

Brevard Public Schools

Apollo 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	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	26
Budget to Support Goals	0

Apollo Elementary School

3085 KNOX MCRAE DR, Titusville, FL 32780

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

Demographics

Principal: Aimee Dilago M

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: B (54%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: B (61%)
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	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Apollo Elementary School

3085 KNOX MCRAE DR, Titusville, FL 32780

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-6</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">49%</p>

School Grades History

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

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 educate all students with excellence as the standard, working together in a safe professional learning community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To inspire all children to learn at their highest potential, preparing them for tomorrow's global expectations.

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
O'Leary, Frank	Principal	<p>To ensure that all students feel safe in an environment of mutual respect and trust.</p> <p>To be the school's primary instructional leader.</p> <p>To ensure that students are receiving the best possible education at all times by ensuring that excellent instruction is taking place in every classroom from kindergarten through sixth grade.</p> <p>To lead student progress meetings.</p>
Landress, Jennifer	Assistant Principal	<p>To ensure that all students feel safe in an environment of mutual respect and trust.</p> <p>To be the school's secondary instructional leader.</p> <p>To ensure that students are receiving the best possible education at all times by ensuring that excellent instruction is taking place in every classroom from kindergarten through sixth grade.</p> <p>To help lead student progress meetings.</p> <p>To oversee ESOL program.</p> <p>To oversee kindergarten testing.</p> <p>To oversee SEL program.</p> <p>To oversee MTSS professional development.</p> <p>To oversee lunch schedules.</p> <p>To oversee carline dismissal.</p>
Wise, Trelawney	Assistant Principal	<p>To ensure that all students feel safe in an environment of mutual respect and trust.</p> <p>To be the school's secondary instructional leader.</p> <p>To ensure that students are receiving the best possible education at all times by ensuring that excellent instruction is taking place in every classroom from kindergarten through sixth grade.</p> <p>To help lead student progress meetings.</p> <p>To oversee science instruction.</p> <p>To oversee ASP program for science, reading and math.</p> <p>To oversee activity schedule.</p> <p>To oversee new teacher induction program.</p>
Gross, Minnie	Instructional Coach	<p>To oversee professional development in all areas of the K-12 Reading Plan.</p> <p>To oversee Reading Endorsement program.</p> <p>To help oversee and monitor i-Ready diagnostic and other testing.</p>

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2015, Aimee Dilago 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.*

5

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

60

Total number of students enrolled at the school

774

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

14

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

14

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	118	118	106	120	91	118	101	0	0	0	0	0	0	772
Attendance below 90 percent	43	25	30	26	40	28	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	228
One or more suspensions	18	11	12	9	14	19	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	93
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	7	13	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	18	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	13	5	8	18	13	17	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA ELA	0	0	0	7	21	38	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA MATH	0	0	0	7	28	42	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	114
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	6	2	5	2	6	7	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	8	13	6	7	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/7/2021

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	110	116	99	100	116	114	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	759
Attendance below 90 percent	39	30	30	18	29	19	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	194
One or more suspensions	1	6	9	5	3	7	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
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	7	15	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	20	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

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	1	3	9	17	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

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	9	0	3	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	110	116	99	100	116	114	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	759
Attendance below 90 percent	39	30	30	18	29	19	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	194
One or more suspensions	1	6	9	5	3	7	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
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	7	15	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	20	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	52

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	1	3	9	17	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	59

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	9	0	3	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	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				59%	60%	58%	54%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	57%	53%	45%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				59%	63%	63%	58%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains				62%	65%	62%	63%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				50%	53%	51%	49%	49%	47%
Science Achievement				34%	57%	53%	54%	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	65%	64%	1%	58%	7%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	63%	61%	2%	58%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				
05	2021					
	2019	40%	60%	-20%	56%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				
06	2021					
	2019	66%	60%	6%	54%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	59%	61%	-2%	62%	-3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	66%	64%	2%	64%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
05	2021					
	2019	39%	60%	-21%	60%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
06	2021					
	2019	70%	67%	3%	55%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	33%	56%	-23%	53%	-20%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The i-Ready Reading and Mathematics diagnostic assessment were used to compile the data below..

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	118/8%	118/16%	118/17%
	Economically Disadvantaged	89/7%	89/15%	89/13%
	Students With Disabilities	28/7%	28/14%	28/11%
	English Language Learners	2/0%	2/0%	2/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	118/7%	118/16%	118/20%
	Economically Disadvantaged	89/8%	89/17%	89/18%
	Students With Disabilities	28/4%	28/18%	28/18%
	English Language Learners	2/0%	2/0%	2/0%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	109/20%	33/30%	28/26%
	Economically Disadvantaged	84/18%	84/31%	84/21%
	Students With Disabilities	16/6%	16/13%	16/6%
	English Language Learners	1/0%	1/100%	1/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	109/7%	109/26%	109/12%
	Economically Disadvantaged	84/5%	84/24%	84/7%
	Students With Disabilities	16/0%	16/0%	16/0%
	English Language Learners	1/0%	1/0%	1/0%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	110/48%	110/59%	110/48%
	Economically Disadvantaged	79/46%	79/54%	79/43%
	Students With Disabilities	30/20%	30/37%	30/33%
	English Language Learners	2/50%	2/50%	2/50%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	110/22%	110/32%	110/33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	79/22%	79/21%	79/21%
	Students With Disabilities	30/10%	30/7%	30/7%
	English Language Learners	2/50%	2/0%	2/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	125/18%	125/35%	125/23%
	Economically Disadvantaged	88/20%	88/33%	88/19%
	Students With Disabilities	32/6%	32/19%	32/6%
	English Language Learners	2/0%	2/0%	2/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	125/10%	125/26%	125/22%
	Economically Disadvantaged	88/8%	88/22%	88/18%
	Students With Disabilities	32/3%	32/0%	32/3%
	English Language Learners	2/50%	2/0%	2/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	111/40%	111/49%	111/28%
	Economically Disadvantaged	73/33%	73/42%	73/22%
	Students With Disabilities	22/9%	22/32%	22/0%
	English Language Learners	1/0%	1/0%	1/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	111/28%	111/37%	111/23%
	Economically Disadvantaged	73/18%	73/30%	73/19%
	Students With Disabilities	22/5%	22/9%	22/9%
	English Language Learners	1/0%	1/0%	1/0%
	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
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	109/29%	109/50%	109/36%
	Economically Disadvantaged	75/25%	75/43%	75/28%
	Students With Disabilities	26/4%	26/15%	26/8%
	English Language Learners	1/0%	1/0%	1/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	109/18%	109/39%	109/21%
	Economically Disadvantaged	75/13%	75/28%	75/31%
	Students With Disabilities	26/0%	26/15%	26/4%
	English Language Learners	1/0%	1/0%	1/0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

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	16	41	31	15	46	52	16				
BLK	24	33	24	19	36	32	35				
HSP	60	67		46	41						
MUL	60	57		51	48		45				
WHT	62	64	41	61	55	71	62				
FRL	43	48	33	37	43	44	39				
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	30	49	47	32	47	38	16				
ELL											
BLK	43	52	38	37	54	45	23				
HSP	55	64	62	51	67	64	25				
MUL	57	54		52	58						
WHT	68	62	68	73	66	48	46				
FRL	51	58	52	50	58	53	25				
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	31	45	43	26	44	28	19				
BLK	35	44	48	36	59	50	27				
HSP	53	60	62	49	62	67	73				
MUL	61	70		60	70						
WHT	67	55	37	70	63	43	61				
FRL	49	49	43	53	62	55	47				

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	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	340
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	31
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	
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	29
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	54
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	52
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	
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	59
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	41
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?

Fourth and sixth grade decreased their FSA ELA and Math scores in 2020-2021 compared to 2018/2019. Fifth grade students increased their FSA ELA, Math and Science scores in 2020-2021 compared to 2018-2019. 56% of our students in grades 4-6 made a learning gain in FSA ELA compared to 51% for the district in 2020-2021. 49% of our students in grades 4-6 made a learning gain in FSA Math compared to 44% for the district. 47% of our lowest 25% made a learning gain in FSA Math compared to 37% for the district. For our lowest scoring ESSA sub-group, Students with Disabilities (SWD), the trend is only 23% of students were proficient or moved up a level in FSA ELA from 2019 to 2021, and only 14% of SWD students were proficient or moved up a level in FSA Mathematics from 2019 to 2021. The trend across grade levels is that there is a decline in student progress from the second progress monitoring assessment to the third progress monitoring assessment for all students and/or all subgroups.

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

Our 20-21 4th grade and our 6th grade ELA and Math proficiency scores and our lowest 25% of students demonstrate the greatest 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?

The pandemic-related mitigation strategies including eLearning led to a decline in student achievement overall.

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

Our 20-21 5th grade FSA ELA score percentage increased by 16 points, and our 5th grade Science score percentage increased by 19 points.

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

An increased focus on standards-aligned instruction, regular progress monitoring with i-Ready, Penda Science, IXL Reading and Math, and utilization and analysis of results of district assessments led to these improvements.

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

Greater utilization of Academic Support Program and ESSER II funds to assist targeted students, increased focus on BEST standards and fidelity of use of new ELA curriculum will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning for all students,

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.

All teachers and leaders participated in the roll-out of the new ELA curriculum. Further PD will have to occur so that teachers are able to instruct using the program with fidelity.

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

Professional development for teachers in BEST standards-aligned instruction, researched-based intervention programs such as Leveled Literacy and monitoring of such this instruction by school leaders will ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: ELA & Math Proficiency and Learning Gains in FSA ELA and Math will increase as a result of a focus on standards-aligned instruction through collaborative planning. Last year, Apollo Elementary was been an average of 6 points below the district for students who scored Level 3 or above in FSA ELA and Math. Only 23% of our SWD students were proficient or increased by one level in FSA ELA and only 14% were proficient or increased by one level in FSA Math.

Measurable Outcome: FSA ELA Level 3+ proficiency will increase from 52% to 57%, and ELA learning gains will increase from 56% to 59%. FSA Math Level 3+ proficiency will increase from 48% to 53%, and Math Learning gains will increase from 49% to 53%. Our SWD student ESSA sub-group will increase proficiency to at least 41% as measured by FSA ELA and Mathematics.

Monitoring: Write Score for grades 2-6 and the i-Ready reading diagnostic for students in grades K-6 will be used three times during the 2021-2022 school year will be used to monitor ELA. The i-Ready mathematics diagnostic for students in grades K-6 will be used three times during this school year to monitor math.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Frank O'Leary (oleary.frank@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: School-wide writing across content areas and text-based writing with complex text. Collaborative planning with grade level teams to design and implement BEST standards-aligned lessons. Student discussion during math lessons will be implemented.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: We believe that the tasks and the standards are not aligned. If tasks are aligned with the standard and more writing across the content areas are incorporated into lessons, we believe that learning gains will increase. We believe that the classroom practice of student discussion during math lessons will deepen understanding of math concepts for students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Hire 2 Title I teachers and 4 Title I assistants to assist with intervention in reading and math for our lowest 25% of students. Hire 1 Title I lab teacher to assist all students in grades K-6 in the area of writing. Maximize Title I schedule for pull-out and push-in time. (Title I).

Person Responsible Frank O'Leary (oleary.frank@brevardschools.org)

2. Data team meetings will occur on a monthly basis to review reading, math and writing data (including ELA Standards Mastery data) and decide on next steps. During two of these meetings, Curriculum Associates will offer assistance to understand data and provide ideas on next steps for ELA and Math. The district elementary math content teacher will also meet with teachers to discuss suggestions on how to improve math instruction. Particular attention will be paid to our subgroups.

Person Responsible Frank O'Leary (oleary.frank@brevardschools.org)

3. Team meetings will be used to discuss writing exemplars and complexity of math and ELA standards-aligned tasks including a focus on science instruction best practices.

Person Responsible Frank O'Leary (oleary.frank@brevardschools.org)

4. Schedule instructional monitoring, feedback, coaching and follow-up based on student data trends and observational data.

Person Responsible Frank O'Leary (oleary.frank@brevardschools.org)

5. Teachers will provide scaffolding for all students using the i-Ready Toolbox.

Person Responsible Frank O'Leary (oleary.frank@brevardschools.org)

6. Utilize Write Score in grades 4-6 three times during the year to monitor and improve student writing (Title I).

Person Responsible Frank O'Leary (oleary.frank@brevardschools.org)

7. Use Reading and Math ASP to supplement instruction for our lowest 25% of students in grades 2-6.

Person Responsible Frank O'Leary (oleary.frank@brevardschools.org)

8. Teachers will provide Tier II and Tier III students with intervention time.

Person Responsible Frank O'Leary (oleary.frank@brevardschools.org)

9. Teachers will provide ESE students with pull-out or push-in intervention time.

Person Responsible Frank O'Leary (oleary.frank@brevardschools.org)

10. Purchase IXL Reading and Mathematics for standards-based skills practice. (Title I) Purchase 33 computers to ensure equity of access to technology.(Title I)

Person Responsible Frank O'Leary (oleary.frank@brevardschools.org)

11. Teachers (classroom and ESE teachers) will be provided up to one day of planning per quarter to collaboratively work on standards-aligned lesson plans. Substitutes will be provided as appropriate. (Title I) (BPIE)

Person Responsible Frank O'Leary (oleary.frank@brevardschools.org)

12. Utilize 21st Century Grant Program after school to provide qualified students with academic assistance.

Person Responsible Frank O'Leary (oleary.frank@brevardschools.org)

13. Organize St. Augustine field trip for 4th grade students to bring real life experience of Social Studies standards. (Title I)

Person Responsible Frank O'Leary (oleary.frank@brevardschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Science 3+ proficiency in FSSA will increase if collaborative planning takes place. Our Science Level 3 and above proficiency increased by 19 points from 2019. At 53%, Apollo is two points below the district and 5 points above the state. The trend shows more opportunity to continue to improve teacher instruction to increase student achievement in the area of 5th grade science, with all other grades providing key instruction so that the students are ready for the 5th grade curriculum. The results also clearly shows that science instruction continues to need to be more rigorous, with a focus on more hands-on opportunities for our students. Our sub-groups (African American students (33%), Students with Disabilities (14%), and Economically Disadvantaged students (42%)) continued to underperform . This data, also indicates that the Nature of Science Content Area should be Apollo’s primary focus, with a proficiency rate of 30% for all students, 2% for Students with Disabilities, 5% for African American students and 16% for Economically Disadvantaged students.

Measurable Outcome: Sixty percent of our students will score a level 3 or higher on the 2022 Florida State Science Assessment. On the 2021 assessment only 30% of our students demonstrated mastery in the area of the Nature of Science. We will increase this to 50% of our students on the 2022 assessment.

Monitoring: The district science assessments and Penda science data will be used to monitor this Area of Focus. A monthly report will be ran for Penda science to see student usage and progress, A PM report will be ran after each assessment window for the grade level assigned assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Trelawney Wise (wise.trelawney@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: The 5E Instructional Model
Hands-on STEM Lab Activities
Coaching

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The 5E Instructional Model is used to design science units, that can be based upon cognitive psychology, constructivist-learning theory, and best practices in science teaching. The 5E cycle consists of cognitive stages of learning that comprise engage, explore, explain, elaborate, and evaluate. Research states that “using this approach, students redefine, reorganize, elaborate, and change their initial concepts through self-reflection and interaction with their peers and their environment. Learners interpret objects and phenomena, and internalize those interpretations in terms of their current conceptual understanding”.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Designate and monitor Science time for each grade level. Teachers will discuss the data at grade level and/or team collaboration meetings.

Person Responsible Trelawney Wise (wise.trelawney@brevardschools.org)

2. Utilize Penda Science to expand and monitor science knowledge. Purchase and utilize Discovery Education (Title I) to enhance classroom instruction.

Person Responsible Trelawney Wise (wise.trelawney@brevardschools.org)

3. Data team meetings will occur on a monthly basis to review data (including Penda Science data) and decide on next steps. Particular attention will be paid to our subgroups.

Person Responsible Trelawney Wise (wise.trelawney@brevardschools.org)

4. Grades 3-5 will be working with Michelle Ferro or admin monthly to create lesson plans and tasks that are engaging and that meet the depth of the standards using the 5 E Instructional Model.

Person Responsible Trelawney Wise (wise.trelawney@brevardschools.org)

5. Grades K-5 will complete selected District Online Summative and Formative assessments.

Person Responsible Trelawney Wise (wise.trelawney@brevardschools.org)

6. Science ASP will be offered to our 5th grade students during the second semester.

Person Responsible Trelawney Wise (wise.trelawney@brevardschools.org)

7. Schedule instructional monitoring, feedback, coaching and follow-up based on student data trends and observational data. Data for our subgroups will be monitored closely.

Person Responsible Trelawney Wise (wise.trelawney@brevardschools.org)

8. Teachers (classroom and ESE teachers) will be provided up to one day of planning per quarter to collaboratively work on standards-aligned lesson plans. Substitutes will be provided as appropriate. (Title I) (BPIE)

Person Responsible Trelawney Wise (wise.trelawney@brevardschools.org)

9. Organize Sea World field trip for 5th grade students to bring real life experience of life science standards.

Person Responsible Trelawney Wise (wise.trelawney@brevardschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Twenty-five of our students currently in grades K-3 are substantially deficient in reading. School year 2020-2021 FSA ELA data shows 45% of 4th grade students performing at proficiency (3+) compared to the state average of 52% and the district average of 58%. Only 17% of our current ESE students in grades 4-6 performed at proficiency (3+) last year.

Measurable Outcome: For School Year 2021-2022, FSA ELA data will show that 55% or more of our 4th grade students performing at proficiency (3+). At least forty-one percent of our ESE students in grades 3-6 will perform at proficiency in the 2022 FSA ELA assessment.

Monitoring: The i-Ready diagnostic will be utilized three times during this school year to progress monitor all students. This data will be analyzed to gauge whether any students will need to receive Tier II or Tier III intervention.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Frank O'Leary (oleary.frank@brevardschools.org)

The evidence based strategy is the use of BEST Standards-aligned instruction using the Benchmark curriculum which per their website meets ESSA Evidence-based requirements.

Evidence-based Strategy:
 .
 **iReady: This approach helps educators accelerate growth and grade-level learning. These tools provide rigorous and motivating reading and mathematics instruction that:
 *Personalize pathways to growth with precise instruction that is guided by i-Ready Assessment data, * Motivate students to persist in building their skills and
 *Provide scaffolded support, through small group instruction that meets the needs of all students. Progress monitoring using the i-Ready diagnostic and fidelity checks through classroom observations will be used to ensure the standards-aligned instruction is taking place.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: If we align our instruction to the BEST Standards and use frequent fidelity checks, our students' achievement in ELA will increase. Our Benchmark curriculum is BEST Standards-aligned.
 **iReady: Apollo students arrive at varying ability levels. Driven by the i-Ready Diagnostic, lessons in Reading provide tailored instruction that meets students where they are in their journey and encourages them as they develop new skills. Tools for Instruction provide actionable, in-the-moment resources for addressing skills gaps in small group and one-on-one settings.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Hire 2 Title I teachers and 4 Title I assistants to assist with intervention in reading for our lowest 25% of students. Hire 1 Title I lab teacher to assist all students in grades K-6 in the area of writing. Maximize Title I schedule for pull-out and push-in time. (Title I).

Person Responsible Frank O'Leary (oleary.frank@brevardschools.org)

2. Data team meetings will occur on a monthly basis to review reading and writing data (including ELA Standards Mastery data) and decide on next steps. During two of these meetings, Curriculum Associates will offer assistance to understand data and provide ideas on next steps for ELA. Particular attention will be paid to our subgroups.

Person Responsible Frank O'Leary (oleary.frank@brevardschools.org)

3. Schedule instructional monitoring, feedback, coaching and follow-up based on student data trends and observational data.

Person Responsible Frank O'Leary (oleary.frank@brevardschools.org)

4. Teachers will provide scaffolding for students using the i-Ready Toolbox.

Person Responsible Frank O'Leary (oleary.frank@brevardschools.org)

5. Use Reading ASP to supplement instruction for our lowest 25% of students in grade 4.

Person Responsible Trelawney Wise (wise.trelawney@brevardschools.org)

6. Teachers will provide Tier II and Tier III students with intervention time.

Person Responsible Jennifer Landress (landress.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

7. The literacy coach will provide teachers with professional development in evidence-based intervention materials such as Leveled Literacy. She will also work with teachers on analyzing data with teachers to help improve reading instruction

Person Responsible Minnie Gross (gross.minnie@brevardschools.org)

8. Teachers (classroom and ESE teachers) will be provided up to one day of planning per quarter to collaboratively work on standards-aligned lesson plans. Substitutes will be provided as appropriate. (Title I) (BPIE)

Person Responsible Frank O'Leary (oleary.frank@brevardschools.org)

9. Utilize 21st Century Grant Program after school to provide qualified students with academic assistance.

Person Responsible Trelawney Wise (wise.trelawney@brevardschools.org)

10. Purchase high interest library books to encourage reading and to enhance reading skills. (Title I)

Person Responsible Jennifer Landress (landress.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

11. Provide students in grades 2-6 with Ready ELA workbooks to provide extra practice with reading and writing skills. (Title I)

Person Responsible Frank O'Leary (oleary.frank@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.

Safe Schools for Alex shows lagging data. In 19-20, Apollo Elementary reported 0.7 incidents per 100 students, which is less than the statewide average of 1.0 incidents per 100 students for elementary schools. Our major incidents were fights (0.36 per 100 students) and tobacco/drug possession (0.36 per 100 students). Our two counselors will be utilized to intervene with the students who had these issues last year and we will continue our social emotional learning focus in all classrooms.

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.

Apollo addresses building a positive school culture and environment by ensuring that we listen to all our stakeholders through SAC, the parent survey, the Youth Truth Survey, and the Insight Survey. We make adjustments to our school based on the input of our stakeholders.

Through our Youth Truth Survey, we learned that 60% percent of the students believe they are very safe at school and only 49% believe that they feel like a real part of the school community. While these low scores may be as a result of the mitigation strategies for COVID-19, especially eLearning, we are committed to rebuilding a more positive culture at school this year through the use of Conscious Discipline, enhancing our PBIS program and social emotional assistance for our students.

Through the BPS Elementary Parent Survey, we learned that despite last year's mitigation strategies for COVID-19, almost 84% of parents who responded felt welcome at school. We hope to increase that percentage this year with some well-targeted Title I family evenings whether virtual or live. From the survey we also learned that 75% of our parents prefer contact through email so we are utilizing email more this year. We will provide family engagement opportunities to continue to build a positive school culture, including: math and reading nights; a One Book/One School event; Kindergarten Round-Up; and Science Fair Help Nights. (Title I)

Through our Insight Survey, we learned that our teachers, with an average score of 82% believe that there is a common vision, common language and highly effective teaching occurring at Apollo. Only 52% believe that there is a low tolerance for ineffective teaching, which is something we are always working on.

For this school year, we provided all students with school supplies to assist families during this ongoing pandemic. (Title I) Many parents verbalized their appreciation for relieving financial stress during this ongoing economic difficult time. We will continue to purchase school and classroom supplies throughout the year. (Title I)

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

The stakeholders at Apollo Elementary are our students, parents and staff. The role of each stakeholder is to provide the school with advice and constructive criticism throughout the year so that the school can be the most positive environment it can be.