

Brevard Public Schools

Roy Allen Elementary School



2022-23 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	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Roy Allen Elementary School

2601 FOUNTAINHEAD BLVD, Melbourne, FL 32935

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

Demographics

Principal: Kelly Grugan L

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	93%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (55%) 2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: C (51%)
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	ATSI

* 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	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Roy Allen Elementary School

2601 FOUNTAINHEAD BLVD, Melbourne, FL 32935

<http://www.allen.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>93%</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>42%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		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 serve every student with excellence as the standard.

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

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
Chance, Sean	Principal	Mr. Chance oversees and monitors schoolwide data and curriculum. He works with instructional staff to ensure that lessons are consistently focused on complex content that appropriately challenges students to meet grade level benchmarks. Also, he ensures the learning environment is safe, welcoming and encouraging students to take risks necessary to master the content. Additionally, he ensures that teachers are intentionally planning and facilitating the learning through use of high-quality, benchmark-aligned materials, monitoring data with a focus on the lowest 25%, SWD and ELL students and collaborating with the school community.
Batman, Amanda	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Batman coordinates all aspects of elementary curriculum. She assists teachers in interpreting and implementing the district's curriculum. She implements and schedules all standardized testing. She also demonstrates knowledge of human growth and development to ensure students progress mentally and academically.
Franklin, Loralee	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Franklin works with classroom teachers to ensure the quality of each lesson meets the intent of the statewide benchmarks. She coaches teachers to improve instructional delivery to meet the needs of all students. She facilitates MTSS and monitors student progress with focus on the lowest 25%, SWD and ELL students.
Gelfond, Kami	Teacher, ESE	As the ESE Lead, she ensures that all I.E.P's are being implemented and that all students are receiving the supports needed to be successful with the state benchmarks and IEP goals. Additionally, she serves as the SAC chair.
Nixon, Jessica	School Counselor	Mrs. Nixon is responsible for social emotional curriculum. She provides Sanford Harmony/Conscious Discipline supports to our teachers, students and families. She meets with students, teachers and parents to help create a safe school family. She collects data to write and implement all 504 plans and is an integral part of the MTSS & IPST teams.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Kelly Grugan L

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.*

7

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

44

Total number of students enrolled at the school

636

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

7

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	71	84	99	99	91	77	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	618
Attendance below 90 percent	3	9	13	13	7	11	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
One or more suspensions	0	3	2	6	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
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	6	8	13	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	45
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	6	16	12	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	5	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	3	0	0	2	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	3	7	3	6	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 6/16/2022

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	1	2	23	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	13	3	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	1	2	23	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	13	3	4	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	61%	61%	56%				59%	62%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	58%						62%	60%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%						62%	57%	53%
Math Achievement	64%	49%	50%				68%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	65%						70%	65%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%						58%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	47%	60%	59%				63%	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	62%	64%	-2%	58%	4%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	43%	61%	-18%	58%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2022					
	2019	67%	60%	7%	56%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
06	2022					
	2019	50%	60%	-10%	54%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-67%				

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	62%	61%	1%	62%	0%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	59%	64%	-5%	64%	-5%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2022					
	2019	68%	60%	8%	60%	8%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				
06	2022					
	2019	66%	67%	-1%	55%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-68%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	60%	56%	4%	53%	7%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

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	28	42	31	38	46	43	15				
ELL	57	56		52	69						
BLK	47	58		53	92						
HSP	58	63		64	77	55	40				
MUL	79	71		68	71						
WHT	63	57	42	63	58	44	49				
FRL	57	56	46	58	59	47	35				
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	30	20		43	70	75	46				
ELL	50	85		46	79		50				
ASN	67			67							
BLK	50			50							
HSP	66	79		60	83		47				
MUL	75	67		80	75						
WHT	59	48	22	66	73	59	49				
FRL	50	47	36	56	71	63	47				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	40	58	43	44	58	38	47				
ELL	58	63		64	53	58	42				
ASN	70			70							
BLK	50	56		55	67						
HSP	58	56	57	66	64	61	47				
MUL	63	57		73	71						
WHT	59	64	63	69	73	56	70				
FRL	53	59	59	62	66	56	56				

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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	70
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	457
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

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

Students With Disabilities	
-----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

English Language Learners	
----------------------------------	--

Federal Index - English Language Learners	61
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	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	63
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	60
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	72
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	54
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	53
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?

The data indicates our English Language Learners (ELL) subgroup is low performing. In the spring of 2022, this subgroup showed the lowest performance with only 29% of students achieving proficiency in ELA and 32% achieving proficiency in math on the FSA. On the IReady ELA diagnostic 1 to diagnostic 3, 64% of the ELL students in grades 3-6 made learning gains, while only 12% of this same group were considered 'proficient.'
 Our overall FSA ELA learning gains in grades 4-6 were 58% moving up 2% from 56% last year. Our overall FSA ELA proficiency in grades 4-6 were 61%, the same as last year.

Our data indicates our Students with Disabilities (SWD) subgroup is low performing. In the spring of 2022, this subgroup showed only 33% of students achieving proficiency in ELA and 39% achieving

proficiency in Math on the FSA..

On the IReady ELA diagnostic 1 to diagnostic 3, 54% of the ESE students in grades 3-6 made learning gains, while only 32% of this same group were considered 'proficient.'

Our data indicates our Lowest 25% group in Math is extremely low. Only 1 student out of 57 made a proficient (3) on the Math FSA. This affected our school grade by bringing our Math L25 Learning Gains plummet by 22 points.

Our overall FSA Math learning gains in grades 4-6 were 65%, dropping 10% from the year before. Our overall FSA Math proficiency in grades 4-6 were 64%, dropping a point (65%) from the year before.

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

Roy Allen's math data showed the greatest need for improvement. Overall math proficiency (64%) went down 1 point from last year. Math LG decreased by 10 points (65%), and Math L25 learning gains plummeted 22 points. In one year the Roy Allen Math L25 went from 70% to 48%.

According to the IReady diagnostic and FSA data stated above, the ELL and SWD student subgroup demonstrated the greatest need for improvement in both ELA and Math. Also, the huge decrease in our Lowest 25% student subgroup's learning gains needs to grow in both ELA and Math.

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 2021/2022 school year was a challenge across the country. Roy Allen's contributing factors included :

- Utilizing Title I personnel as substitutes impeding tiered instruction with our most fragile subgroups.
- Tier 2 and 3 small groups were not being completed with fidelity on a daily basis.
- Grade Level Planning Meetings were not productive across all grade levels.
- Inconsistent communication &/or expectations between grade levels and ESE personnel supporting them.

Actions Needed -

- Leadership Team involvement during grade level meetings to share specific strategies to meet the needs of our ELL, ESE, and L25% population.
- Continuing the Grade Level/Instructional Coach Planning Day (Qtrs. 1,2,3), now including our appointed Math Instructional Coach.
- Ensuring that small group intervention is happening for all ESE students with their ESE teacher and in the 90-minute reading block every day.

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

After reviewing IReady ELA Diagnostic Data, Roy Allen's Free and Reduced Lunch (FRL) showed the most improvement. 57% in grades 3-6th demonstrated proficiency from the fall to the Spring in IReady. 70% showed a Learning Gain.

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

Many factors contributed to the improvement of the FRL subgroup. Grade Level/ Instructional Coach Planning Days for all grades helped create a common language and strategies throughout the school.

Teachers identifying these students and their strengths/weaknesses in ELA, then ensuring those who need it are in an intervention group using explicit and systematic instruction.

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

Providing planning time for teachers and coaches will need to be a priority in order to learn new state benchmarks and new curriculum in Math. Teachers need the planning time to learn the new curriculum in order to strategically plan what information can be front loaded to accelerate learning. Continuing to support teachers pushing students to do the heavy lifting in learning as they provide support and encouragement will further support acceleration.

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.

BEST Strategies and new curriculum overviews will be shared with all teachers during Preplanning. Ongoing PD will be provided to teachers during Grade Level/Teacher Leader Math Planning Days Qtrs. 1,2,3. PD Time will be offered to teachers to view Math Diagnostic 3 data from the previous year and FAST Progress Monitoring 1 to support all learners.

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

This year the majority of PD will consist of learning the new BEST standards and the new Math curriculum. Consistent progress monitoring through observations and walkthroughs of on grade level Math instruction with appropriate task alignment will be the focus. Last year, in ELA, the focus was on whole group instruction of the new benchmarks and curriculum. This year in ELA, Roy Allen will focus on tightening up small group instruction. The Leadership team will use a shared Google spreadsheet to confirm that small group instruction is happening with fidelity and students are moving throughout the MTSS process expediently.

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: Roy Allen has identified that a focus on small group instruction in ELA will benefit all of our students as well as the subgroups that are identified below. The data indicates our English Language Learners (ELL) subgroup is low performing. In the spring of 2022, this subgroup showed the lowest performance with only 29% of students achieving proficiency in ELA. On the IReady ELA diagnostic 1 to diagnostic 3, 64% of the ELL students in grades 3-6 made learning gains, while only 12% of this same group were considered 'proficient.'

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Our overall ELA learning gains in grades 4-6 were 55%. Our overall ELA proficiency in grades 4-6 were 60%

Our data indicates our Students with Disabilities (SWD) subgroup is low performing. In the spring of 2022, this subgroup showed only 33% of students achieving proficiency in ELA. On the IReady ELA diagnostic 1 to diagnostic 3, 54% of the ESE students in grades 3-6 made learning gains, while only 32% of this same group were considered 'proficient.'

Measurable Outcome: Roy Allen's measurable outcome will be based on IReady Diagnostic 3 data procured in the Spring of 2023. Overall ELA proficiency for grades K-6 will be 75%. SWD ELA proficiency for grades K-6 will be 50%. ELL ELA proficiency for grades K-6 will be 50%.

Monitoring: After a year of introducing, utilizing, and focusing on whole group instruction of the Benchmark & Savvas curriculums, emphasis will now focus on small group instruction within the 90-minute reading block. Classroom Teachers along with the Leadership team will analyze IReady, FAST, & Benchmark Unit test results helping us create intervention groups. The use of small group intervention within the reading block and SWD pull out/push in time as well as the Intervention period will greatly improve Roy Allen's overall ELA proficiency. The ELL subgroup will have an additional intervention time with the ESOL teacher and IA to scaffold another support within the school day to acquire ELA proficiency.

Class and grade-wide ELA data (IReady, Benchmark Advance Assessments) will be monitored at weekly grade level meetings. Tier I, II, & III meetings were strategically planned to monitor the intervention cycles and ensure students are working towards the grade level expectations.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Loralee Franklin (franklin.loralee@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Use of the coaching cycle for guided collaborative planning, modeling, follow-up, and monitoring through instructional rounds and observation data. -Fidelity within (tier 2 and tier 3) MTSS with explicit instruction in phonics, vocabulary, fluency, comprehension. Response to Intervention and Improving Adolescent

strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Literacy: Effective Intervention Practices.

-Grade level teams meet weekly as well as receive one planning day a grading period. During these meetings some of the focus will be on small group instruction and intervention groups. The grade levels will receive mini ELA PDs. The coach will be available to Q/A, too.

-Tier 1 & Tier 2 data meetings are scheduled for the entire year. LLT & teachers will analyze the data collected and determine the next steps. We will adjust our Tier 2 groups as needed.

-The Literacy Coach along with teachers and the rest of the MTSS will work collaboratively to plan and analyze data for more intensified explicit intervention.

-Tier 2/Tier 3 strategies come from research-based programs for explicit, systematic instruction. These include, but are not limited to: Heggerty Phonemic Awareness and 95% Group (PASI, PLL, and Vocabulary Surge)

-LLT will use small group/intervention walkthroughs to determine if these groups are being taught with fidelity. Teachers will be using Phonological Awareness, Phonics, Fluency, and Vocabulary instruction from the 95% Group during their ELA intervention block.

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

During the 90-minute reading block, small group instruction will be specifically designed to meet the needs of all student, including our struggling ELL or SWD readers.

In addition, The RTI time will target these struggling students that need more specific support than the small group instruction occurring during the 90-minute reading block can give them.

Action Steps to Implement

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.

1. Teachers will provide differentiated daily small group reading instruction to all readers, regardless of additional supports outside of the classroom.
2. Teachers will regularly progress monitor, both formally and informally, and utilize data to develop individual & small groups, with a focus on the following subgroups: ELL, SWD, and L25.
3. Literacy Coach will provide support to teachers in all grade levels, including modeling, conferencing, lesson planning and PD.
4. Each teacher will demonstrate and receive feedback on small group instruction as measured by the walkthrough tool.

Person Responsible

Amanda Batman (batman.amanda@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.

During the 2021/2022 school year, our students declined in Math overall. Our overall Math learning gains in grades 4-6 were 58%. Our overall Math proficiency in grades 4-6 were 65%. Overall Math proficiency went down by 1 point resulting in 64%. Math Learning Gains went down by ten points resulting in 65%. Math Lowest 25% Learning gains went down 22 points resulting in 48%.

Measurable

Outcome:

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

School Grade and Learning Gains will not be able to be calculated this year due to new testing. Consequently, the objective of Roy Allen is to raise the proficiency level in all grade levels in mathematics during the 22/23 school year. Through the use of the new Reveal and EdGems curriculum, overall school proficiency will improve from 64% to 70%. Third grade proficiency will improve from 60 to 65, fourth grade will improve from 71 to 75, fifth grade will improve from 66 to 71, and sixth grade will improve from 59 to 65. These school-wide Math scores will increase as a result of teachers collaboratively planning to implement the new standards and curriculum.

Monitoring:

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

Classroom teachers will analyze the FAST progress monitoring and IReady Diagnostic data and conference with students quarterly to discuss progress of goals. Class and grade-wide Math data (FAST, IReady, Unit assessments) will be discussed at grade level meetings. Individual student progress will be discussed at monthly MTSS meetings.

Person

responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amanda Batman (batman.amanda@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

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

In whole group and small groups, teachers will discuss and refer to the mathematical purpose and goal of a lesson to ensure that students understand how the current work contributes to their learning. The strategy utilized to reach our goals will be the new Math Curriculums adopted in Brevard for Grades K-6. Along with our Math Coach, teachers will identify and monitor all students using unit assessments, with a focus on the ELL, SWD, & L25 subgroups. The Math coach will facilitate collaborative planning and coach teachers to determine the best use of time and resources to support interventions.

Rationale for

Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Every student needs access to high quality curriculum and instruction. Every teacher needs to strategically plan for on grade level and BEST standard aligned tasks during the whole group math block. During the math block, small group instruction will be able to meet the students' specific needs, especially struggling mathematicians. Grade level teams meet weekly as well as receive one planning day a grading period. During these meetings some of the focus will be on math whole group instruction and intervention groups. The grade levels will receive mini math PDs from the math coach.

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.

1. Continue support of Tier 1 Math Instruction using Reveal and EdGems with specific focus on grade-level aligned tasks and new state standards.
2. Teachers will identify and monitor all students using unit assessments, with a focus on the following subgroups: ELL, SWD, and L25.
3. The Math coach will facilitate collaborative planning and coach teachers implementing lessons with meaningful feedback.
4. Teachers, Math Coach and Administration will collaborate to determine the best use of time and resources to support interventions.

Person

Responsible

Amanda Batman (batman.amanda@brevardschools.org)

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Conscious Discipline

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Providing a social emotional supportive learning environment for students will promote healthy relationships, reduce stress and increase the capacity for students to learn. According to the Spring, 2022 Teacher Survey only 36% of teachers think expectations are consistent for student behavior. According to the Spring, 2022 Student Survey only 20% of students believe that their classmates behave well in class. Only 7% of students feel their teacher asks about their life at home.
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome. On the Spring, 2023 Teacher Survey, 50% of teachers will think expectations are consistent for student behavior. According to the Spring, 2023 Student Survey, 50% of students will believe that their classmates behave well in class, and 30% of student will feel that their teacher asks about their life at home based on the relationships that will be built through Conscious Discipline.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. At Roy Allen a Conscious Discipline Action Team (CDAT) has been created after the weeklong Conscious Discipline Summer Training. Each person that attended has also committed to completing the e-course offered by the district. At the monthly meetings, the pulse of the teachers and students will be discussed and monitored to ensure that relationships have been strengthened. Monthly behavior meetings are being implemented to track behaviors and interventions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Amanda Batman (batman.amanda@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. Roy Allen will provide timely, relevant professional development on Conscious Discipline.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy. Stress and trauma cross all ethnic and economic lines, with sad effects on health, learning, social-emotional development and brain development. Conscious Discipline is designed to teach effective social-emotional skills, and embed resiliency into the school culture as a way to counteract the stress and trauma that are so prevalent in our society. (Bailey, 2014)

Action Steps to Implement
 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.

1. Conscious Discipline Action Team will do the E-course and meet monthly to discuss implementation of Conscious Discipline school-wide.
2. Administration will continue to present Conscious Discipline videos at monthly faculty meetings.
3. Administration will continue to discuss and expect CD strategies to be utilized throughout the day.
4. Teachers will share positive CD scenarios within grade level meetings and faculty meetings.
5. Student Insight Survey will be analyzed for a decrease in trauma within the classroom.
6. Student Insight Survey will be analyzed for a greater feeling of relationships between teachers and students.

**Person
Responsible**

Amanda Batman (batman.amanda@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.

During preplanning, the staff reviewed the following surveys: Youth Truth Student Survey 2021- 2022, Parent Survey 2021- 2022 and the Teacher Insight Survey 2021-2022. From the results of these surveys, we found that we need to focus on building relationships with students and not wasting time during the school day based on the Youth Truth Student Survey, addressing communication with parents and providing more in school activities for parents to attend from the Parent Survey, and Professional Development Day opportunities and evaluation needs from the Teacher Insight Survey.

During pre- planning week, teachers were provided training on Conscious Discipline to promote a positive school climate and assist with behavior issues in the school. We will be a pilot school for Conscious Discipline for the 2022-2023 school year.

Although, we provide a rigorous curriculum within the classroom, we recognize the importance of developing relationships with students must come first and we will thrive to do this within the first month of school and continue throughout the school year. We aim for students to be able to reach and expand their potential and prepare them to become productive, responsible, ethical, creative and compassionate members of society.

Communication with parents is key to maintaining a positive school climate. We strive to provide parents avenues of communication that will involve one mode through the Focus Portal and student planners. Teachers may use other modes of communication, as well. Together, we will all work as a team for students to be successful academically and socially.

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

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 via newsletters, emails, dojos, and conferences. Teachers meet weekly to examine data to look for patterns among student groups. On the Youth Truth survey of the past school year, 75% of students believed that teachers treated them

with respect. This indicates that the students feel their teachers have developed a positive school environment focused on relationships and learning.