Roy Allen Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Roy Allen Elementary School

2601 FOUNTAINHEAD BLVD, Melbourne, FL 32935

http://www.allen.brevard.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Kelly Grugan L

Start Date for this Principal: 8/26/2021

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)	93%
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: A (63%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: A (62%)
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.](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

Roy Allen Elementary School

2601 FOUNTAINHEAD BLVD, Melbourne, FL 32935

http://www.allen.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	62%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	37%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		A	A	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 serve every student with excellence as the standard.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Roy Allen will serve our community and enhance students' lives by delivering the highest quality education in a culture of dedication, collaboration and learning, while building leaders one child at a time.

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
Chance, Sean	Principal	Mr. Chance oversees and monitors schoolwide data and curriculum. He works with instructional staff to ensure that lessons are consistently focused on complex content that appropriately challenges students to meet grade level benchmarks. Also, he ensures the learning environment is safe, welcoming and encouraging students to take risks necessary to master the content. Additionally, he ensures that teachers are intentionally planning and facilitating the learning through use of high-quality, benchmark-aligned materials, monitoring data with a focus on the lowest 25%, SWD and ELL students and collaborating with the school community.
Batman, Amanda	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Batman oversees and monitors schoolwide data and curriculum. She also ensures that supports are put into place to give the students every opportunity of success by monitoring student progression with a focus on the lowest 25%, SWD and ELL students. Finally, she facilitates PD and progress monitoring of accelerated learning of the lowest 25%.
Gelfond, Kami	Teacher, ESE	As the ESE Lead, she ensures that all I.E.P's are being implemented and that all students are receiving the supports needed to be successful with the state benchmarks and IEP goals. Additionally, she serves as the SAC chair.
Franklin, Loralee	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Franklin works with classroom teachers to ensure the quality of each lesson meets the intent of the statewide benchmarks. She coaches teachers to improve instructional delivery to meet the needs of all students. She facilitates MTSS and monitors student progress with focus on the lowest 25%, SWD and ELL students.
Myers, Misty	Teacher, K-12	Title I teacher - Mrs. Myers pulls small group intervention groups and creates schedules of the Title I team. She works with classroom teachers to ensure the quality of each lesson meets the intent of the benchmarks. She coaches teachers to improve instructional delivery to meet the needs of all students and monitors student progress with focus on the lowest 25%, SWD and ELL students.
Hammer, Peggy	Teacher, K-12	Title I Teacher - Mrs. Hammer pulls small group intervention groups and works with classroom teachers to ensure the quality of each math lesson meets the intent of benchmarks. She coaches teachers to improve instructional delivery to meet the needs of all students and monitors student progress with focus on the lowest 25%, SWD and ELL students.
Nixon, Jessica	School Counselor	Mrs. Nixon is responsible for social emotional curriculum. She provides Sanford Harmony/Conscious Discipline supports to our teachers, students and families. She meets with students, teachers and parents to help create a safe school family.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 8/26/2021, Kelly Grugan L

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.*

6

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

46

Total number of students enrolled at the school

622

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

10

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

9

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	80	96	109	96	73	90	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	627
Attendance below 90 percent	5	20	27	11	5	10	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
One or more suspensions	0	3	8	1	1	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA ELA	0	0	0	2	7	25	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA MATH	0	0	0	1	2	23	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	2	23	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

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	5	13	3	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/31/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	82	95	90	74	80	84	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	586
Attendance below 90 percent	8	11	5	7	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
One or more suspensions	1	6	3	2	4	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
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	1	2	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	1	2	1	0	1	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	6	10	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

2020-21 - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	82	95	90	74	80	84	81	0	0	0	0	0	0	586
Attendance below 90 percent	8	11	5	7	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
One or more suspensions	1	6	3	2	4	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
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	1	2	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	21

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	1	2	1	0	1	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	16

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	6	10	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				59%	62%	57%	57%	60%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				62%	60%	58%	55%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				62%	57%	53%	45%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				68%	63%	63%	64%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				70%	65%	62%	48%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58%	53%	51%	28%	49%	47%
Science Achievement				63%	57%	53%	57%	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	62%	64%	-2%	58%	4%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	43%	61%	-18%	58%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2021					
	2019	67%	60%	7%	56%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
06	2021					
	2019	50%	60%	-10%	54%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	62%	61%	1%	62%	0%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	59%	64%	-5%	64%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2021					
	2019	68%	60%	8%	60%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
06	2021					
	2019	66%	67%	-1%	55%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	60%	56%	4%	53%	7%
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 Reading and Math Diagnostic, our Universal Screeners

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	99/17%	104/39%	107/54%
	Economically Disadvantaged	71/17%	74/38%	75/51%
	Students With Disabilities	16/13%	16/31%	17/35%
	English Language Learners	8/13%	8/38%	8/25%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	99/12%	102/26%	106/58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	71/7%	72/21%	74/49%
	Students With Disabilities	16/13%	16/6%	17/35%
	English Language Learners	8/0%	8/12%	8/38%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	90/34%	93/43%	96/61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	50/34%	52/44%	51/59%
	Students With Disabilities	16/13%	17/18%	16/31%
	English Language Learners	5/0%	5/20%	5/40%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	90/16%	88/35%	96/55%
	Economically Disadvantaged	50/10%	49/29%	51/49%
	Students With Disabilities	16/13%	13/0%	16/44%
	English Language Learners	5/20%	5/20%	5/20%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	76/54%	76/75%	78/87%
	Economically Disadvantaged	40/45%	40/73%	41/83%
	Students With Disabilities	13/15%	13/54%	13/85%
	English Language Learners	3/0%	3/0%	3/67%
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	75/16%	76/41%	78/72%
	Economically Disadvantaged	39/13%	40/25%	41/61%
	Students With Disabilities	13/0%	13/38%	13/62%
	English Language Learners	3/33%	3/0%	3/67%

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	80/50%	81/47%	83/63%
	Economically Disadvantaged	51/41%	52/46%	52/54%
	Students With Disabilities	22/23%	22/9%	22/32%
	English Language Learners	6/0%	6/0%	6/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	79/23%	81/35%	83/55%
	Economically Disadvantaged	51/18%	52/29%	52/46%
	Students With Disabilities	22/0%	22/14%	22/32%
	English Language Learners	6/0%	6/17%	6/0%

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	81/44%	85/44%	88/57%
	Economically Disadvantaged	53/40%	56/34%	56/50%
	Students With Disabilities	11/9%	11/9%	12/50%
	English Language Learners	5/20%	5/0%	5/40%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	81/35%	86/44%	88/72%
	Economically Disadvantaged	53/32%	56/39%	56/68%
	Students With Disabilities	11/9%	12/17%	12/33%
	English Language Learners	5/20%	5/20%	5/60%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	NA	NA	NA
	Economically Disadvantaged	NA	NA	NA
	Students With Disabilities	NA	NA	NA
	English Language Learners	NA	NA	NA

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	76/39%	78/36%	80/49%
	Economically Disadvantaged	49/29%	50/24%	51/39%
	Students With Disabilities	11/9%	12/8%	13/8%
	English Language Learners	1/100%	1/0%	1/100%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	75/39%	77/38%	79/63%
	Economically Disadvantaged	48/29%	50/28%	51/55%
	Students With Disabilities	11/9%	12/17%	13/15%
	English Language Learners	1/0%	1/0%	1/0%

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	30	20		43	70	75	46				
ELL	50	85		46	79		50				
ASN	67			67							
BLK	50			50							
HSP	66	79		60	83		47				
MUL	75	67		80	75						
WHT	59	48	22	66	73	59	49				
FRL	50	47	36	56	71	63	47				
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	40	58	43	44	58	38	47				
ELL	58	63		64	53	58	42				
ASN	70			70							
BLK	50	56		55	67						
HSP	58	56	57	66	64	61	47				
MUL	63	57		73	71						
WHT	59	64	63	69	73	56	70				
FRL	53	59	59	62	66	56	56				
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	32	40	37	32	37	30	40				
ELL	40	53		55	56						
BLK	33	30		52	55		60				
HSP	60	56	50	62	43	14	64				
MUL	58	74		58	37						
WHT	58	53	49	66	50	29	56				
FRL	50	48	38	57	41	22	50				

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	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	56

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	471
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
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	61
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	67
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	50
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	61
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	74

Multiracial Students	
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	54
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	53
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?

The data indicates our English Language Learners (ELL) subgroup is low performing. In the spring of 2021, this subgroup showed the lowest performance with only 20% of students achieving proficiency in ELA and 27% achieving proficiency in math on the FSA. On the IReady ELA diagnostic 1 to diagnostic 3 the amount of ELL students being 2 or more grade levels below increased (30% to 33%).

Our data indicates our Students with Disabilities subgroup is low performing. In the spring of 2021, this subgroup showed the second lowest performance with only 29% of students achieving proficiency in ELA and 39% achieving proficiency in math on the FSA.

Our overall ELA learning gains decreased on the 2021 FSA by 6% (62% to 56%).

Our lowest 25% student subgroups decreased by 26% of students making learning gains (62% to 36%).

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

According to the iReady diagnostic and FSA data stated above, the ELL and SWD students demonstrated the greatest need for improvement in both ELA and Math. Also, the huge decrease in our Lowest 25% student subgroup making learning gains is a need for improvement.

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

-Scheduling conflicts and a lack of personnel (as a result of COVID-19) have impeded tiered supports for our ELL, SWD and Lowest 25% population.
-General Education and ELL support collaboration needs
strengthening. Scheduled, structured time needs to be provided for teachers to come
together to share specific strategies to meet the needs of individual students, and
further professional development on how to best provide specialized instruction and
support for our ELL, ESE and Lowest 25% population is needed.
-ELL, ESE and Lowest 25% student subgroups must have access to grade level materials and rigor during T1/Core instruction.

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

The Lowest 25% student subgroup showed the most improvement in math learning gains (58% to 70%). School wide math learning gains also increased by 5% (70% to 75%). African American students doubled the percentage of students showing proficiency on the math Iready Diagnostic 1 to Diagnostic 3 (22% to 44%).

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

Last year was the 3rd year of implementing Eureka. The continued understanding and increased knowledge of the Eureka program and teacher planning was the contributing factor.

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

Providing planning time for teachers and coaches will need to be priority in order to learn new state benchmarks and new curriculum in ELA. Teachers need the planning time to learn the new curriculum in order to strategically plan what information (vocabulary, background information, etc.) can be front loaded to accelerate 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.

PD will be offered to the Leadership Team (Literacy coach, Title I team) first. We will start small at first. Each Leadership team member will be assigned a grade level and work with the lowest 25% student subgroup. PD will be provided on how to choose what vocabulary, prerequisite skills, background knowledge, etc. should be front loaded before a new benchmark is introduced.

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

This year the majority of PD will consist of learning the new benchmarks and new ELA curriculum. Consistent progress monitoring through observations and walkthroughs of on grade level ELA benchmarks, with appropriate text and task alignment will be the focus. Next year the on grade level benchmarks, appropriate text and task alignment will be the expectation but small group, differentiated instruction will be the focus of continued PD and progress monitoring. The following

year literacy centers and independent and/or group work will be the focus to ensure both benchmark alignment and differentiation.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our overall ELA learning gains decreased on the 2021 FSA by 6% (62% to 56%). Our lowest 25% student subgroups decreased by 26% of students making learning gains (62% to 36%). The data indicates our English Language Learners (ELL) subgroup is low performing. In the spring of 2021, this subgroup showed the lowest performance with only 20% of students achieving proficiency in ELA. On the IReady ELA diagnostic 1 to diagnostic 3 the amount of ELL students being 2 or more grade levels below increased (30% to 33%). Our data indicates our Students with Disabilities subgroup is low performing. In the spring of 2021, this subgroup showed the second lowest performance with only 29% of students achieving proficiency in ELA on the FSA. The data indicates a need for improvement in ELA schoolwide, especially our student subgroups of Lowest 25%, students with disabilities and ELL students.
Measurable Outcome:	School-wide ELA scores will increase as a result of teacher collaboratively, planning, and the implementation of standards based instruction in all classrooms for all students. Roy Allen Elementary will increase on grade level ELA proficiency by 10% (from 356% to 66%) on the 2021-2022 Florida Standards Assessment. In addition, 80% of students in each grade level will meet the typical annual growth identified on iReady diagnostic.
Monitoring:	Classroom teachers will analyze iReady data on a weekly basis. Teachers will check the weekly lessons being passed to determine if there needs to be adjustments to students' individual learning paths. Teachers will conference with students bi-weekly to discuss progress on their IReady path. Class and grade-wide ELA data (Iready, Benchmark Advance assessments) will be discussed at grade level PLC meetings. Individual student progress will be discussed at our monthly MTSS meetings.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Loralee Franklin (franklin.loralee@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Use of the coaching cycle for guided collaborative planning, modeling, follow-up, and monitoring through instructional rounds and observational data. -Whole group benchmark-aligned text and tasks - Planning and implementation. -Collaborative Planning -Differentiated small group instruction. -Multi-tiered System of Supports (MTSS)
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	-Every student needs access to and experience with grade level benchmarks. Every teacher needs to strategically plan for on grade level text and benchmark-aligned tasks during the whole group reading block. -During the 90 minute reading block, small group instruction will be able to meet the students' specific needs, especially struggling readers. -The Walk to Intervention block will target students that need more specific support than the small group instruction occurring during the 90 minute reading block can give them.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Continue support of Tier1 benchmarks-in ELA, with specific focus on on-grade-level benchmark aligned tasks during the whole group reading block.

2. Classroom and Title I Teachers will identify and monitor students in different subgroups with a focus on the following:
Lowest 25%, ELL, and the Students with Disabilities. (T)
3. The literacy coach will facilitate collaborative planning and coach teachers
implementing benchmark-based lessons by observing and providing feedback. (.5 T)
4. Administration and literacy coach will provide support for the
implementation and monitoring of the MTSS process.
5. Invite targeted subgroups to the Academic Support Program (ASP).
6. Teachers will allow for 30 minutes of iready reading instruction weekly and analyze online instruction data.
7. Teachers, Literacy Coach, Title I Teachers, IA, & Administration will collaborate to determine
the best use of time and resources to support interventions. (T)
8. Laptops will be purchased for iReady use. (T)
9. Brainpop Jr. will be purchased to support reading instruction. (T)

Person Responsible   Amanda Batman (batman.amanda@brevardschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	On the 2020-2021 our percentage of students showing proficiency on the FSA decreased by 3% (68% to 65%). On the 2021-2022 Iready Diagnostic 1 there was a 36% (62% to 26%) decrease in students showing proficiency in math compared to the 2020-2021 Iready Diagnostic 3. On the 2021 Math FSA, only 41% of our students with disabilities were proficient. On the 2021 IReady Diagnostic 3 only 39% of our students with disabilities were proficient. In the 2020-2021 school year only 45% of our students with disabilities showed learning gains based on the i-Ready diagnostic. On the 2021-2022 Diagnostic 1 only 11% of our SWD showed proficiency. On the 2021 Math FSA, only 27% of our ELL students were proficient. On the 2021-2021 IReady Diagnostic 1 only 6% of our ELL students showed proficiency. The data indicates a need for improvement in Math proficency and learning gains schoolwide, especially our student subgroups of students with disabilities and ELL students.
Measurable Outcome:	During the 2021-2022 school year we will increase our math proficiency by 10% (65% to 75%) on the 2021-2022 Math FSA. During the 2021-2022 school year we will increase our students with disabilities' and ELL students' math proficiency by 20% on the Iready Diagnostic.
Monitoring:	Progress will be monitored using the Eureka exit tickets, Mid Module, and End of Module tests. We will also be using Math iReady notebooks to monitor students progress.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amanda Batman (batman.amanda@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The Eureka math curriculum will be used with fidelity each day with teachers adhering to the Eureka pacing guide.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The use of the hands-on manipulatives and small group instruction supports the mastery of the daily lesson. Mastery of the standard and foundational skills will be achieved with teacher fidelity to the Eureka curriculum and timeline. Our Title I math teacher will pull math small groups to assist with our student with disabilities.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Eureka daily lessons will utilize the standard aligned tasks that are associated with each module, incorporating hands-on manipulatives for practice, weekly sprints, daily exit tickets, and homework practice problems.
2. Eureka exit tickets will be utilized daily as a formative assessment with students with disabilities student subgroup, the teacher will then review exit tickets as a method of reteach/review for the students.
3. Teachers will plan with their teams in order to support each other and work cooperatively to plan ahead.
4. Coordinated use of Zearn and i-Ready math program for differentiated math supports.
5. Our Title I math teacher will pull math small groups to assist with our student with disabilities.

Person Responsible	Sean Chance (chance.sean@brevardschools.org)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Providing a social emotional supportive learning environment for students will promote healthy relationships, reduce stress and increase the capacity for students to learn. During the 20/21 school year at Roy Allen 507 discipline referrals were inputted into AS400. With the use of Conscious Discipline, the leadership team hopes to decrease this number by 10%.
Measurable Outcome:	At the end of the 21/22 school year, an Incident Summary Report will be run in AS400. The goal is that there will be a decrease of 10% or more in Discipline Referrals (457 or less referrals).
Monitoring:	1. Admin will continue to share Conscious Discipline videos each month at Faculty Meetings. 2. Admin will positively recognize teachers who are utilizing CD consistently in their class room. 3. Leadership team will analyze and share behavior data on a regular basis. 4. Behavior Data will inform decisions to revise school-wide CD plan. 5. Behavior will be discuss at our monthly MTSS meetings.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Amanda Batman (batman.amanda@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Provide timely, relevant professional development on Conscious Discipline, Trauma Informed Classrooms, and Zones of Regulation that will provide teachers with a well-stocked toolbox for managing minor and major incidents.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Stress and trauma cross all ethnic and economic lines, with grave effects on health, learning, social-emotional development and brain development. Conscious Discipline is designed to teach effective social-emotional skills, and embed resiliency into the school culture as a way to counteract the stress and trauma that are so prevalent in our society. (Bailey, 2014)

Action Steps to Implement

1. Administration will continue to present Conscious Discipline videos at monthly faculty meetings.
2. Administration will continue to discuss and expect CD strategies to be utilized throughout the day.
3. Teachers will share positive CD scenarios within grade level meetings and faculty meetings.
4. Student Insight Survey will be analyzed for a decrease in trauma within the classroom.
5. CD books will be purchased for each grade level. (T)

Person Responsible	Amanda Batman (batman.amanda@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

Our total numbers of suspension of 44 is in the high category compared to the state average according to SafeSchoolsforAlex.org. Our total suspensions per 100 students is 6 compared to the state average of 3.9. This is our primary concern. The implementation of Conscious Discipline for our staff will give the teachers the tools to self-regulate themselves as adults as well as work with students and teach skills to self-regulate in order de-escalate behaviors before they become more severe incidents.

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.

During Pre-Planning and throughout the school year, the Roy Allen teaching staff will be being trained in Conscious Discipline to promote best practices in a trauma sensitive classroom. With the continuation of the Covid-19 Pandemic, the development of social and emotional skills within our students has proven to be paramount.
Although rigorous academic preparation is necessary, ensuring Roy Allen students are thriving socially is becoming increasingly important. During the 2021-2022 school year, we aim to support children in acquiring the knowledge, attitudes, and skills necessary to recognize and manage their emotions, demonstrate caring and concern for others, establish positive relationships with peers and adults, make responsible decisions, and positively navigate challenging social situations.

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

The school engages families, students, and all faculty in a shared understanding of academic and behavioral expectations as well as high-quality instruction.
Teachers communicate high expectations for all students (e.g., "All students are college material").
Teachers meet in PLCs weekly to routinely examine disaggregated data to look for themes/patterns among student groups. This data and the following, discipline referrals or incident reports, in and out-of-school suspension and attendance also forms the basis for discussions of what's working (or not) for particular groups within a school and what needs to be done. The school provides orientation for new teachers and ongoing support from a mentor teacher. Teachers establish and practice clear expectations of classroom procedures, provide frequent feedback to students, encourage students to be caring and respectful to one

another while teachers model such interactions in the classroom. The schools, curriculum, and teachers' lesson plans draw on the diverse interests and experiences of students.

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

A clear code of conduct for students and adults with input from students, families, and school personnel has been created. Such as, establishing specific and attainable strategies for reducing disproportionate discipline with staff, student, and family input. Implementing evidence-based alternatives to exclusionary discipline (e.g., restorative practices and positive behavioral supports) and provide ongoing training and feedback to teachers on implementing these approaches.

The school has established an infrastructure to support family engagement, such as a decision-making SAC council and Title I meetings and events. It reaches out to families and the community early and often - not just when there is an issue. Seeking input from families on how the school can support students, and follow up with what's being done as a result. We also ensure that logistics of parent/teacher conferences and other school events enable all parents to participate (schedule to accommodate varied work hours, offer translation, and provide food and childcare). It is a priority for the school to intentionally engage with families of historically under-served students (e.g., by providing opportunities for small-group conversations with school leaders).