams provides every student with a relevant and rigorous education to prepare them to learn, grow, and succeed in all aspects of their lives.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Williams community ensures that every crane learns, grows and succeeds.

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 |
|--------------------|---------------------|---|
| Melendez, Josefina | Principal | Mrs. Melendez supports student and teacher growth. As a member of the leadership team, she works with her team to ensure student and staff needs are consistently met. As part of the planning for improvement process, she meets weekly with teachers to review student achievement, behavior, and attendance data. She supports teachers with professional development to ensure students achieve at their highest academic performance with both their academic and social needs being met in the classroom. Through observation and feedback she works with her staff to continuously improve the learning cycle and to support teacher's professional practices. She meets with our Crane community to plan for upcoming projects and initiatives. |
| Braun, Michelle | Assistant Principal | Mrs. Braun provides curriculum support for all teachers and assists teachers with classroom management and behavior management implementing year 2 of Conscious Discipline. She provides observation and feedback for teachers to improve the learning cycle and supporting the implementation of the BEST standards. As a member of the leadership team, Mrs. Braun will be assist the facilitation of the MTSS and intervention process for all students and monitors the warning indicators for all grade levels. |
| Webb, Jessica | Reading Coach | Mrs. Webb supports all instructional staff with the implementation of the BEST standards and the new reading series adoption. She provides support with the learning cycle through planning, modeling, observing, and providing feedback for teachers to improve core and intervention instruction with ELA at Williams Elementary. As a member of the leadership team, she collaborates with the design of school improvement processes. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Susan Schroeder M

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.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

43

Total number of students enrolled at the school

492

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

6

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

5

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 | 48 | 61 | 71 | 72 | 67 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 454 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 1 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 13 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 15 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 8 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 13 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 29 |
| LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA MATH | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 9 | 15 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 38 |

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 | 2 | 0 | 4 | 15 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |

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 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/17/2021

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 | 42 | 62 | 69 | 69 | 74 | 72 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 447 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 4 | 12 | 13 | 13 | 18 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |

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 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 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 | 42 | 62 | 69 | 69 | 74 | 72 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 447 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 4 | 12 | 13 | 13 | 18 | 10 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |

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 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |
| 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 | | | | 62% | 62% | 57% | 70% | 60% | 56% |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 65% | 60% | 58% | 55% | 54% | 55% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 58% | 57% | 53% | 42% | 46% | 48% |
| Math Achievement | | | | 69% | 63% | 63% | 74% | 62% | 62% |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 64% | 65% | 62% | 79% | 59% | 59% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 48% | 53% | 51% | 61% | 49% | 47% |
| Science Achievement | | | | 64% | 57% | 53% | 70% | 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 | 54% | 64% | -10% | 58% | -4% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 62% | 61% | 1% | 58% | 4% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -54% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 66% | 60% | 6% | 56% | 10% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -62% | | | | |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 69% | 60% | 9% | 54% | 15% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -66% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 55% | 61% | -6% | 62% | -7% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 83% | 64% | 19% | 64% | 19% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -55% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 62% | 60% | 2% | 60% | 2% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -83% | | | | |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 73% | 67% | 6% | 55% | 18% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -62% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 65% | 56% | 9% | 53% | 12% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

i-Ready

| Grade 1 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 60% | 66% | 77% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 45% | 36% | 64% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 50% | 50% | 75% |
| | English Language Learners | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 45% | 42% | 61% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 33% | 33% | 44% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 50% | 25% | 50% |
| | English Language Learners | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Grade 2 | | | | |
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 16% | 31% | 55% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 8% | 20% | 44% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0% | 0% | 25% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 11% | 19% | 42% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 6% | 6% | 17% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 13% | 13% | 25% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 33% | 0% |

| Grade 3 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 24% | 48% | 58% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 22% | 35% | 43% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 6% | 28% | 33% |
| | English Language Learners | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 18% | 28% | 51% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 22% | 22% | 39% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0% | 6% | 39% |
| | English Language Learners | 0% | 0% | 0% |
| Grade 4 | | | | |
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 64% | 82% | 88% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 70% | 91% | 91% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 11% | 44% | 56% |
| | English Language Learners | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 15% | 51% | 66% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 0% | 42% | 53% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 11% | 33% | 56% |
| | English Language Learners | n/a | n/a | n/a |

| Grade 5 | | | | |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 39% | 61% | 61% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 17% | 26% | 26% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0% | 47% | 40% |
| | English Language Learners | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 21% | 50% | 69% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 5% | 32% | 50% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0% | 27% | 27% |
| | English Language Learners | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Science | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| | Students With Disabilities | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| | English Language Learners | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Grade 6 | | | | |
| English Language Arts | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 51% | 54% | 68% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 47% | 53% | 74% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 33% | 28% | 44% |
| | English Language Learners | n/a | n/a | n/a |
| Mathematics | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 26% | 52% | 54% |
| | Economically Disadvantaged | 21% | 42% | 47% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 6% | 22% | 11% |
| | English Language Learners | n/a | n/a | n/a |

Subgroup Data Review

| 2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD | 33 | 52 | 29 | 30 | 42 | 22 | 20 | | | | |
| ELL | 73 | | | 73 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 38 | 50 | | 49 | 43 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 73 | 50 | | 67 | 40 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 65 | | | 65 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 73 | 72 | 61 | 68 | 60 | 44 | 59 | | | | |
| FRL | 55 | 63 | | 47 | 40 | 13 | 50 | | | | |
| 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 | 47 | 45 | 39 | 58 | 52 | 33 | | | | |
| ELL | 30 | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 75 | | | 67 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 35 | 50 | 58 | 38 | 43 | 38 | 40 | | | | |
| HSP | 62 | 64 | | 72 | 71 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 61 | 86 | | 72 | 100 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 66 | 65 | 55 | 74 | 63 | 41 | 69 | | | | |
| FRL | 52 | 61 | 50 | 60 | 55 | 39 | 36 | | | | |
| 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 | 25 | 38 | 39 | 30 | 54 | 38 | 29 | | | | |
| ASN | 92 | 82 | | 100 | 91 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 46 | 41 | 33 | 42 | 64 | 43 | | | | | |
| HSP | 59 | 52 | | 65 | 83 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 82 | | | 64 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 73 | 56 | 41 | 78 | 79 | 61 | 69 | | | | |
| FRL | 61 | 55 | 46 | 61 | 74 | 59 | 66 | | | | |

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 | 55 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 386 |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|-----|
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |
| Percent Tested | 98% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 33 |
| 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 | 73 |
| 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 | |
| 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 | 45 |
| 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 | 58 |
| 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 | 65 |
| 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 | 62 |
| 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 | 45 |
| 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?

According to the "All Students" category at every grade level in i-Rewady, more than half of Williams students demonstrate growth at every marking period in both ELA and math. Economically Disadvantaged students also make gains in ELA by spring, although scores generally remain stagnant between the fall and winter. Students with Disabilities (SWD) also make progress in math and ELA, although the growth is not consistent across all grade levels and all marking periods.

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

Although SWD demonstrate progress in both ELA and math, achievement remains below proficiency levels.

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

SWD require additional supports to achieve their academic potential. Covid and e-learning limited the school's ability to properly provide the accommodations. As a result, SWD did not reach proficiency. Now that students are in-person and receiving all required accommodations without restrictions, SWD will demonstrate growth in both ELA and math.

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

According to FSA EA data, 3rd and 6th grades showed the most improvement. In 2019, 54% of 3rd grade students achieved proficiency, and in 2021 that percentage rose to 71% (nearly a 20% difference). In 2019, 62% of 4th graders were proficient, and in 2021 that percentage rose to 66% (4% difference). In 2019, 69% of 6th graders were proficient, and in 2021 the percentage rose to 73%. In Math, the only grade to demonstrate improvement was 3rd grade. In 2019, 55% of 3rd graders were proficient, and in 2021 that number rose to 65%.

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

Williams grade level teams met weekly with administration and the reading coach to keep track of student growth, set goals for individual students, and ensure students were being given appropriate interventions. Individual student data was progress monitored with fidelity to ensure interventions were being effective.

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

This year teachers are implementing a new ELA curriculum. As they become familiarized with the BEST Standards and the structure of each lesson, they will also differentiate instruction to fill in learning gaps. Teachers will also collaborate with the reading coach to organize small groups for learning.

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.

We will continue to offer teachers the opportunity to obtain their reading certification by attending classes on campus facilitated by our reading coach. We will also have staff engage in data analysis and create action plans to accelerate student learning. Grade-level teams meet weekly with the reading coach to learn how to teach the new ELA program with fidelity to all learners.

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

Continuous data analysis and reflection is paramount to school-wide success. We will continue to maintain time in the daily schedule for grade level teams to collaborate and plan. Teams will also continue to meet with administration on a monthly basis to look at student needs and determine next steps.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: 4th and 5th grade students performed below 70% on the FSA reading due to learning gaps from COVID and distance learning. ESE, Black, and ELL students continue to underperform compared to other students in subgroups. When designing small group instruction, it is critical to ensure that students in this subgroup are monitored closely in their performance and included in small group instruction when necessary.

Measurable Outcome: 73% of all 3-6 students will attain grade level proficiency on the FSA. The bottom quartile of students will make a learning gain.
70% of all K-2 students will attain grade level proficiency on iReady Diagnostic 3.
50% of our ESE, Black, and ELL students will be at or above grade level proficiency levels.

Monitoring: Collaborative planning sessions with the BEST standards and new reading series will occur with the teams, reading coach and leadership team to develop an understanding of the new standards and create small group instructional strategies. Bi weekly data chats with teachers and leadership team will triangulate iReady data, District Assessments, and teacher created formative assessments to monitor all students. ESE and Black students will be monitored to see where they are performing and what supports they need to increase reading proficiency. Grade level and leadership teams will collaborate to determine strengths and weaknesses of student, class, and grade level achievement data. Through bi-weekly data chats, the team will analyze performance matters, student samples and teacher kept data binders. Observations and feedback of small group instruction from our reading coach and administrative team will provide teachers feedback for continuous improvement of instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Josefina Melendez (melendez.josefina@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Deliberate action at all stakeholder levels to use data-driven analysis for school improvement is required to close the achievement gap. Data analysis will determine the rate of accelerated learning that is needed by planning differentiated, small group instruction for students during the reading core instruction. Student data will be closely monitored to through bi weekly meetings with the leadership team. Collaborative planning will focus on whole group and differentiated small group instruction that allows for flexible groupings based on skill need. Collaborative planning sessions among the grade level, reading coach, and/or administration will occur to engage round table discussions on analysis of the standards, implementation of the curriculum, and strengthening core instruction for all students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: According to an article from The Pathway to College Network, "Using Data to Improve Educational Outcomes"; the use of data is a powerful tool to strengthen academic outcomes for all students—especially underserved students. Data use informs teacher preparation and training needs, supports revised instructional practices to improve student performance, and measures the effectiveness of ongoing academic and social support programs. Greater reliance on data has led some teachers to be more accountable to one another through collaborative school improvement work and reflective practice. Importantly, data have been used to challenge untested assumptions and beliefs about some students' inherent abilities. Williams administration and staff will work together to ensure all students will receive targeted, rigorous reading instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Analyze data from FSA, iReady diagnostic and foundational skill assessments
2. Provide collaborative planning sessions for grade levels and the leadership team.

3. Establish learning cycle calendar to support collaborative planning organization.
4. Establish progress monitoring schedule and data analysis meetings.
5. Administer Standards Mastery assessments according learning cycle calendar.
6. Analyze data from Standards Mastery Assessments, scheduled district assessments, and foundational skill assessments.
7. Design lessons for re-teach and provide additional scaffolding as needed.
8. Offer After School Programming (support) beginning January 2022.

Person Responsible Josefina Melendez (melendez.josefina@brevardschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Students in the 5th grade performed at 51% proficiency overall on the SSA. Previous years' data evidences a decline in student proficiency by 14%. We believe this is due to COVID related learning. In 2019-2020, students were at 65% proficiency in 18-19 student performed at 70% proficiency. It is critical to assess and progress monitor student mastery of the science standards.

Measurable Outcome: 60% of 5th grade students will perform at or above proficiency on the SSA.

Monitoring: Teachers will utilize common formative district assessments to determine mastery of the standards.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Michelle Braun (braun.michelle@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Collaborative planning to align tasks to grade level standards, and analyzing data will support grade level teams in their planning for Science instruction. Our planning sessions with assistant principal will include identifying scaffolds to support all learners in access grade level content toward mastery of standards. 4th grade and 5th grade teachers will collaborate to utilize the PENDA science program, science interactive notebooks, and hands on learning to engage students in science standards. Grade levels will collaborate to design engaging lessons and hands on instruction with the 5 E model for instruction to meet the science standards expectation.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Due to COVID and distance learning for a year and a half students have gaps with science concepts and standards. Historical student achievement data for Williams has been on the SSA has been at or above state level of proficiency. Students need lessons that are designed to enrich and remediate understandings of past standards missed due to the pandemic.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Analyze district assessment with 5th grade teachers with the assistant principal.
2. Determine reteaching strategies from 4th grade science assessment.
3. Administer 4th and 5th grade district unit tests to determine mastery of standards.
5. Establish progress monitoring schedule and data analysis meetings.
3. Design lessons with 4th and 5th grade teachers with PENDA and district lessons.
4. Use PENDA with fidelity in grades 3-6.

Person Responsible Michelle Braun (braun.michelle@brevardschools.org)

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

3rd, 5th, and 6th grade students performed below 70% on the FSA math due to learning gaps from COVID and distance learning. ESE, Black, and ELL students continue to underperform compared to other students in subgroups.

Measurable**Outcome:**

73% of all 3-6 students will attain grade level proficiency on the FSA. The bottom quartile of students will make a learning gain.

70% of all K-2 students will attain grade level proficiency on iReady Diagnostic 3.

50% of our ESE, Black, and ELL students will be at or above grade level proficiency levels.

Monitoring:

Bi weekly data chats with teachers and the leadership team will triangulate iReady data, District Assessments, and teacher created formative assessments to monitor all students with fluency, conceptual knowledge, and problem solving skills in mathematics. ESE and Black students will be monitored to see where they are performing and what supports they need to increase mathematical proficiency. Through data chats, students who are performing below grade level will be selected to receive supplemental explicit math instruction in our After School Program. Students will use the iReady instructional path in ASP along with small group instruction to strengthen mathematical skills. iReady data will be monitored to determine achievement and deficits.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michelle Braun (braun.michelle@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Explicit instruction often is described as the cornerstone of effective mathematics instruction for students

with learning difficulties (Hudson et al., 2006; Jitendra et al., 2018; Witzel et al., 2003).

There are three main components of explicit instruction:

- Modeling: facilitated by the teacher
- Practice: involves the students and the teacher
- Supports: consist of an ongoing dialogue between the teacher and students. Supports are employed during modeling and during practice. Supports are described within the explanations of modeling and practice.

iReady path for math will support students with their targeted, specific skills needed to be proficient at grade level.

Small group instruction in math provides explicit instruction and practice with mathematical skills. vocabulary, and concepts.

Rationale**for**

Evidence-based Strategy:

Due to COVID and distance learning students have gaps with mathematical concepts.

Students performing below grade level need support and direct instruction to become proficient at their current grade level.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Analyze data from iReady diagnostic and math assessments.
2. Determine students performing below grade level.
3. Create 1- 2 ASP classes per grade level for 2nd -6th grades per student needs.
4. Develop targeted instructional plan with the ASP team.
5. Design lessons for re-teach and provide additional scaffolding as needed.

6. Use iReady instructional path for students to fill gaps in mathematic proficiency.
7. Implement small group direct instruction to support student pathway.
8. Offer After School Programming (support) beginning January 2022.

Person Responsible Michelle Braun (braun.michelle@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.

Williams Elementary along with Brevard Public Schools is implementing year two of Conscious Discipline. Leadership and staff have a commitment to implement morning meetings to deepen relationships within the classroom to create a strong school community. Teachers will continue to implement strategies from Conscious Discipline to create safe spaces for students to assist students with self monitoring and deescalate within the classroom walls. Discipline data will reflect the positive effect the strategies implemented.

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.

Every morning the principal and assistant principal are visible at arrival and dismissal for parents to approach.

Once the school day begins, the principal does the announcements with students to set a positive tone over the call system. Parents are included in ongoing feedback on school based performance and needs assessment

through monthly Mocha Monday meetings with administration and the SRO (In person and Virtually this year). They also have a portion of the agenda for open comment for School Advisory Council meetings and monthly virtual family nights. Annually we conduct a parent survey to provide feedback on all areas of school operations.

We are working diligently to grow Our Partners in Education program. Our goal is to achieve funding that would be spent on school-wide resources that would benefit all students..

In focusing on the culture of our school, 2021 Insight Survey data indicated a significant gap

between the district average and the ratings of our staff in relation to Peer Culture. Our professional development of Conscious Discipline is designed to support the adult interactions first to be a model for the students. Our learning cycles with collaborative planning have also been strengthened to support team growth and support from administration and the instructional coach. Our hope is that these efforts will continue to improve the working relationships for each team as well as the ancillary staff supporting students through inclusion and other services.

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

Crane families play in integral role in shaping our positive culture and school environment. The Williams PTO is a visible force of engaged parents who strive to support students and teachers throughout the school in different capacities. For example, PTO members assist with open house, picture day, and other school-wide events.

Individual PTO members volunteer in classrooms and assist teachers however needed. Administration continues to host Mocha Monday, School Advisory Committee meetings, and virtual monthly family nights, PTO participates and assists in each of these events to model and encourage increased community engagement.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

| | | | |
|--------|--------|---|--------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math | \$0.00 |
| Total: | | | \$0.00 |