**Brevard Public Schools**

# Dr. W.J. Creel Elementary School



# 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# Dr. W.J. Creel Elementary School

## 2000 GLENWOOD DR, Melbourne, FL 32935

### http://www.creel.brevard.k12.fl.us

**Demographics**

## Principal: Nicole Gaumond

Start Date for this Principal: 6/29/2022

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>PK-6 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2021-22 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| **2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students*<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| **School Grades History** | 2021-22: D (40%)<br><br>2018-19: C (43%)<br><br>2017-18: D (40%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Southeast |
| **Regional Executive Director** | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield |
| **Turnaround Option/Cycle** | N/A |
| **Year** | N/A |
| **Support Tier** | N/A |
| **ESSA Status** | CSI |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here. | |

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard County School Board.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org.](www.floridacims.org.)

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

## Table of Contents

# Dr. W.J. Creel Elementary School

## 2000 GLENWOOD DR, Melbourne, FL 32935

## http://www.creel.brevard.k12.fl.us

## School Demographics

| **School Type and Grades Served** (per MSID File) | **2021-22 Title I School** | **2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3) |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary School PK-6 | Yes | 100% |

| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 53% |

## School Grades History

| Year | 2021-22 | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | D | | C | C |

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard County School Board.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement.**

As a school family, Dr W.J. Creel's mission is to empower each other to S.O.A.R. to greatness!

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Together We Will Achieve Greatness!

### 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 |
|---|---|---|
| Gaumond, Nicole | Principal | |
| Back, Erica | Assistant Principal | |
| Oberbeck, Sarah | Assistant Principal | |

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Wednesday 6/29/2022, Nicole Gaumond

**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.*
8

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**
68

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**
649

**Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.**
12

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.**
24

**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 | 74 | 101 | 80 | 84 | 66 | 84 | 96 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 585 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 22 | 20 | 14 | 14 | 19 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 102 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 10 | 3 | 8 | 5 | 7 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 |
| 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 | 16 | 6 | 35 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 89 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 11 | 39 | 45 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 106 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 23 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |

**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 | 1 | 4 | 7 | 12 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 |

**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 | 0 | 12 | 5 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Tuesday 8/30/2022

**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 | 108 | 89 | 91 | 98 | 102 | 94 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 669 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 11 | 23 | 9 | 7 | 20 | 12 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 99 |
| One or more suspensions | 3 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 8 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 |
| 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 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 26 | 29 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78 |
| LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA MATH | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 35 | 30 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 103 |

**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 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 27 | 24 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 |

**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 | 11 | 12 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

**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 | 108 | 89 | 91 | 98 | 102 | 94 | 87 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 669 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 11 | 23 | 9 | 7 | 20 | 12 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 99 |
| One or more suspensions | 3 | 5 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 8 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 |
| 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 | 4 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 |
| LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 26 | 29 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78 |
| LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA MATH | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 35 | 30 | 35 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 103 |

**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 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 27 | 24 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 |

**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 | 11 | 12 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |

## 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 | 40% | 61% | 56% | | | | 51% | 62% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 47% | | | | | | 48% | 60% | 58% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 33% | | | | | | 34% | 57% | 53% |
| Math Achievement | 44% | 49% | 50% | | | | 44% | 63% | 63% |
| Math Learning Gains | 50% | | | | | | 57% | 65% | 62% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 40% | | | | | | 35% | 53% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 24% | 60% | 59% | | | | 29% | 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 | 58% | 64% | -6% | 58% | 0% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 54% | 61% | -7% | 58% | -4% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -58% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 41% | 60% | -19% | 56% | -15% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -54% | | | | |
| 06 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 52% | 60% | -8% | 54% | -2% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -41% | | | | |

| 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 | 38% | 61% | -23% | 62% | -24% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 52% | 64% | -12% | 64% | -12% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -38% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 27% | 60% | -33% | 60% | -33% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -52% | | | | |
| 06 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 55% | 67% | -12% | 55% | 0% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -27% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 30% | 56% | -26% | 53% | -23% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 06 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -30% | | | | |

## 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 | 22 | 28 | 22 | 24 | 33 | 29 | | | | | |
| ELL | 36 | 61 | | 34 | 38 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 19 | 31 | 20 | 31 | 42 | 35 | 11 | | | | |
| HSP | 39 | 53 | 58 | 39 | 44 | 31 | 25 | | | | |
| MUL | 45 | 48 | | 50 | 62 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 49 | 50 | 32 | 50 | 56 | 43 | 31 | | | | |
| FRL | 35 | 45 | 32 | 36 | 49 | 42 | 18 | | | | |
| 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 | 21 | 39 | 38 | 24 | 33 | 19 | 19 | | | | |
| ELL | 37 | 59 | | 42 | 53 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 33 | 35 | 23 | 28 | 30 | 23 | 19 | | | | |
| HSP | 42 | 54 | 50 | 43 | 57 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 51 | 71 | | 31 | 44 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 48 | 49 | 55 | 46 | 39 | 18 | 32 | | | | |
| FRL | 38 | 42 | 33 | 34 | 38 | 21 | 24 | | | | |
| 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 | 16 | 28 | 26 | 10 | 33 | 37 | 8 | | | | |
| ELL | 35 | 34 | 29 | 41 | 56 | 27 | | | | | |
| BLK | 39 | 48 | 30 | 29 | 46 | 30 | 13 | | | | |
| HSP | 44 | 41 | 30 | 36 | 49 | 27 | 25 | | | | |
| MUL | 47 | 37 | | 35 | 50 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 58 | 52 | 41 | 52 | 64 | 41 | 37 | | | | |
| FRL | 46 | 44 | 34 | 37 | 52 | 35 | 22 | | | | |

## 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) | CSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 42 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 3 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 58 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 336 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| **Subgroup Data** | |
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 23 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 3 |
| **English Language Learners** | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 45 |
| 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 | 27 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 1 |
| **Hispanic Students** | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 43 |

| Hispanic Students | |
|---|---|
| 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 | 51 |
| 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 | 44 |
| 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 | 38 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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?**

MATH: Student data on FSA indicates a deficit in math proficiency (44%), learning gains (50%), and lowest 25% learning gains (40%). Proficiency is below district (56%) and state (52%) averages.

Science 24% (State 48%, District 55%) Student data on SSA indicates a deficit in science proficiency (25%). Proficiency is below both the district average (55%) and the state average (48%).

ELA: Student data on FSA indicates a deficit in ELA proficiency (40%), learning gains (47%), and lowest 25% learning gains (33%). Proficiency is below district (60%) and the state average (55%).

SWD performed below 32% for three consecutive years.

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

In 2021, data showed that the lowest performing area was in Science. In 2022, 24% of students were proficient in Science (State 48%, District 55%). Student data on SSA indicates a deficit in science proficiency (25%). Proficiency is below both the district average (55%) and the state average (48%).

The 21-22 iReady Diagnostic 3 Data shows that 31% of Kindergarten, 60% of First grade, and 62% of Second grade students in Grades K-2 are not on track to score grade level or above on the statewide ELA assessment.

21-22 FSA Data shows 60% of 3rd graders, 64% of 4th graders, and 68% of 5th graders scored below grade level (Levels 1 and 2).

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

To impact student achievement in Science, instructional planning and coaching systems are needed to provide clarity to all teaching staff. The Science Coach (T) will work with teachers on planning hands on, interactive science instruction. Science data will be monitored using district science assessments in grades 3-6. Teachers will also have opportunities to take their classes to the science lab. There they will observe the science coach teaching as well as be observed by the science coach while they are teaching in order to increase their capacity as teachers of science. The science coach will provide grade level PD on instructional teaching practices in science.

In 21-22, we had a reading intervention team in place at the beginning of the year. However, due to staff shortages, our intervention teachers and IAs (T & U) were put into the classroom to cover daily instruction. Therefore, reading interventions were not completed with fidelity. In the 22-23 school year, we are recommitting our focus to making reading interventions a priority. When we implemented reading interventions in previous school years, we did see growth and success with our students as readers. Data will be monitored weekly and discussed at monthly meetings where students are moved through groups based on their progress. Classroom teachers will work with the Reading Coach to plan instruction that implements the B.E.S.T. standards using best practices in ELA.

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

In 2022, the area that showed the most improvement was the learning gains category for math and lowest 25% learning gains in math. In 2021, 41% of students showed a learning gain in math and 29% of students in the lowest 25% showed a learning gain in math. The 2022 FSA results show improvements in math learning gains from 41% in 2021 to 50% in 2022. In the area of math lowest 25% learning gains there was an improvement from 29% in 2021 to 40% in 2022.

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

Administration, District and School-Based (T) Math Coaches, and Teachers worked closely together to analyze and own student data to guide instruction. During data conversations with all teachers subgroup data was analyzed and additional supports put in place based on subgroups and lowest 25% population. Teachers used this data to design and implement standards-based instruction that met the needs of their students. Teachers used student data to determine which skills students needed in order to be successful. Teachers then used 30 minutes of their 90 minute math block to accelerate learning in small groups. Teachers had access to more standards-based curriculum resources as well as planning time with District and School-Based (T) Math Coaches. We also added an additional 30 minute math

intervention block to all grade levels to ensure that students were getting classroom-based math interventions.

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

In order to accelerate student learning, teachers will continue to be trained on the new ELA B.E.S.T. Standards as well as the new standards-based curriculum that was adopted for the 21-22 school year. This will continue to enhance student learning in Tier 1 ELA instruction. In Math, teachers will be trained on the new Math B.E.S.T. Standards as well as the new standards-based curriculum that was adopted for the 22-23 school year. They will implement standards-based core instruction in the math block using whole group and small group models. Teachers in K-6 will also have an additional 30 minutes of math intervention each day to accelerate student learning. Reading and Math Interventionists (T) will be pulling groups out of classrooms to deliver research-based interventions based on student needs after data meetings with administration, coaches, and teachers. School-based Instructional Coaches (T) will provide support to teachers during Curriculum planning days, as well as through grade level meetings and coaching cycles with grade levels and individual teachers. Science coach (T) will work with teachers (monthly) using a systematic planning structure so that grade levels can stay on pace with the district and collaboratively plan utilizing the district curriculum and 5E process in order to increase the standards based instruction. Coaching systems will move teachers to the next level of deeper science knowledge and teaching practices which will benefit all students.

**Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.**

Teachers will have multiple opportunities to attend professional development on the new Math B.E.S.T. Standards, as well as the new Math curriculum that was adopted by the district. Teachers will also participate in grade level or individual Coaching Cycles with District and school-based Instructional Coaches (T). Teachers will use Teach Like a Champion (U) professional development to strengthen their instructional practices in all subject areas.

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

Teachers will have an increased knowledge of appropriate resources to utilize for both acceleration and intervention that will ensure sustainability of improvement. School based coaches will continue to work closely with teachers in coaching cycles to continue to grow all instructional practices within the building. The continuous growth and refining of our intervention plan to to meet all subgroup areas will also be key in ensuring long term sustainability. We will also continue monthly classroom walkthroughs with district school improvement staff as well as monthly check-ins with the State Coach for the RAISE program. In addition, the leadership team will do weekly walkthroughs utilizing the Walkthrough Tool. Our literacy coach will work closely with the state coach as we move throughout the year with the B.E.S.T. standards and keeping a focus on early literacy within the primary grades.

**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.** | Teacher learning and growth are dependent upon frequent interaction, dialogue, and reflection between themselves, instructional coaches, and administration. |
| **Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** | School-wide ELA scores will increase as a result of teacher collaboratively planning and the implementation of the B.E.S.T. standards utilizing an aligned, researched-based curriculum in all classrooms. In 2022, 47% of students scored a learning gain and 40% of students in grades 3-6 were proficient on the ELA FSA. The goal for 2023 is to increase students showing a learning gain to 52% and students meeting proficiency to 45% on the ELA FSA. In 2022, 33% of students in the lowest 25% category scored a learning gain. The goal for 2023 is to increase students in this category to a 38% learning gain. |
| **Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** | Teachers will monitor student progress in ELA utilizing the state progress-monitoring system three times per year, as well as the iReady diagnostic twice a year. Teachers in Grade K will utilize PASI and KLS assessments and teachers in Grades 1-2 will utilize PSI and ORR to monitor student progress on foundational reading skills. Teachers in Grades 1-6 will monitor student reading fluency utilizing the DORF. Teachers in Grades 3-6 will monitor student progress in writing utilizing the Write Score Assessment (T) three times per year. Teachers will also monitor comprehension utilizing end of unit assessments within the Saaves and Benchmark program to plan for instruction based on student understanding of new content. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Sarah Oberbeck (oberbeck.sarah@brevardschools.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented** | Utilization of collaborative planning with standards-aligned, research-based quality curriculum resources. |

| | |
|---|---|
| **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.** | Evidence supports that teaching strategies increase when teachers are given time to collaborate with peers and build their skills utilizing quality materials. This strategy when paired with administration walk throughs, immediate feedback, and common assessments can yield great results for all learners. |

### 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.

Teachers will collaboratively plan with district and school based-coaches (T) quarterly to map out ELA standards aligned curriculum including complex text, tasks, questions, and exit ticket for understanding. Early release Fridays will be utilized for collaborative planning with administration and coaches.

| **Person Responsible** | Sarah Oberbeck (oberbeck.sarah@brevardschools.org) |
|---|---|

Teachers will collaboratively work to increase understanding and implementation of best practice writing strategies for instruction. The Write Score online platform (T) will be used as a progress monitoring tool for writing in grades 3-6.

| **Person Responsible** | Kimberly Dias (dias.kimberly@brevardschools.org) |
|---|---|

Administration and coaches will utilize walkthrough tool aligned to school improvement gap analysis to monitor and provide actionable feedback to teachers.

| **Person Responsible** | Sarah Oberbeck (oberbeck.sarah@brevardschools.org) |
|---|---|

DATA: A data room will be utilized by the Title One team and admin to monitor ongoing progress of iReady diagnostics, the State-Monitoring tool, PASI, and PSI assessments school wide. (T)
Janet's Notes: add student data chats, teacher data chats etc.

| **Person Responsible** | Sarah Oberbeck (oberbeck.sarah@brevardschools.org) |
|---|---|

Teachers will monitor student progress through iReady diagnostics, the State-Monitoring tool, PASI, PSI, KLS, Running Records, and Oral Reading Fluency to guide and plan for standards based instruction.

Janet's notes: add student data chats as needed.

| **Person Responsible** | Kimberly Dias (dias.kimberly@brevardschools.org) |
|---|---|

School wide intervention will continue by utilizing iReady, State-Monitoring, PASI, PSI, and ORR data to focus on individual student needs facilitated by additional teachers, interventionists, and IA's. (T)

Add: SWD action steps including teacher actions related to planning, monitoring etc.

| **Person Responsible** | Kimberly Dias (dias.kimberly@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.** | Student data on FSA indicates a deficit in math proficiency (44%), learning gains (50%), and lowest 25% learning gains (40%). Proficiency is below district (56%) and state (52%) averages. To impact student achievement, instructional planning and coaching systems are needed to provide clarity to all teaching staff. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** | Math proficiency scores will increase as a result of teachers collaboratively planning and the implementation of standards-based instruction in all classrooms. The utilization of the Reveal (K-5) and EdGems (6) math program will impact student outcomes. In 2022, 50% of students scored a learning gain and 44% of students were proficient on the Math FSA. The goal for 2023 is to increase student proficiency from MATH FSA 21-22 at 44% (3+) to FAST 22-23 50% (3+). |
| **Monitoring:** **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** | Teachers will monitor student progress on iReady diagnostic (2x) and FAST (3x) per year. Teachers will monitor student progress utilizing unit assessments. Assessment data will be analyzed bi-monthly at MTSS meetings and grade-level planning sessions with coaches to determine skill deficits that will drive instructional planning for tiered math support.

All teachers will be tiered using the school-created coaching tool. This is used by administration and coaches to monitor and record teacher-selected areas of growth to improve instructional practices. Administration will utilize the school-created walkthrough tool on a weekly basis to identify standards-based instruction, research-based curriculum, specific teacher and student action look-fors, and student engagement. This data will provide quality instructional feedback to teachers. Evidence of Implementation: Student-performance data, coaching tool, and walkthrough tool data. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Erica Back (back.erica@brevardschools.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.** | Reveal Math and EdGems curriculum are strategically designed to fuel active student engagement and deepen conceptual understanding. This coherent, vertically aligned K–5 and 6th grade Tier 1 math curriculum will help uncover the mathematician in every student through productive struggle, rich tasks, inquiry opportunities, and mathematical discourse. Teachers will also utilize pre-assessment data from the curriculum to identify student gaps and address those needs in small groups. Teachers will monitor lowest 25% and use curriculum resources to fill the gaps within instruction. |

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

Evidence supports that teaching strategies increase when teachers are given time to collaborate with peers and build their skills utilizing quality materials. The strategy when paired with administration walk-throughs, immediate feedback, and common assessments can yield great results for all learners. Learners will be provided opportunities for productive struggle, rich tasks, inquiry opportunities, and mathematical discourse.

## 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.

Implement induction year of the Reveal program in K-5 and EdGems in 6th grade to increase student depth of knowledge on standards. Administration and coaches will develop a planning and coaching system with quality look-fors to provide clarity to all teachers for implementing new programs.

**Person Responsible** Courtney Droll (droll.courtney@brevardschools.org)

Math coach (T) will work with teachers (Gen Ed and ESE) using a systematic planning structure so that grade levels can stay on pace with the district and collaboratively plan utilizing the Reveal and Ed Gems Math curriculum in order to increase the standards based instruction and coaching systems will move teachers to the next level of deeper mathematical knowledge and teaching practices which will benefit all students.

**Person Responsible** Erica Back (back.erica@brevardschools.org)

Teachers will plan monthly with their team (including ESE teachers), district coach, and math coach (T) for whole group and small group math instruction as well as math interventions. Teachers will plan as a team weekly so they can support each other and work together to plan ahead and prep materials for lessons.

**Person Responsible** Erica Back (back.erica@brevardschools.org)

Administration and coaches will develop and utilize the walkthrough tool that will be aligned to school improvement goals and uncover the gaps in instructional practices. This monitoring system will provide actionable feedback to teachers and provide rationale for additional coaching cycles.

**Person Responsible** Erica Back (back.erica@brevardschools.org)

Math coach (T) will work with teachers and/or grade levels to model and co-teach lessons utilizing the walkthrough tool that contains quantified data. The data will be reviewed on a monthly basis and be compared to the coaching log. The math coach will also provide coaching cycles for teachers through a tiered approach to provide differentiated support.

**Person Responsible** Erica Back (back.erica@brevardschools.org)

Math coach (T) will facilitate PD opportunities on the new BEST standards for math for teachers including, but not limited to, schoolwide PD (once per semester), grade level PD (monthly), and voluntary math book studies (on-going) (T).

**Person Responsible**    Erica Back (back.erica@brevardschools.org)

Math coach (T) will work with grade level teams to track exit ticket data (formative assessment) and use that data to look at student successes and areas to grow before unit assessments and to make decisions about students to work with during math intervention and continue to target students who need extra support.

**Person Responsible**    Erica Back (back.erica@brevardschools.org)

Monthly data and MTSS meetings with teachers will continue and focus on the lowest 25% student population as well as ESSA categories identified under 41%. Classroom teachers will have data binders with student data sheets that will facilitate student/teacher data conversations. The expectation will be that data chats are occurring after each common assessment.

**Person Responsible**    Courtney Droll (droll.courtney@brevardschools.org)

Math coach (T) will utilize monthly planning sessions to model and disseminate math manipulatives to teachers to ensure that teachers have meaningful knowledge on how to use them effectively with students so students can engage in productive struggle and rich problem solving tasks. (T)

**Person Responsible**    Courtney Droll (droll.courtney@brevardschools.org)

Teachers in Grades K-6 will have an additional 30 minutes of math intervention to accelerate student learning and administer assessments that will determine skill gaps to identify to an appropriate intervention.

**Person Responsible**    Courtney Droll (droll.courtney@brevardschools.org)

Administration, coaches, and teachers will meet quarterly to analyze student data to determine students who are not showing learning gains and or meeting proficiency expectations. UNISIG funding will pay for additional teacher planning sessions for data analysis to ensure all students are predicted to make a years' growth.

Analyzation of data will occur to determine answers to the following:
*Did change happen?
*Can it be replicated?
*Is it sustainable?
*Is teacher-practice changing based on quantifiable data from look-for tool?
*Is student achievement data showing learning gains?
*Are the data tools being used to monitor instructional practices showing that implementation is being done with fidelity and quality of planning?

**Person Responsible**    Erica Back (back.erica@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. | Student data on SSA indicates a deficit in science proficiency (24%). Proficiency is below both the district average (55%) and the state average (48%). To impact student achievement, instructional planning and coaching systems are needed to provide clarity to all teaching staff. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome. | Schoolwide Science scores will increase as a result of teachers collaboratively planning and the implementation of standards based instruction in all classrooms with the district created Science resources aligned to standards based instruction. In 2022, 24% of 5th grade students were proficient on the SSA. The goal for the 2022-2023 school year is to increase the percentage of students proficient on the SSA to 40%. |
| **Monitoring:** Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome. | Teachers and Science Coach will monitor PENDA (grades 3-6) and district created science pre and post assessments (grades 3-6) throughout the year to ensure understanding of each standard. Assessment data will be analyzed bi-monthly at MTSS meetings and grade-level planning sessions with coaches to determine skill deficits that will drive instructional planning for tiered science support in grades 3-6. All teachers will be tiered using the school-created coaching tool. This is used by administration and coaches to monitor and record teacher-selected areas of growth to improve instructional practices. Administration will utilize the school-created walkthrough tool on a weekly basis to identify standards-based instruction, research-based curriculum, specific teacher and student action look-fors, and student engagement. This data will provide quality instructional feedback to teachers. Evidence of Implementation: Student-performance data, coaching tool, and walkthrough tool data. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Nicole Sherburne (sherburne.nicole@brevardschools.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. | Collaborative planning with science coach and district science content specialist on the utilization of the Five E model for hands on science instruction that will provide learners opportunities for productive struggle, rich tasks, inquiry opportunities, and student discourse. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Explain the rationale for | Evidence supports that teaching strategies increase when teachers are given time to collaborate with peers and build their skills utilizing quality materials. This strategy when paired with administration walkthroughs, immediate feedback, and common assessments can yield great results for all learners. Planning sessions |

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

need to have a clear structure to focus on the alignment of benchmarks, resources, student tasks, assessments, and the transfer to instruction.

**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.

Science coach (T) will work with teachers (monthly) using a systematic planning structure so that grade levels can stay on pace with the district and collaboratively plan utilizing the district curriculum and 5E process in order to increase the standards based instruction. Coaching systems will move teachers to the next level of deeper science knowledge and teaching practices which will benefit all students.

**Person Responsible**        Erica Back (back.erica@brevardschools.org)

Teachers will plan collaboratively with grade-level team and Science coach (T) (monthly) using the standards aligned science resources created by the district. This collaboration will aid in increasing standards-based instruction and a deeper science knowledge for all students.

**Person Responsible**        Erica Back (back.erica@brevardschools.org)

Administration and coaches will utilize walkthrough tool (weekly) aligned to school improvement gap analysis to monitor and provide actionable feedback to teachers.

**Person Responsible**        Erica Back (back.erica@brevardschools.org)

The continuation of Generation Genius (schoolwide) and PENDA for science interactive instruction grades 3rd - 6th. (T) These standards-based programs will help to reinforce skills, and deepen understanding of grade level science benchmarks as documented by classroom achievement data collected from PENDA activities, as well as district summative assessments.

**Person Responsible**        Erica Back (back.erica@brevardschools.org)

Science coach (T) will model and coach teachers on standards aligned science instruction during science lab and provide feedback for teacher growth in grades 3-6.

**Person Responsible**        Erica Back (back.erica@brevardschools.org)

Science coach (T) will work with grade level teams to track formative and summative data (district, Penda, SSA prep) and use that data to look at student successes and areas to grow before upcoming unit assessments. Then make decisions about which students will benefit from additional support during science lab and continue to target those students.

**Person Responsible**        Nicole Sherburne (sherburne.nicole@brevardschools.org)

Monthly data and MTSS meetings with teachers will continue and focus on the lowest 25% student population as well as ESSA categories identified under 41%. Classroom teachers will have data binders with student data sheets that will facilitate student/teacher data conversations. The expectation will be that data chats are occurring after each common assessment.

**Person Responsible**        Erica Back (back.erica@brevardschools.org)

Students in grade 5 will participate in L3Harris Super Science Saturdays led by the district science cadre who will model the lessons for our science coach (T) and 5th grade science teachers. This program is designed to remediate 3rd and 4th grade benchmarks to reinforce concepts that are assessed on the Grade 5 SSA. The evidence of impact will be shown analyzing the pre and post assessments that are connected to the Science Saturday concepts. The lessons will then be taught to all students in the science classrooms/lab by the teachers/coach.

**Person Responsible**     Erica Back (back.erica@brevardschools.org)

The science coach (T) will create a Science Google Classroom that will be shared with parents at the first family engagement night. Parents will then have on-going science resources (monthly) to support at home as grade levels work through the district pacing calendar and new concepts have been taught. These reminders will be communicated through the school-wide family newsletter.

**Person Responsible**     Erica Back (back.erica@brevardschools.org)

Students in grades 4-5 will participate in an on-campus hands-on science investigation (Diamond Del Gem Mining) in alignment with the Earth and Space body of knowledge, Big Idea Earth Structures. Students will be immersed in the first two phases of The 5E Model (engage and explore). Teachers, with the support of the science coach (T), will then continue the 5E process (explore, explain, elaborate, evaluate) in the classroom/lab for student benchmark mastery.

**Person Responsible**     Nicole Sherburne (sherburne.nicole@brevardschools.org)

| #4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Lifeskills | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** | In the 2021-2022 school year, our students had a combined 123 days of suspension. There were 1013 total referrals. Positive School culture and environment is an area of focus with the goal of decreasing in-school and out of school suspensions through the use of SEL strategies and support. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** | Short term: Through the use of School Recommitment forms, total number of suspensions will decrease by 5%. Long Term: By the Spring 2023, total number of referrals will decrease by 10%. |
| **Monitoring:** **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** | Teachers will monitor student progress utilizing the State-Monitoring Tool, iReady diagnostic scores, and supplemental resources. This data will guide conversation in MTSS meetings when we discuss the needs of the whole child. We look at the SEL and academic needs of our students with the goal of decreasing student referrals. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Nicole Gaumond (gaumond.nicole@brevardschools.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.** | Conscious Discipline has achieved CASEL's SELect Program designation, recognizing Conscious Discipline as a leader in impactful social and emotional learning (SEL). Conscious Discipline meets CASEL's SELect Program designation, the highest designation for evidence-based programs. Conscious Discipline is an evidence-based, trauma-informed approach. The Harvard study's authors say, "Conscious Discipline provides an array of behavior management strategies and classroom structures that teachers can use to turn everyday situations into learning opportunities." |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the** | A collaborative problem planning approach will be utilized to make data driven instructional decisions to ensure that the needs of all students are being addressed. Additionally, school-based collaborative teams will focus on identified groups of under-performing students in an effort to provide unified and accelerated support. Additionally, Conscious Discipline can play a central role in our school's approach to promoting student social and emotional learning to close learning gaps. |

**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.

When addressing the needs of our students, we look at inclusion opportunities to include all core content areas, morning meetings, and opportunities for social and emotional support.

**Person Responsible**     Nicole Gaumond (gaumond.nicole@brevardschools.org)

Instructional Leader(s) will lead the MTSS/Data bi-weekly meetings as the key person(s) responsible for the oversight and coordination of goals and action steps related to inclusive best practices.

**Person Responsible**     Nicole Gaumond (gaumond.nicole@brevardschools.org)

When reviewing data, we will ensure that data chats are inclusive for all ESSA sub-categories. Prioritizing each sub group will ensure none of our students and their needs get overlooked.

**Person Responsible**     Nicole Gaumond (gaumond.nicole@brevardschools.org)

Teachers will collaboratively plan with district and school based-coaches (T) quarterly to map out ELA standards aligned curriculum including complex text, tasks, questions, and exit tickets for understanding. Early release Fridays will be utilized for collaborative planning with administration and coaches. Extended common planning time will provide teachers with in-depth collaboration on standards aligned instruction, and Social Emotional Life Skills professional development.

**Person Responsible**     Nicole Gaumond (gaumond.nicole@brevardschools.org)

As a Conscious Discipline Anchor School school with in-person coaching, we get additional support for select teachers and Administrators, including our CDAT team. These certified instructors provide coaching, mentoring, and consultation to ensure fidelity and successful implementation of Conscious Discipline.

**Person Responsible**     Carmen Bernard (bernard.carmen@brevardschools.org)

Administration will support faculty and staff with Conscious Discipline implementation by providing training and coaching opportunities, as well as materials to support implementation in the classroom. They will monitor instructional engagement w/in the ESSA subgroups during classroom walkthroughs and observations, as well as implementation of strategies for engagement through Conscious Discipline. They will Model Conscious Discipline strategies at faculty meetings and provide connection opportunities for faculty and staff to build school community among the adults as well.

**Person Responsible**     Nicole Gaumond (gaumond.nicole@brevardschools.org)

**RAISE**

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale**

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

**Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA**

The 21-22 iReady Diagnostic 3 Data shows that 31% of Kindergarten, 60% of First grade, and 62% of Second grade students in Grades K-2 are not on track to score grade level or above on the statewide ELA assessment.

Planning sessions will have a clear structure to focus on the alignment of Benchmarks, resources, student tasks, assessments, and the transfer of instruction.

**Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA**

21-22 FSA Data shows 60% of 3rd graders, 64% of 4th graders, and 68% of 5th graders scored below grade level (Levels 1 and 2).
Our focus will be to increase primary literacy achievement so that gaps will not be as prominent in grades 3-5. Our planning sessions need to have a clear structure to focus on the alignment of benchmarks, resources, student tasks, assessments, and the transfer to instruction.

**Measurable Outcomes:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

**Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)**

Short term: From FAST-STAR-PM1 to PM2, literacy achievement will increase by 5%.
Long Term: By the Spring 2023 FAST, literacy achievement will increase by 10%.

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

School-wide ELA scores will increase as a result of teacher collaboratively planning and the implementation of the B.E.S.T. standards utilizing an aligned, researched-based curriculum in all classrooms. In 2022, 47% of students scored a learning gain and 40% of students in grades 3-6 were proficient on the ELA FSA. The goal for 2023 is to increase students showing a learning gain to 52% and students meeting proficiency to 45% on the ELA FSA. In 2022, 33% of students in the lowest 25% category scored a learning gain. The goal for 2023 is to increase students in this category to a 38% learning gain.

3rd grade will grow from 40% proficiency 3+ to 50% proficiency
4th grade will grow from 36% proficiency 3+ to 50% proficiency
5th grade will grow from 32% proficiency 3+ to 50% proficiency

**Monitoring:**
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Teachers will monitor student progress in ELA utilizing the state progress-monitoring system three times per year, as well as the iReady diagnostic twice a year. Teachers in Grade K will utilize PASI and KLS assessments and teachers in Grades 1-2 will utilize PSI and ORR to monitor student progress on foundational reading skills. Teachers in Grades 1-6 will monitor student reading fluency utilizing the DORF. Teachers in Grades 3-6 will monitor student progress in writing utilizing the Write Score Assessment (T) three times per year. Teachers will also monitor comprehension utilizing end of unit assessments within the Saaves and Benchmark program to plan for instruction based on student understanding of new content. The literacy leadership team will monitor all grade level data to determine trends and adjust planning/instruction/intervention as needed.

Impact at EOY: There will be a student performance increase on the following platforms: FAST, iREADY, Benchmark Advance assessments, OPMs

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Gaumond, Nicole, gaumond.nicole@brevardschools.org

**Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Kindergarten through fifth grade teachers will implement the Benchmark Universe curriculum and sixth grade teachers will implement the Savvas curriculum, both align with the B.E.S.T. Standards. Teachers will also utilize Lexia, iReady, Read Naturally, Visualizing and Verbalizing, Imagine Learning and 95% Group materials during the intervention process. These materials are systematic and explicit as well as meet Florida's definition of evidence-based materials.
Teachers will also be given standards-aligned Collaborative Planning time, Site-based Coach Support, Ongoing PD utilizing Teach Like a Champion (these PDs equip teachers with various strategies to increase academic instruction in ELA), Instructional Expectations, and research-based quality curriculum resources. Pacing and guidance documents for core instruction will be referenced with fidelity to support K-12 implementation.
Decision Trees and IPST Forms 1-8 are tools used in MTSS process.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

K-6 data shows Creel students need explicit, systematic phonics instruction. All evidence-based practices/ programs listed above address the identified need that is improving primary literacy achievement. The identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population as they are B.E.S.T. Standards Aligned, aligned with Brevard K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan, meet Florida's definition of evidence-based, are systematic and explicit, and geared towards struggling readers with and emphasis on Foundational Skills such as Phonological Awareness and Phonics.

**Action Steps to Implement:**
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

| Action Step | Person Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|
| Administration will define roles and establish a Principal-Coach partnership agreement to specify duties and activities of the coach and how the Principal will provide support, and collaborate with content coaches before/after planning. Administration will clearly communicate the expectations for planning sessions with coaches and teachers at Dr. W.J. Creel Elementary, and develop content area planning protocols that will delineate expectations for benchmark-aligned instructional practices. | Oberbeck, Sarah, oberbeck.sarah@brevardschools.org |
| Literacy coach will lesson plan with teachers, model, co-teach, engage in reflective conversations, and engage in data chats. During planning, literacy coach will focus on teacher clarity, instructional model and strategies, questioning and assessments that align with the benchmarks and will support intended learning. Literacy coach will identify and plan for the supports that teachers will need before, during, and after planning. Grade levels will plan for half a day, two times a quarter. Subs (UNISIG) will cover classrooms to allow for this planning to occur. ELA Instructional Assistants will provide explicit, systematic phonics instruction based on targeted intervention data. Two IA positions allocated to serve K-3 students with a focus on early literacy. The Literacy Coach will work with the IA's to provide training, weekly support, and feedback. | Dias, Kimberly, dias.kimberly@brevardschools.org |
| Teachers will use program assessments for foundational reading skills, along with DIBELS measures, PASI, PSI, and ORR to monitor reading skills development. Literacy coach will work with teachers to define performance criteria based on assessment data that prompts the addition of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions for students not meeting expectations and or benchmarks. The literacy team will have data chats regularly around Benchmark Advance assessments, iReady, FAST, and intervention OPMs to determine next steps. | Oberbeck, Sarah, oberbeck.sarah@brevardschools.org |
| Literacy Coaches will provide Job- embedded PD and side by side coaching. On-site intervention material and instruction PD will be provided by Literacy Coach and/or Leadership team. The literacy leadership team will identify mentor teachers and establish model classrooms for other members of the teaching staff to visit. The literacy leadership team will ensure that time is provided for teachers to meet weekly for professional development using the professional development needs assessment. | Oberbeck, Sarah, oberbeck.sarah@brevardschools.org |
| ESE teachers will meet weekly with the literacy leadership team to review and analyze data, and bi-weekly with the Literacy Coach to plan curriculum lessons. ESE teachers will implement the Benchmark curriculum in their instruction to target the specific needs of the ESE population, as well as other sub groups that are identified as needing additional instruction. | Dias, Kimberly, dias.kimberly@brevardschools.org |
| The ELL teacher and Instructional Assistant will implement the Imagine curriculum in their instruction as a content-based approach to literacy instruction utilizing real-world compelling texts to engage and excite learners that are currently in our ELL programs. The ELL teacher will share intervention strategies from this program with teachers to ensure there is cohesive approach to supporting the ELL students. | Oberbeck, Sarah, oberbeck.sarah@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 the 2022 summer, the CDAT (Conscious Discipline Action Team) attended the Conscious Discipline weeklong Summer Institute. A deeper conceptual understanding was learned about the brain-states and how they relate to all stakeholders and the need for continued schoolwide implementation. The CDAT created processes and forms that will be utilized to support with social/emotional/behavioral interventions. Conscious Discipline common language will be consistent throughout the process with teachers, support tea, and administration.

During pre-planning, all teachers attended a full-day training with a Conscious Discipline trainer. Teachers were given strategies for building a sense of safety within their classrooms and school leaders were given strategies for building connections and community school-wide. Data has shown that our teachers want this support in their classrooms so they are better prepared to help their students not only academically, but socially and emotionally as well.

In addition to addressing positive school culture for the students at Dr. WJ Creel, we are choosing to focus on the emotional wellness of the adults on our campus as well. In doing so, we are utilizing Conscious discipline structures such as a staff safe place, where they can go to recharge and find a moment of calm. This can be used as a model for adults so they can experience the benefits and in turn, offer it to their students.

In Year 3 of Conscious Discipline, we will continue to support teachers and students to ensure successful implementation. We have a designated time in our schedules for Brain Start Smarts and Wish Wells, which will allow our students to be in a good mindset for the rigorous academic instruction throughout the day. This will also allow our students to be better equipped to acquire the knowledge, attitudes, and skills necessary to recognize and manage their emotions, demonstrate caring and concern for others, establish positive relationships with peers and adults, make responsible decisions, and positively navigate challenging social situations through the utilization of Caring School Community and Conscious Discipline. We will continue the Student Ambassador program to give students opportunities for leadership on campus and to be role models for their peers. This program will be sponsored by members of our School Support Team.

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

Leadership Team: Support faculty and staff with Conscious Discipline by providing training and coaching opportunities, as well as materials to support implementation in the classroom. Model Conscious Discipline strategies at faculty meetings and provide connection opportunities for faculty and staff to build school community among the adults as well.

Teachers: Follow the Caring School Community and Conscious Discipline Plans created by our School Support Team and implementing Brain Smart Starts, Wish Wells, and other Conscious Discipline strategies in their classrooms. Communicate with parents about student progress in social emotional and academic areas.

Coaches (T): Embed modeling Conscious Discipline strategies while working in classrooms with teachers in their specific content area.

Title 1 Team (T): Share information on school social media site and host parent and family engagement events that highlight social emotional learning strategies that parents can use at home to make a home-school connection.

Parents: Attend information sessions about Conscious Discipline, communicate with child's teacher about social emotional as well as academic progress, and reinforce positive strategies and attitudes about self and school at home.

Business Partnerships: Attend and support community events related to social emotional well-being.