

Brevard Public Schools

Surfside Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	0

Surfside Elementary School

475 CASSIA BLVD, Satellite Beach, FL 32937

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

Demographics

Principal: Kassie Erenstoff R

Start Date for this Principal: 9/16/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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)	25%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: A (69%) 2016-17: A (75%)
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	6
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Surfside Elementary School

475 CASSIA BLVD, Satellite Beach, FL 32937

<http://www.surfside.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 KG-6	No	26%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	13%

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.

Surfside Elementary School provides a safe and positive environment where high quality education occurs for all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Surfside Elementary will create a challenging, positive learning environment that promotes excellence and group achievement. Staff, students, and parents will work together to encourage children to realize their maximum potential for learning, problem solving, and responsible citizenship.

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
Erenstoft, Kassie	Principal	Mrs. Erenstoft establishes high expectations for all students. She monitors instruction and data for all grade levels. She facilitates collaborative planning and assists in MTSS training and implementation. Her job duties include coaching Mrs. Seibert and Mrs. Oehlmann in their job duties and assisting all staff in helping students achieve their very best.
Seibert, Tracy	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Seibert oversees curriculum, assessment, and discipline. She assists with school improvement, monitors student progress and learning gains, reflects on data and develops professional data based on the data. She oversees the MTSS processes and training for Surfside and assists in coaching Mrs. Oehlmann and our instruction staff.
Oehlmann, Patricia	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Oehlmann oversees teacher mentoring and coaching. She supports administration and teachers with state, district, and school-based assessments, iReady for grades K-6, data collection and progress monitoring of student academic and behavior interventions, and provides PD for teachers.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 9/16/2021, Kassie Erenstoft R

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.*

2

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

33

Total number of students enrolled at the school

409

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

3

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

3

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	43	68	49	48	70	78	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	409
Attendance below 90 percent	4	8	4	2	6	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	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	0	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	11	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	2	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	5	3	0	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	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/16/2021

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	67	49	44	68	71	52	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	434
Attendance below 90 percent	1	1	2	8	6	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	4	0	2	0	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	

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	67	49	44	68	71	52	83	0	0	0	0	0	0	434
Attendance below 90 percent	1	1	2	8	6	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	4	0	2	0	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	

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				69%	62%	57%	80%	60%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				54%	60%	58%	63%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50%	57%	53%	58%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				79%	63%	63%	80%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				76%	65%	62%	72%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				68%	53%	51%	65%	49%	47%
Science Achievement				77%	57%	53%	67%	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	72%	64%	8%	58%	14%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	71%	61%	10%	58%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
05	2021					
	2019	78%	60%	18%	56%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
06	2021					
	2019	54%	60%	-6%	54%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	70%	61%	9%	62%	8%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	82%	64%	18%	64%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				
05	2021					
	2019	71%	60%	11%	60%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				
06	2021					
	2019	87%	67%	20%	55%	32%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	76%	56%	20%	53%	23%
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 was used to progress monitor for math and reading in all grade levels. The district science assessments were used to progress monitor in science.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	71%	87%	96%
	Economically Disadvantaged	57%	79%	89%
	Students With Disabilities	40%	80%	100%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	54%	79%	93%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14%	71%	83%
	Students With Disabilities	0	80%	100%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	28%	61%	88%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16%	58%	100%
	Students With Disabilities	16%	33%	100%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	18%	53%	75%
	Economically Disadvantaged	22%	50%	58%
	Students With Disabilities	16%	57%	71%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	42%	70%	87%
	Economically Disadvantaged	28%	50%	72%
	Students With Disabilities	25%	50%	75%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	26%	35%	51%
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	33%	33%
	Students With Disabilities	17%	0	13%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	62%	81%	88%
	Economically Disadvantaged	27%	60%	80%
	Students With Disabilities	14%	38%	69%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	14%	49%	66%
	Economically Disadvantaged	31%	40%	47%
	Students With Disabilities	13%	23%	46%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	54%	73%	79%
	Economically Disadvantaged	23%	46%	46%
	Students With Disabilities	13%	63%	63%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	38%	48%	81%
	Economically Disadvantaged	42%	23%	62%
	Students With Disabilities	0	13%	25%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students		18%	
	Economically Disadvantaged		0	
	Students With Disabilities		20%	
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	38%	56%	63%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10%	18%	55%
	Students With Disabilities	13%	38%	25%
	English Language Learners	N/A	N/A	N/A
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	35%	47%	61%
	Economically Disadvantaged	60%	27%	55%
	Students With Disabilities	0	13%	25%
	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	36	69		39	77						
HSP	60			73							
MUL	50			50							
WHT	84	85	80	78	86	65	69				
FRL	67	77		60	68		42				
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	31	45	40	34	60	53					
HSP	75	30		75	60						
WHT	70	56	54	81	79	79	79				
FRL	58	42	43	69	73	73	73				
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	50	57	42	44	43	39					
HSP	92	64		92	73						
MUL	70			60							
WHT	79	62	61	80	72	63	65				
FRL	70	59	62	72	66	62	60				

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	76
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	535
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	55

Students With Disabilities	
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	67
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	50
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	78
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	63
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?

Overall, our school population as a whole made learning gains in ELA. We have work to do in math and with our ESE subgroups. We did not make the progress we would have hoped for in math or with our students receiving ESE services.

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

Both our FSA data and our progress monitoring shows that we need to focus more on math. Additionally, progress monitoring showed that our students receiving ESE services need more support in math. Our overall percentage proficient on the FSA math was 76%. This is a 5% decrease from 2019. The percentage of kids making a learning gain in math increased by 3%, going from 81% to 84%. The lowest 25% making learning gains stayed the same at 64%. Our science achievement dropped from 74% proficient, down to 67% proficient.

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

As a new administrative team, we focused mostly on ELA last year. We did not want to overwhelm our staff by jumping in and requiring more in multiple subjects. The data shows that we made gains in ELA. However, we need to focus more on math, so that our students make gains there as well.

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

FSA showed that our students made substantial learning gains in ELA. In 2021, 84% of all students made learning gains, whereas in 2019, only 65% made learning gains. When reviewing the data for our lowest 25%, 79% made ELA learning gains in 2021, whereas only 42% did in 2019.

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

Our collaborative planning sessions focused on ELA. During MTSS, we focused on ELA and getting kids to read. We did professional development on ELA and made it the focus for our school last year.

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

In order to accelerate learning, we are focusing as a staff on strengthening our Core Tier I instruction for all students. Every child is a general education student first, and MTSS, ESE and other supports are layered around the core to help students succeed.

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.

This year, we will focus our professional development on the MTSS process, strengthening Tier I, Social Emotional Learning and math strategies for enhance learning.

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

X

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Both our FSA data and our progress monitoring shows that we need to focus more on math. Our overall percentage proficient on the FSA math was 76%. This is a 5% decrease from 2019. The percentage of kids making a learning gain in math increased by 3%, going from 81% to 84%. The lowest 25% of students making learning gains stayed the same at 64%. On the 2021 fall iReady diagnostic, the domain in which our students scored the lowest was numbers and operations, with only 35% of students being proficient in this area.
Measurable Outcome:	On the end-of-year iReady diagnostic assessment, 80% of all Surfside students will be proficient in the numbers and operations domain.
Monitoring:	We will monitor classroom math instruction in this area during walkthroughs. Grade levels will review data during data chats and collaborative planning to discuss progress within this domain.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kassie Erenstoft (erenstoft.kassie@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will use visual representations and patterns to help students learn basic math facts with automaticity. As a school, we will have a school-wide challenge, encouraging kids to grow and strengthen their facts. Kindergarten will focus on subitizing, First and Second grades will work on addition and subtraction facts and Fourth through Sixth will work on multiplication facts.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	When students know their math facts with automaticity, they are able to more successfully tackle advanced math concepts. Our iReady data showed a deficit in Numbers and Operations.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In reviewing our Florida State Assessment data, Surfside improved in English Language Arts by %. However, when looking at school-wide iReady data in grades K-6, our overall proficiency rating at the end of 2020-2021 school year was 84% with 16% one to three grade levels below. With the new Florida Benchmarks and utilizing a new English Language Arts Curriculum, there is a critical need to own the new Benchmarks and to ensure quality, rigorous instruction in order to close the achievement gap.
Measurable Outcome:	Surfside Elementary students will increase achievement from 84% to 90% on the iReady Progress Monitoring Tool on the 2021-2022 Final Diagnostic Assessment.
Monitoring:	Collaborative Planning sessions, professional development opportunities, classroom walkthroughs and on-going feedback, coaching cycles, and intervention/PAWS time.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kassie Erenstoft (erenstoft.kassie@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Implement the Florida Benchmarks while following district created lesson plans through new Benchmark and Savvas programs to ensure a strong Tier 1 program.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	In order to have a strong Tier 1 Core, there needs to be standards aligned ELA instruction. With the new Florida Benchmarks, Curriculum, and Time Stamped Lesson Planning, support must be provided to ensure teachers depth of knowledge in these new areas.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Provide and facilitate collaborative planning meetings.
2. Facilitate and analyze data meetings reviewing common assessments, standards mastery and iReady data.
3. Provide professional development in areas of need (Vocabulary).
4. Literacy Coach to model lessons and share best practice instructional strategies.
5. Classroom walkthroughs with feedback regarding Tier 1 Core instruction.

Person Responsible Tracy Seibert (seibert.tracy@brevardschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	On the State Science Assessment, the percentage of students proficient dropped in 2021 to 69% from 76% in 2019.
Measurable Outcome:	On the 2022 State Science Assessment, 80% of our students will be proficient.
Monitoring:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - We will complete walkthroughs to monitor science instruction in grades 3-5. - Teachers will utilize district assessments to progress monitor.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kassie Erenstoft (erenstoft.kassie@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teachers will use Penda learning to teach science standards. - Administration will provide time for teachers to vertically plan for science instruction. - Administration and teachers will communicate with families about the standards covered on the SSA.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Penda was adopted by the district this year for use in 3-6 science classrooms. Our hope is that by utilizing this and planning quality instruction aligned with the state science standards, students will show growth.

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: According to the Youth Truth Survey, Surfside students fell in the 8th percentile (2.42/3) with Brevard 70th percentile (2.59/3) for Academically Challenged. As we enter another Covid year, students are not able to sit in groups and engage in activities in the same way.

Measurable Outcome: Due to the implementation of a Tier 1 SEL program utilizing Sanford Harmony and Conscious Discipline school-wide, Surfside will decrease discipline referrals from 103 in 2021 by 10% in 2022.

Monitoring: Utilizing the Youth Truth Survey, % of students will improve by 10%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Tracy Seibert (seibert.tracy@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Implement the Effective Approaches to Social Emotional Learning first 4 Modules provided through District Leadership, Cathleen Erdmann.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The rationale is through the district the Social Emotional Leadership Team for Surfside is being provided evidence-based Modules to implement best practice skills for students and staff.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Team of teachers across multiple grade levels, along with the activity team teachers, trained during the summer of 2021 to learn more Conscious Discipline strategies.
2. Surfside teachers received 2 hours of additional Conscious Discipline training during pre-planning and will receive additional training through Early Release Professional Development days.
3. Teachers utilize the Tier 1 Social Emotional Learning (SEL) Curriculum, Sanford Harmony, in their classroom.
4. Social Emotional Action Team will meet throughout the year to reflect and provide additional support/training for students, staff and families.
5. Guidance Counselor will provide Social Emotional Small Groups for students needing Tier 2 support.

Person Responsible Tracy Seibert (seibert.tracy@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.

Based on data we have collected, students with disabilities at our school are suspended more than general education students. We will continue to implement and strengthen Social Emotional Learning within all classrooms, by utilizing Sanford Harmony Curriculum. We will address Tier II needs through social skills groups led by our guidance counselor, and as a staff continue using Conscious Discipline to unify our strategies and approaches.

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.

Surfside Elementary School builds a positive school culture and environment by involving all stakeholders including students, teachers, staff, families, business partners and the community. Connecting with families through school-wide events, two-way communication, educational opportunities, volunteering and networking opportunities to address goals as well as areas for continuous improvement.

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

COMING SOON