

Brevard Public Schools

Theodore Roosevelt Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Theodore Roosevelt Elementary School

1400 MINUTEMEN CSWY, Cocoa Beach, FL 32931

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

Demographics

Principal: Elizabeth Hill Brodigan J

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2022

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
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	39%
2021-22 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	2021-22: A (73%) 2018-19: A (69%) 2017-18: A (68%)
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	N/A
* 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	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Theodore Roosevelt Elementary School

1400 MINUTEMEN CSWY, Cocoa Beach, FL 32931

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-6</p>	<p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>39%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>28%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	A	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.

To provide a safe and supportive environment in which students are guided in becoming independent lifelong learners and respectful citizens. We strive to meet the unique needs of all students through a commitment to educational equity and excellence. (Revised 20-21)

Provide the school's vision statement.

Roosevelt students are empowered to reach their full potential and succeed in a safe, engaging environment filled with a rigorous education and an understanding, respect, and tolerance for differences.
(Revised 20-21)

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Lott, Kathryn	Principal	<p>The principal oversees the instructional decision making at all levels. She collaborates with all classroom teachers through 40 minute PLCs, MTSS meetings and observations. Decisions are made based on stakeholders input and disaggregation of data from multiple data points. Support may include professional development, coaching and other strategies as necessary. As the leader of the leadership team, the principal guides the growth and development of the SIP across the school. The principal participates in biweekly 40 minute PLCs with each grade level and the school leadership team.</p>
Blaile, Roxanne	Assistant Principal	<p>Observe instruction in efforts to support teacher goal setting and implementation. Monitor, observe instruction and provide feedback for noted achievement and growth needs.</p> <p>Site in-service representative-this component of the assistant principal's role is vital to ensure that teachers are participating in ongoing quality professional development.</p> <p>Collaborate with the principal in efforts to review and communicate faculty/staff/student needs.</p> <p>Discipline of students: Tracking data to ensure student discipline needs are being met and addressed adequately.</p> <p>Coordinate and facilitate yearly after school support program.</p> <p>Partners in Education Contact.</p> <p>Serve as an active member of school leadership team, threat assessment team.</p> <p>Coordinate safety drills.</p> <p>Ensure textbook needs are met.</p> <p>FOCUS contact and campus facilitator.</p> <p>Assist the Principal in overseeing eLearning instruction and assess the needs of teachers.</p> <p>Communicate key information vital to our school improvement goals and needs to faculty, staff and community.</p> <p>Be an active member and participant in stakeholder focused organizations (Parent Teacher Organization).</p> <p>Assist the Principal in make decisions regarding: everyday function and needs of campus facilities as they impact the ability of teachers to provide high-quality standards-driven instruction.</p> <p>Assist the Principal in keeping track of whole school data and coordinate efforts to address strengths and weaknesses. Support faculty, staff, and students through recognition of their efforts and accomplishments.</p>
Anderson, Stephanie	School Counselor	<p>Recognize and appropriately take care of individual students' social-emotional challenges.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * Provide Psychoeducational counseling to students as needed. * Collaborate with stakeholders to determine how to best meet academic needs of our students. * Submit referrals to outside agencies as necessary. * Respond effectively to crises affecting students and faculty. * MTSS Chairperson * 504 Contact

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * ESOL Contact * LEA * Student-in-Transition Contact * Hospital Homebound Contact * Healthy Living Liaison
Verduzco, Chelsea	Reading Coach	Supporting teachers and administration with state/district and school base assessments <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * data collection and analysis * providing professional development to assist with rigorous standards-based instruction * managing the iReady data and observing instruction to provide assistance and any needed resources * instructing and managing Reading Endorsement course

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2022, Elizabeth Hill Brodigan J

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

3

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

19

Total number of students enrolled at the school

286

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

4

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

5

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	31	35	34	50	36	48	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	288
Attendance below 90 percent	0	9	2	1	4	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	3	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	8	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/21/2022

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	21	30	31	33	49	45	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	263
Attendance below 90 percent	1	6	4	6	3	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	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	1	2	2	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2021 FSA ELA	0	0	0	1	3	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2021 FSA Math	0	0	0	1	8	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	12	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	21	30	31	33	49	45	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	263
Attendance below 90 percent	1	6	4	6	3	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	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	1	2	2	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2021 FSA ELA	0	0	0	1	3	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Level 1 on 2021 FSA Math	0	0	0	1	8	5	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	12	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	73%	61%	56%				78%	62%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	75%						62%	60%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	76%						53%	57%	53%
Math Achievement	69%	49%	50%				75%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	69%						71%	65%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	71%						72%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	77%	60%	59%				73%	57%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	70%	64%	6%	58%	12%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	70%	61%	9%	58%	12%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				
05	2022					
	2019	79%	60%	19%	56%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				
06	2022					
	2019	82%	60%	22%	54%	28%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	57%	61%	-4%	62%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	69%	64%	5%	64%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-57%				
05	2022					
	2019	88%	60%	28%	60%	28%
Cohort Comparison		-69%				
06	2022					
	2019	84%	67%	17%	55%	29%
Cohort Comparison		-88%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	72%	56%	16%	53%	19%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-72%				

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	50	100		33	71						
HSP	100			80							
MUL	83	90		92	90						
WHT	71	73	78	67	64	68	76				
FRL	76	78	73	70	76	77	69				
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	50	54		44	46						
HSP	77			62							
MUL	100			70							
WHT	73	71	64	67	69	61	53				
FRL	72	71		61	61		36				
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	57	55	56	49	66	64	69				
HSP	67	50		63	56						
MUL	79	45		79	82						
WHT	81	64	56	78	70	71	78				
FRL	83	72		69	71	77	60				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	73
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO

ESSA Federal Index	
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	510
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
----------------------	--

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	64
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0

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%	0

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%	0

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%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	90
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	89
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	71
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	74
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

This year we saw our FSA ELA and Math Lowest 25th Percentile make great gains from 69% to 75% in ELA, and 60% to 71% in Math. Our Grade 5 Science scores increased 20%, from 57% to 77%. However, we have seen a decline of our overall ELA achievement over the last three years from 78% in 2019, to 75% in 2021, and finally, 73% in 2022. Our overall Math achievement has also fallen over the years from 75% in 2019, to 67% in 2021, and 69% in 2022. While it did increase 2% this year, it is still below our goal of all students being proficient.

Despite the fall in ELA, in our targeted areas of lowest 25% and learning gains, we did make gains in ELA. This decline in Math is also seen in our lower grades, K-2. In our subgroups this year, we saw increases in our learning gains in ELA and Math for our students with disabilities and our multi-racial students. Our overall math achievement did fall for our students with disabilities from 44% to 33%.

Our third grade did see a large decline in both tested areas. Grade 3 ELA fell from 77% in 2021 to 66% proficiency in 2022 in ELA, as well as Math proficiency fell from 62% in 2021 to 41% in 2022. Grade 6 ELA also saw a significant decrease in proficiency in ELA from 95% in 2021 to 75% in 2022.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Compared to the state average, the largest gap in proficiency we are now seeing is in our 3rd grade Math scores. While the state average was 58%, we were well below that at only 41% of students showing proficiency. Our 6th grade Math scores also saw a decline from 77% to 68%; it was still above the state average of 49%.

Our ELA proficiency also saw a similar decline in grades 3 and 6. Our 6th grade ELA fell from 95% to 75%, which is still above the state average of 52%, but a significant drop for our school as a whole.

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

We had several contributing factors that led to this need for improvement. Due to staffing shortages, our 3rd grade did not have certified teachers until February 2022. Additionally, one of our 1st grade and one of our 4th grade classrooms were without teachers until October 2021. We also added another kindergarten classroom at the end of January 2022 due to class size. These were factors that may have impacted student achievement.

This year we have been fully staffed in all grade levels with certified teachers. This combined with direct instruction, interventions, protected acceleration times, new curriculum for math, collaborative grade-level planning, and continuous walk-throughs by administration and the leadership team will improve our ELA and Math proficiency. We have also started to grow in the areas of MTSS and improving our knowledge as a school in Tiered instruction and behavior supports. We believe that focusing on MTSS will allow us to identify students that need support in areas earlier than previous years.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

According to progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, the area that showed the most improvement was science. We had dropped from 73% in 2019 to 57% in 2021. Last year, we used more formative assessments in all grade levels and tracked data throughout the year to identify focus standards. On the 2022 Florida NGSSS assessment we improved by 20% to 77%.

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

Some contributing factors to our science improvement was a school-wide focus on standards aligned science instruction. We used formative assessments to guide our lessons in the classroom and more direct instruction when it came to science. Our students kept track of their progress of formative and summative assessments in their data notebooks, which allowed the students to see their progress with science standards. We also had consistent use of PENDA in our grades 3-6, and progress monitoring using districts assessments for our lower grade levels of K-2. Our acceleration time was also used for those students who needed front-loading based on formative assessments in science to ensure that they would be successful on the summative assessments when the time came.

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

Roosevelt will continue our school-wide implementation of acceleration that was initiated last year. Classroom teachers, with the help of activity teachers, provide students 30 minutes of daily acceleration instruction/lessons in small groups. At the same time, teachers are providing tier 2 interventions in reading and math to those students who have been identified through the MTSS process.

As a school, we will be implementing the FCRR Walkthrough Tool to help teachers focus on explicit

instruction and differentiated instruction. We will use our early release PD days and our PLCs to better get to know the walkthrough tool. We will continue to work on learning the MTSS process better as a school as to help identify those struggling students faster and be able to intervene when necessary.

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.

Educators will participate in the following professional development:
B.E.S.T. Math Standards with Reveal and EdGems
i-Ready
MTSS
PENDA
FCRR Walk-Through Tool

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

We conduct bi-weekly PLCs/Data Chats, monthly professional development, and bi-weekly faculty meetings. These are built into the calendar each year. During those times, data is reviewed and analyzed, goals are set and revisited, and students are identified for interventions if necessary. This also helps to ensure that we are allotting time to problem solve, address new concerns for student progress, and build our knowledge of pedagogy. Purposeful planning of time to engage in these key strategies will continue to help in sustainability of improvement.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Data analysis will continue to be our focus in ELA across the grade levels. Our data from FSA shows a learning gain of 1% in ELA and a 7% learning gain in our lowest 25% group. However, our overall percentage of students scoring a level 3 or higher has decreased from 75% to 73%.
 Third grade showed an decrease of students earning a level 3 or higher from 77% to 66%. Fourth grade showed an increase from 65% to 73%. Fifth grade showed an increase from 66% to 69% and sixth grade made the largest decline from 95% to 75%. ELA i-Ready Diagnostic 1, for grades 1-6 taken in September 2021, indicates 50% of our students are currently performing on or above grade level in ELA with 35% of our students performing 1 grade below grade level. ELA i-Ready Diagnostic 1 also indicates that 15% of our students are performing well below grade level in ELA. On the final diagnostic for i-Ready, our ELA scores indicated that 78% of students were on or above grade level, 18% were one grade level below, 3% were tow grade levels below, and 1% were three or more grade levels below. This is the rationale for improving our overall core instruction in ELA as data indicates a strong need to improve our overall core instruction in ELA.

Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Due to the fact we are changing to the FAST Assessment, our measurable outcome may be difficult to assess at this moment. The FSA data showed a decrease in students earning a level 3 or higher in ELA. Our target for 2022-2023 school year will be to increase the number of students achieving proficiency on the FAST Reading Assessment for PM3. Third grade will increase proficiency by 29%, fourth grade will increase by 10%, fifth grade will increase by 10%, and sixth grade will increase by 10%. The FAST PM1 Reading data indicates our current 4th grade students still need the most support at 46% scoring a level one on this September assessment. Our target for 2022-2023 school year will be to increase the number of students performing at grade level to 80% by our last progress monitoring assessment in Spring of 2022.

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

We will continue to focus on the data and will monitor students throughout the year through our bi-weekly data chats and monitoring their STAR/FAST progress monitoring data, as well as benchmark unit assessments. We will use evidence based data to execute strategies and to make decisions to positively impact our students. Strategies will align with our standards and core instruction. We will also monitor direct instruction of ELA through our use of the FCRR Walkthrough Tool.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Chelsea Verduzco (verduzco.chelsea@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy

We will focus on our students' data during our bi-weekly meetings with teachers and teachers will meet with students individually to discuss their data with them. We will implement acceleration in all classrooms with the support of activity teachers.

being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based

Strategy: Data-driven instruction has been proven to be one of the most effective methods. This is noted by Robert J. Marzano, What Works In Schools: Translating Research Into Action. "Indeed, one of the defining, characteristics of schools producing unprecedented gains in student achievements, is that they rely on data to identify probable successful interventions (Hopkins & Ainskow, 1993). Teachers rely on data to make decisions of students specific needs and understand when teaching and learning is working and when it its not. Data-driven instruction emphasizes on whether students have mastered and learned the desire necessary skills. "They also rely on data to determine how effective those interventions are when implemented (Barth et al., 1999; Schmoker, 2001).

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Monitor student achievement and progress on STAR and FAST progress monitoring assessments, monitor unit assessments through Benchmark by analyzing data in Performance Matters, and use i-Ready pathways and diagnostics, as well as inform teachers of pertinent data as needed.

Person Responsible Chelsea Verduzco (verduzco.chelsea@brevardschools.org)

For the purpose of coaching support, observe in classrooms in collaboration with the teacher to support the implementation of the adopted reading curriculum. We will be focusing on the implementation of Benchmark and BEST standards with fidelity.

Person Responsible Chelsea Verduzco (verduzco.chelsea@brevardschools.org)

Model standards-driven instruction of the adopted ELA curriculum in collaboration with the teacher in efforts to demonstrate rigorous instruction.

Person Responsible Chelsea Verduzco (verduzco.chelsea@brevardschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Our lowest performance on the 2021-2022 FSA testing was Math in 3rd grade with only 41% proficiency, which was a drop of 21% from the previous year. Overall, our Math achievement was 69%, with our lowest 25th percentile making 71% achievement. Our 4th and 5th grades Math Level 3 and above scores increased from 59% to 76%, and 65% to 77%, respectively. In Grade 6, we also saw a decline in proficiency from 77% to 68%.

We fell below 70% proficiency in 3rd and 6th grades. We were above the district and state average in all grades but 3rd. Our i-Ready diagnostic 3 data, taken in April 2022, showed us that our K-2 students struggled with Math as well; our grade 1 students ending the year with only 50% on grade level, compared to Kindergarten and 2nd grade which were 78% and 84%, respectively.

This need for improvement in this area was further solidified by our September 2022 STAR/FAST data. Our current 4th graders showed the highest percentage of students scoring a level one in Math. While this is only a progress monitoring data point, it does show the need for intervention and direct instruction in math to ensure at least 70% proficiency by our last progress monitoring.

Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Our goal is to increase achievement from 69% to 79% meeting proficiency. 3rd Grade will improve from 41% to 71%, 4th Grade will improve from 76% to 81%, 5th Grade will improve from 77% to 87%, and 6th Grade will improve from 68% to 78%.

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

We will monitor this through our i-Ready diagnostics, which are done three times a year. We will monitor using STAR/FAST data from our September and January, and finally our May, EOY testing. Respectively, we will monitor our students i-Ready instructional pathway pass rate, and will intervene when a student is failing lessons. If a student continues to fail lessons, we will adjust the student's path to close the gap and provide teacher assigned lessons in the area needing further support. We will continue to use the classroom assessments as another data point. This will provide feedback to use during our intervention/acceleration where there are activity teachers pushing in to support instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Roxanne Blaile (blaile.roxanne@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-

Throughout the last several years, Roosevelt has been targeting the instructional needs of students using differentiated instruction and progress monitoring using i-Ready, FSA, subgroup and other formative assessments. These strategies will continue this year, and we will be using the STAR/FAST progress monitoring data as well, and will be even more involved with students knowing their own achievement throughout the year using Data

based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Notebooks. Students will track their own data for i-Ready diagnostics, as well as i-Ready weekly lesson pass rates. We will also be implementing acceleration in all grades by using our activity teachers to push into classrooms and provide support to the classroom teacher and to the students who are already on grade level. This will allow those students who need intervention to receive the small group time with their teacher, and those students who need acceleration to receive that small group instruction as well.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Differentiated Instruction relies on the teacher knowing students academically and social emotionally and using these data to meet the needs of the students (Tomlinson, 2013, Ferlazzo (n.d.). Acquiring and using data effectively, calls for both students and teachers to engage in progress monitoring. Monitoring student progress provides ongoing checks which enables the teacher to plan for instruction based on the various data collection tools (i.e. i-Ready, FSA, formative and summative classroom assessments etc.) Effect size speaks to the impact that a particular strategy has on student achievement. Any effect size .40 or higher, is positive (Hattie, 2013). Roosevelt has shown increases in our Math Learning Gains and Lowest 25th Percentile learning gains by double digits. The teachers know that what they have implemented works. Teacher confidence after a year of success implementing these strategies will increase and confidence in one's ability has a .92 effect size (Hattie, 2017).

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

We will review last years FSA and i-Ready data. We will also be reviewing our STAR/FAST data from the September progress monitoring to create groups for our interventions and acceleration.

Person Responsible Roxanne Blaile (blaile.roxanne@brevardschools.org)

Conduct bi-week data chats to set goals and assess the ongoing implementation of instruction purposed for addressing goals.

Person Responsible Roxanne Blaile (blaile.roxanne@brevardschools.org)

Collect mid and end of year data from in class instructional efforts and assessments as well as district and iReady assessments for ongoing review and goal adjustments as needed.

Person Responsible Roxanne Blaile (blaile.roxanne@brevardschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Based on the 2022 Florida NGSSS data, our science proficiency improved from 57% to 77%. While this is a large increase in proficiency, we believe that our work from last year had a huge part to play in that jump. We want to continue to work we did last year, into this year. We will continue to work on implementing formative and summative assessments, while also using PENDA in our upper grades to enhance our science learning. Over the years, we have seen our 5th grade review test average go from 50% to 55%, and this year is no different. On the Grade 5 review taken in September, the average was a 55%. This tells us that we need to continue the work in Science.

Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve.

We will increase our Florida NGSSS science scores from 77% proficiency to 80% proficiency.

This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Monitoring: Describe how this

Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

We will progress monitor the science standards from K-6 with the summative and formative assessments tracked on the Brevard County science website and put the information on a sheet as part of the data notebook, that we will discuss in data chats monthly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Holly Schumann-Grubb (schumann-grubb.holly@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being

The 5E Model, developed in 1987 by the Biological Sciences Curriculum Study, promotes collaborative, active learning in which students work together to solve problems and investigate new concepts by asking question, observing, analyzing, and drawing conclusions. The 5E Model is based on the constructivist theory to learning, which suggests that people construct knowledge and meaning from experiences. By understanding and reflecting on activities, students are able to reconcile new knowledge with previous ideas.

implemented for this Area of Focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

When we learn things it isn't for memorizing a piece of information. Just reciting science facts or principles is not what we want children to be able to do. We want them to be able to go out in the world and make sense of novel phenomenon. The NGSSS calls for students to actively engage in science. 5E mentally engages students with a question or activity. hands on activities will be explored. Teachers will then provide the concepts or terms used for students to provide explanations and elaborate via writing on what was observed. Students will discuss and compare ideas with others. Finally they will reflect and evaluate learning. With the changes required in the updated science, engineering and computer technology fair, teachers and students can use the 5E model to go through the process together as a class prior to working on individual or team projects.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Continuous training on the 5E model of science instruction to new and returning teachers.

Person Responsible Holly Schumann-Grubb (schumann-grubb.holly@brevardschools.org)

Monthly data chats will include science data from the district website assessments and placed in the students individual data notebooks.

Person Responsible Roxanne Blaile (blaile.roxanne@brevardschools.org)

School-wide science experiments and SMASH night to kick off science fair for all grade levels.

Person Responsible Holly Schumann-Grubb (schumann-grubb.holly@brevardschools.org)

Continuous use of PENDA for grades 3-6 with action board in the hallways showing student success.

Person Responsible Roxanne Blaile (blaile.roxanne@brevardschools.org)

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

By understanding and responding to a person’s social/emotional needs to include trauma-informed practices, the school based community consisting of administrators, teachers, and staff can help to reduce its negative impact, support critical learning opportunities, and create a more positive school environment. The area of focus was identified through District initiatives, student needs, academics data, and recent worldwide events.

Measurable Outcome:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Measurement of the baseline data will take place at the onset of the 22-23 school year. Students will complete a pre, mid, and post survey. Our goal is to ensure that our students' social/emotional needs are met within our practices and we see a 25% reduction in the impact of systemic barriers for those identified through behavioral referrals, threat assessments, and SRI's.

Monitoring:

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

We will monitor identified students at risk of systemic barriers through daily check-ins, attendance reports, SRI, and student surveys.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephanie Anderson (anderson.stephanie@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Roosevelt Elementary School utilizes many different programs and services to ensure that the social emotional needs of all students are being met daily. We continue to implement Conscious Discipline, Monique Burr, and classroom SEL lessons school-wide for the 2022-2023 school year as an additional level of behavioral support. Each classroom is required to have daily morning meetings in order to build a sense of community among the students. Our school counselor teaches whole group social-emotional learning, as well as facilitates individual and small group counseling. In order to provide additional social-emotional support for our military students, we have a counselor from the Behavioral Military and Family Life Counseling Services that is available to meet with students that have a parent in the military.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria

It is hypothesized that with social/emotional learning, psycho-educational counseling opportunities, trauma-informed care practices, equity, and professional development, it will lead to improvement of educational outcomes and fewer behavioral referrals, threat and SRI assessments. Therefore, we are not just responsible to make sure that our students are academically sound but also in their connection to how their social-emotional well-being has been impacted by systemic barriers.

used for selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Review the Student Survey from the 21-22 school year-SIP Team

Person Responsible Stephanie Anderson (anderson.stephanie@brevardschools.org)

Review Systemic Risk Factors/Barriers to Learning Data-SIP Team

Person Responsible Stephanie Anderson (anderson.stephanie@brevardschools.org)

Create a Pre-Mid-Post Student Survey regarding student views on. their social and emotional well-being in the school and outside of the school.

Completion of the surveys will be in October, January and April.

Teacher's will receive and Outlook reminder to complete the surveys.

Person Responsible Stephanie Anderson (anderson.stephanie@brevardschools.org)

Update Professional Development and Social/Emotional goals based on the results of the surveys.

Person Responsible Stephanie Anderson (anderson.stephanie@brevardschools.org)

Provide opportunities for monthly Social/Emotional lessons within the classrooms.

Person Responsible Stephanie Anderson (anderson.stephanie@brevardschools.org)

Provide feedback to teachers on ways to differentiate instruction of SEL and academic needs with students.

Person Responsible Stephanie Anderson (anderson.stephanie@brevardschools.org)

Review school referral and SRI data-SIP Team

Person Responsible Stephanie Anderson (anderson.stephanie@brevardschools.org)

Disaggregate the survey data for the year and identify over-arching themes to use during the 23-24 school year.

Person Responsible Stephanie Anderson (anderson.stephanie@brevardschools.org)

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Roosevelt works collaboratively with faculty, staff, students, and the community to solicit feedback surrounding our district and school's mission and vision. PTO and SAC meetings are advertised consistently and within a timeframe which allows for all who desire to join us in conversations, and planning for events, face to face that will help us to connect and reconnect. This ongoing connection with an emphasis always on our district and school mission and vision, help us to promote a positive school culture and environment via engagement. We also use conscious discipline where we are proactive rather than reactive to behaviors. We welcome all students to school with a smile.

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

Engaging ALL Stakeholders

- 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 biweekly 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 and classroom procedures, and provide frequent feedback to students, and encourage students to be caring and respectful to one another and 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 those beliefs manifest in the school building.

For example:

- Collaborative planning is solutions-oriented and based in disaggregated data
- Student work is displayed throughout school
- All students are enrolled in college- and career-ready prep curriculum.
- The administration ensures that teachers have resources, training, and ongoing support to meet them and provides frequent, constructive feedback, and, actively make themselves available to teachers and staff. The leadership team actively solicit staff feedback on school-wide procedures and create 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 strategies, but attainable 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.

SAC - The school has established an infrastructure to support family engagement, such as a decision-making SAC council. 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).