

Brevard Public Schools

Jupiter 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	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Jupiter Elementary School

950 TUPELO RD SW, Palm Bay, FL 32908

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

Demographics

Principal: Sherie Troisi L

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2014

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	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
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 (60%) 2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	16
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Jupiter Elementary School

950 TUPELO RD SW, Palm Bay, FL 32908

<http://www.jupiter.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	63%

School Grades History

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

Reaching every child, every day. (Reviewed August 2022)

Provide the school's vision statement.

Jupiter Elementary School will challenge our diverse community of learners, and establish a positive and productive school culture, set high expectations for achievement, and encourage independent, self-directed learning. (Reviewed August 2022)

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
Troisi, Sherie	Principal	As the instructional leader, Sherie Troisi provides vision and strategic focus for all stakeholders. She ensures high academic expectations for all students by holding teachers accountable through regular observations with feedback and individual teacher data chats, supervises curriculum and instruction and ensures weekly data analysis and progress monitoring are occurring. She facilitates weekly leadership team meetings to review student data (academic, behavioral and attendance) and current practices to determine professional development needs and/or additional supports for teachers and students.
Ouellette, Amber	Assistant Principal	Amber Ouellette supports classroom instruction by ensuring all teachers have the appropriate curriculum and instructional resources. She conducts regular classroom observations with feedback to improve instructional practices. Mrs. Ouellette oversees the implementation of our response to intervention and our academic support programs and oversees our new teacher mentor program. She organizes and facilitates professional development and coordinates all testing.
Cirino, Stacy	Teacher, K-12	Stacy Cirino coordinates our Title I program. She supports administration with discipline, maintains discipline records and oversees our Behavior Intervention Room. Mrs. Cirino supports classroom teachers in the areas of classroom management and math instruction utilizing the coaching model and coordinates our new teacher program. Mrs. Cirino provides RtI instruction to students in need of academic support for 80% of her day.
Rice, Crystal	Instructional Coach	As our Literacy Coach, Crystal Rice supports classroom teachers with all aspects of reading instruction. She utilizes the coaching model to support reading instruction, coordinates implementation of iReady Reading and Lexia, mentors teachers and facilitates our weekly child chats.
Brennan, Nancy	Teacher, ESE	Nancy Brennan is the Lead ESE Teacher. She works with the ESE team to ensure that all students with disabilities are provided rigorous instruction designed to meet their individual needs. She monitors the academic progress of our students with disabilities and ensures that classroom teachers are aware of student accommodations.
Daniels, Chrystal	School Counselor	Chrystal Daniels coordinates our MTSS program. She supports classroom teachers with the creation and implementation of behavior plans and supports the social emotional needs of our students via individual and small group counseling.
Bach, Rebecca	Teacher, K-12	Becky Bach provides RtI instruction to students in need of academic support. She also serves as a mentor teacher and supports teachers through modeling

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		best practices, observation of classroom instruction and providing feedback on effective instructional practices.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Tuesday 7/1/2014, Sherie Troisi 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.*

6

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.*

12

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

60

Total number of students enrolled at the school

734

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

13

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

13

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	88	103	92	116	86	91	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	655
Attendance below 90 percent	11	30	20	21	16	15	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	126
One or more suspensions	0	6	9	5	4	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	17	19	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	12	18	22	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	76
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	4	9	8	23	6	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	62

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	3	4	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	8	16	3	15	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/25/2022

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	96	108	90	106	88	80	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	665
Attendance below 90 percent	6	16	6	11	6	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	8	2	1	0	3	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
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	29	28	21	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	104
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	30	28	36	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	118
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	2	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	3	2	9	10	22	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	67

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	8	5	10	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	96	108	90	106	88	80	97	0	0	0	0	0	0	665
Attendance below 90 percent	6	16	6	11	6	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	8	2	1	0	3	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
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	29	28	21	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	104
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	30	28	36	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	118
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	1	2	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	3	2	9	10	22	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	67

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	6	8	5	10	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	52%	61%	56%				47%	62%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	67%						57%	60%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	67%						66%	57%	53%
Math Achievement	58%	49%	50%				48%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	68%						59%	65%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	67%						47%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	39%	60%	59%				34%	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	49%	64%	-15%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	48%	61%	-13%	58%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
05	2022					
	2019	38%	60%	-22%	56%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				
06	2022					
	2019	47%	60%	-13%	54%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				

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	43%	61%	-18%	62%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	40%	64%	-24%	64%	-24%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2022					
	2019	42%	60%	-18%	60%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				
06	2022					
	2019	59%	67%	-8%	55%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	33%	56%	-23%	53%	-20%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-33%				

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	30	60	67	40	68	70	27				
ELL	30	75	75	38	57		20				
BLK	46	63	58	52	73	72	25				
HSP	48	76	86	52	64	70	29				
MUL	49	68		55	69						
WHT	60	65	64	64	66	55	58				
FRL	44	59	61	53	66	63	32				
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	19	14	9	28	31	18	11				
ELL	17	35		19	41						
BLK	45	45	25	26	36	13	26				
HSP	28	31	36	26	42	20	7				
MUL	34	29		49	43		42				
WHT	48	54		54	52	42	44				
FRL	35	32	22	36	41	26	18				
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	28	58	53	23	59	61					
ELL	25	55		22	65						
BLK	33	49	60	36	49	38	15				
HSP	50	67	69	47	63	50	36				
MUL	52	58		67	72						
WHT	53	57	81	53	61	53	48				
FRL	42	57	65	43	57	46	27				

ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	85
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	503
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	52
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	54
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	56
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	64

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	60
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	62
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	58
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?

Across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas, Jupiter Elementary has found that growth in learning gains has been inconsistent. In 2019, 59% of students made learning gains on the FSA in Math, however, in 2021 only 44% of students made learning gains. In 2022, the number of students making learning gains in math increased to 68%, an overall increase of 24%.

In ELA, we have identified a similar trend. In 2019, 66% of students made learning gains on the FSA in ELA but learning gains decreased in 2021 to 31%. In 2022, learning gains increased to 67%, an overall increase of 35%.

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

In 2021, 40% of students scored a level 3 or higher on the Florida State Assessment (FSA) in math. The number of students that scored a level 3 in 2022 increased to 58%. In 2021, 41% of students scored a level 3 or higher on the FSA in ELA. The number of students that scored a level 3 in 2022 increased to 52%. FSA data indicates that Grades 3 and 4 ELA are areas demonstrating the greatest need as only 46% scored level 3 or higher in Grade 3 and 48% in Grade 4.

In 2021 34% of our students scored proficient on the Florida Science Assessment. In 2022, the number of students at level 3 or higher increased to 39%. However, our science scores continue to fall below state (48%) and district (55%) average.

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

Based on inconsistent growth in Grades 3 and 4 ELA and average scores consistently being below 50%, improvement in MTSS Tiered instruction at Jupiter Elementary is a great need. Fifteen of the current Grade 3 students were retained, 14 of which scored a level 1 on the 2022 FSA. Seventeen current Grade 4 students scored a level 1. Based on this data, improvement and consistency in evidenced-based instruction at all levels is a priority.

Actions that must be continued are collaborative planning and departmentalization of Grades 3 through 6, continue providing professional development of an effective RTI model, and provide professional development on evidenced-based programs providing systematic and explicit instruction. We will also focus on the use of instructional time at the Tier 1 level to ensure that students are fully engaged and doing the thinking that the lesson demands. Data analysis linked to core, supplemental, and intensive instruction will be emphasized.

To impact science achievement, we will monitor the implementation of our Penda learning science program. We will use the data from weekly Penda reports to inform instruction and support student learning.

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

2021-2022 iReady diagnostic assessments: Based on the Math end-of-year i-Ready diagnostic our level of proficiency increased from 44% to 50%. Based on ELA end-of-year i-Ready diagnostic our proficiency level increased from 56% to 63%. On both the ELA and Math iReady diagnostic assessments, students in Kindergarten and first grade experienced the most growth. Students in fifth grade demonstrated the least amount of growth in both ELA and Math.

In 2022, the number of students that scored a level 3 on the Florida State Assessment in Math increased from 40% to 58%. The number of students that scored a level 3 on the Florida State Assessment in ELA increased from 41% to 52%.

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

One of the greatest contributing factors to improvement was the consistent practice of evidence-based instruction through the adopted curriculum. An additional contributing factor for this improvement includes teachers ensuring students completed forty-five minutes of their instructional path in both ELA and math. In math, students participated in a "Pass 5" initiative to encourage and celebrate lessons passed weekly. During weekly grade-level meetings, data were used to determine which standards to reteach and provide intervention. Teachers participated in consistent grade-level collaborative planning in both Math and Reading to guide instruction.

During the 2021-2022 school year, we began departmentalizing in grades 3-6, allowing teachers to teach to their strengths in specific content areas, which is another contributing factor to the improvements.

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

Jupiter Elementary will accelerate learning by using i-Ready diagnostic data and the F.A.S.T Progress Monitoring assessments to diagnose essential missed learning. Learning will be accelerated by increasing ELA and math small group instruction daily during Tier 1. Additionally, students receiving Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions will engage in targeted lessons through systematic, explicit instruction.

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.

Professional development will be provided on an effective RTI Model, with a focus on evidence-based programs providing explicit instruction, progress monitoring tools, and effective data tracking. Collaborative planning sessions will focus on Tier 1 pacing of instruction and small group instruction.

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

1. Utilize District and ESSER funds to provide additional academic support before/after school.
2. Summer Academic Clinic to avoid summer slide in ELA and math
3. Continue math "Pass 5" initiative
4. School-wide reading challenges
5. Continue to use VAM scores and teachers strengths for teacher placement

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 Collaborative Planning

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

Data showed that in 2021, 40% of students scored a level 3 or higher on the Florida State Assessment in math. The number of students that scored a level 3 in 2022 increased to 58%. In 2021, 44% percent of students made learning gains in math. In 2022, the number of students making learning gains in math increased to 68%. In addition, the 2021 Spring i-Ready Diagnostic indicated 56% of students scored below grade level. 2022 Spring iReady data showed 49% of students scored below grade level, a decrease from the previous year.

Data show that in 2021, 41% of students scored a level 3 or higher on the Florida State Assessment in ELA. The number of students that scored a level 3 in 2022 increased to 52%. In 2021, 44% percent of students made learning gains in ELA, in 2022, the number of students making learning gains in ELA increased to 67%. In addition, the 2021 Spring i-Ready Diagnostic indicated 44% of students scored below grade level. 2022 Spring iReady data showed 2022 data showed 37% of students scored below grade level, a decrease from the previous year.

Jupiter Elementary will increase the number of students on grade level or above in ELA and math as evidenced by Florida's Assessment of Student Thinking (F.A.S.T.) and i-Ready assessments.

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

On the 2022 Spring i-Ready diagnostic, End-of-Year View, 24% of students scored on grade level or above in math. Jupiter will increase the number of students scoring on grade level or above to 50% by the end of the year diagnostic.

On the 2022, Spring i-Ready diagnostic, End-of-Year View, 36% of student scored on grade level or above in ELA. Jupiter will increase the number of students scoring on grade level or above to 50% by the end of the year diagnostic.

Jupiter will increase the percent of students at proficiency to 55% or higher in ELA and math and 60% or higher will demonstrate learning gains on the 2023 F.A.S.T.

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

The leadership team will attend weekly collaborative planning sessions with each grade level to monitor pacing of instruction. Professional development will be provided to meet the needs of individual grade levels. Follow up to professional development will occur during data chats and coaching sessions.

Ongoing monitoring will be done utilizing the following measures: F.A.S.T. Progress Monitoring, iReady Reading/Math Diagnostic Assessments, District

	reading/math assessments, and grade level specific common formative math assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sherie Troisi (troisi.sherie@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	<p>The evidence-based strategy Jupiter will implement during the 2022-2023 school year is collaborative planning utilizing Reveal (K-5) and EdGems (6) for math and Florida Benchmark Advance (K-5) and SAVVAS (6) for ELA as our Tier 1 curriculum.</p> <p>According to the research article, Teacher Collaboration in Perspective, "Schools that are more collaborative have been shown to have stronger student academic outcomes than schools that are less collaborative." Our experience aligns to this research showing that as we continue to grow collaboratively our students are growing academically.</p> <p>More than 50% of our students are proficient in ELA and math based on 2022 FSA Achievement data. This indicates that instructional practice specifically relating to collaborative planning was an effective area of focus in 2021-2022 school year that Jupiter will continue to implement for the 2022-2023 school year. To continue with a focus on Tier 1 instruction.</p> <p>Research has shown that schools with better-quality collaboration, had higher student achievement gains in math and reading. In previous years teachers have not followed the district pacing and sequencing guides nor used collaborative planning time effectively. This has led to a decrease in student achievement. Maintaining our focus on collaborative planning for instruction and use of high quality instructional materials will support teachers in identifying their students' instructional needs.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	
Action Steps to Implement List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.	
Provide Professional Development around the new math curriculum, BEST ELA and Math Standards, iReady Math Prerequisite Data and iReady Reading implementation. (T)	
Person Responsible	Sherie Troisi (troisi.sherie@brevardschools.org)
Provide teachers time each week, during their planning time, to plan collaboratively with the leadership team and coaches. (T)	
Person Responsible	Amber Ouellette (ouellette.amber@brevardschools.org)
Analyze F.A.S.T and i-Ready data to monitor student progress and make necessary instruction adjustments.	
Person Responsible	Sherie Troisi (troisi.sherie@brevardschools.org)
Conduct classroom observations with feedback to monitor implementation of plans.	
Person Responsible	Sherie Troisi (troisi.sherie@brevardschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

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

In 2021, 40% of students scored a level 3 or higher on the Florida State Assessment in Math. The number of students that scored a level 3 in 2022 increased to 58%. In 2021, 41% of students scored a level 3 or higher on the Florida State Assessment in ELA. The number of students that scored a level 3 in 2022 increased to 52%.

In 2021, 44% of students made learning gains in math. In 2022, the number of students making learning gains in math increased to 68%, an overall increase of 24%. In 2021, 31% of students made learning gains in ELA. In 2022, learning gains increased to 67%, an overall increase of 35%.

This data indicates that we must address instruction at all levels. Focus Goal 1 addresses Core (Tier 1) instruction and Focus Goal 2 addresses interventions (Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction) in small group.

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

Jupiter Elementary will increase the number of students on grade level or above in ELA as evidenced by i-Ready, Benchmark Advance, Florida Assessment of Student Thinking, and other district assessments.

As indicated by Florida Assessment of Student Thinking Progress Monitoring 3, 55% or more of Jupiter students will score on or above grade level.

Students falling within the lowest 35% will be consistently monitored utilizing information from Performance Matters. This data will be accessible through a shared site and referenced weekly during Child Chats with teachers. The school-based shared site will also be used to monitor progress of students in the MTSS system through Form Seven. Data monitored includes: F.A.S.T Progress Monitoring, Lexia, iReady Reading Diagnostics, iReady Usage and Pass Rates, iReady My Path analysis for students not making progress, Benchmark Advance/Savvas Assessments, and Tier 3 intervention data.

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

The leadership team will attend collaborative planning sessions with each grade-level to monitor pacing of instruction for the ELA and Math curriculum. Professional development will be provided to meet the needs of individual grade levels and follow up will occur during child chats and coaching sessions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Crystal Rice (rice.crystal@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based

The evidence-based strategy Jupiter will implement during the 2022-2023 school year is to ensure all struggling students are receiving consistent intensive, systematic, and explicit small group instruction on foundational reading skills. (T)

strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Rationale for Evidence-based

Strategy: Data from 2022 FSA and end-of-year iReady diagnostic showed significant learning gains from the previous year. The evidence-based strategies implemented improved our delivery of intensive, systematic, and explicit instruction, therefore will be continued. Research indicates that struggling readers need small group instruction (intervention) that is designed to meet their specific areas of weakness in order to improve their reading skills. A comprehensive review of research literature conducted by the Institute of Education Sciences concluded that reading interventions improve reading outcomes for students at risk of struggling with typical classroom reading instruction.

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Identify students in the lowest 35% for all teachers and leadership team to access and monitor growth throughout the school year.

Person Responsible Sherie Troisi (troisi.sherie@brevardschools.org)

2. Use data from F.A.S.T, i-Ready, Lexia, district assessments, and common formative assessments to form intervention groups. (T)

Person Responsible Crystal Rice (rice.crystal@brevardschools.org)

3. Monitor student progress at weekly child chats and adjust instruction based on student needs. (T)

Person Responsible Amber Ouellette (ouellette.amber@brevardschools.org)

4. Provide professional development covering the essential components of an effective Rtl model, to include evidence-based programs and ongoing progress monitoring tools. (T)

Person Responsible Crystal Rice (rice.crystal@brevardschools.org)

5. Provide training for teachers and Title I instructional assistants on evidence-based explicit instruction through the use of Math Iready lessons & manipulatives and ELA 95% lessons, LLI, Lexia, Read Naturally, and Toolkit Intervention Lessons. (T)

Person Responsible Crystal Rice (rice.crystal@brevardschools.org)

6. Conduct quarterly walks during Rtl times to ensure intervention groups are consistently providing students with appropriate supplemental and intensive, explicit instruction.

Person Responsible Sherie Troisi (troisi.sherie@brevardschools.org)

8. Offer reading and math academic support programs targeting our lowest 35% and the lowest performing subgroups including Students with Disabilities and English as a Second Language students.

Person Responsible Amber Ouellette (ouellette.amber@brevardschools.org)

Host Title 1 parent and family curriculum nights with a focus on ELA and Math. (T)

Person Responsible Stacy Cirino (cirino.stacy@brevardschools.org)

Plan a summer academic clinic to support students in general content areas in grades K-6. (T)

Person Responsible Stacy Cirino (cirino.stacy@brevardschools.org)

Purchase and upgrade classroom technology that enhances instructional delivery and keeps students actively engaged during Tier I instruction. (T) Purchase materials and supplies to also support small group instruction etc. (T)

Person Responsible Stacy Cirino (cirino.stacy@brevardschools.org)

Utilize Title 1 funds for field trips that are aligned to the state standards and assist in making real-world connections with classroom instruction.

Person Responsible Stacy Cirino (cirino.stacy@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.

In 2021 34% of our students scored proficient on the Florida Science Assessment. In 2022, the number of students at level 3 or higher increased to 39%. However, our science scores continue to fall below state (48%) and district (55%) average.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Jupiter Elementary will increase the percent of students scoring on grade level or above on the Florida Standards Science Assessment from 39% to 45%.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers and administration will monitor student progress utilizing Penda Science weekly and monthly reports. Instruction will be adjusted based on evidence of standards not passed on Penda assignments and assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sherie Troisi (troisi.sherie@brevardschools.org)

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

Students in grades 3-6 will complete a minimum of 30 minutes weekly utilizing the online standards aligned Penda Science Program. These lessons support Tier 1 instruction and are differentiated to support students who require additional support.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

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

Students at Jupiter continue to struggle with science mastery as evidence by the Florida Standards Science Assessment. Penda Science has been proven to raise student achievement and mastery of science concepts by providing rigorous science instruction that motivates and engages students in their learning.

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.

Provide professional development for classroom teachers covering implementation and how to analyze student data for instructional purposes.

Person Responsible

Amber Ouellette (ouellette.amber@brevardschools.org)

Host a Title I parent/family STEM curriculum night. (T)

Person Responsible

Stacy Cirino (cirino.stacy@brevardschools.org)

Conduct quarterly walks during the science block to ensure science instruction is rigorous and standards aligned and provide feedback to teachers.

Person Responsible

Sherie Troisi (troisi.sherie@brevardschools.org)

Review Penda Science progress reports to ensure consistent implementation and monitor student progress.

Person Responsible

[no one identified]

Utilize Title I funds to purchase science resources and provide hands on materials that will enhance science instruction. (T)

Person Responsible

Stacy Cirino (cirino.stacy@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

D3 i-Ready data from 21-22 show that 34% of students in grades K-2 are not on track to score grade level or above on the statewide ELA assessment. Collaborative planning sessions need to have a clear structure to focus on the alignment of benchmarks, resources, student tasks, assessments, and the transfer to instruction.

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

21-22 FSA Data shows 54% of 3rd Graders, 52% of 4th Graders, 49% of 5th Graders, and 44% of 6th Graders scored below grade level (Levels 1 and 2). Increasing Primary Literacy Achievement so that gaps will not be as prominent in 3-5. Collaborative 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%.

Grade-level goals:

Kindergarten Grade will increase in proficiency from 57% (PM1) to 70% (PM3)

1st Grade will increase in proficiency from 60% (PM1) to 70% (PM3)

2nd Grade will increase in proficiency from 65% (PM1) to 75% (PM3)

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Short Term – From FAST-STAR-PM1 to PM2, literacy achievement will increase by 20%.

Long Term - By the Spring 2023 FAST, literacy achievement will increase by 40%.

Grade-level goals:

3rd Grade will increase in proficiency from 18% (PM1) to 51% (PM3)

4th Grade will increase in proficiency from 29% (PM1) to 51% (PM3)

5th Grade will increase in proficiency from 35% (PM1) to 55% (PM3)

6th Grade will increase in proficiency from 43% (PM1) to 60% (PM3)

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.

Ongoing monitoring will be used to evaluate instructional impact and determine next steps. This will take place throughout the year as evidence by data from:

- Progress Monitoring 1, Progress Monitoring 2, FAST
- i-Ready D1 and D2
- Walkthroughs with feedback
- Benchmark Advance Assessments
- Intervention Data (Intervention instruction will specifically target identified gaps)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Troisi, Sherie, troisi.sherie@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. Â§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?

Our focus will be on the features of effective instruction by implementing the following programs and practices:

- Focus on tightening up delivery of instruction focusing on the systematic, explicitness of instruction and reinforcing the “why” – Science of Reading.
- Scaffolded instruction - intentional, temporary, support; Gradual release until student(s) can perform independently
- Differentiated instruction - adapts instruction in response to the distinct assessed skills and needs of individual learners
- Collaborative Planning - Supports consistent, high-quality implementation of Benchmark Advance; Allows for instructional strategies, resources, tools, and materials to be scaffolded and differentiated.
- Lexia (Strong level of evidence)
- 95% Group (Strong level of evidence) - systematic and explicit instruction on foundational skills utilizing evidence-based practices as listed in the IES’ Practice Guides Assisting Students
- i-Ready (Promising level of evidence) - Universal screener data is used to start data conversations at school level.

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?

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 the Brevard K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan
- Meet Florida’s definition of evidence-based
- Systematic and/or Explicit

- Geared towards struggling readers with an 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
<p>Action Step: Content coach will facilitate benchmark-aligned planning.</p> <p>Literacy Leadership:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Clearly communicate the expectations for planning with coaches and teachers. - Establish Principal-Coach partnership agreement specifying roles and responsibilities of the coach and how the Principal will provide support. <p>Literacy Coaching:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Lesson planning with teachers, modeling, co-teaching, engaging in reflective conversations and engaging in data chats. - Focus on teacher clarity, instructional model, strategies, questioning, and assessments that align to the benchmark(s) and will support the intended learning. <p>Assessment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Teachers will use program assessments for foundational reading skills, alongside DIBELS measures, PASI/PSI and/or Running Records to monitor reading skills development. - Data chats will occur regularly around Benchmark Advance Assessments, i-Ready, FAST, Lexia and intervention OPM. <p>Professional Learning:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - On-side intervention material and instructional PD will be provided by Literacy Coach. - Maximize time for PD by infusing small chunks during grade level data and planning sessions 	<p>Troisi, Sherie, troisi.sherie@brevardschools.org</p>

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.

School Culture was our highest rated area on the 2022 Student Youth Truth Survey. Jupiter Elementary creates a positive school culture in many ways. Jupiter Elementary implements the Second Step and I Can Problem Solve character education programs, which also provide a school to home connection. Jupiter provides family nights throughout the school year to create positive relationships between home and school.

The 2022 Student Youth Truth Survey indicated that our students are struggling with a sense of belonging and relationships. Therefore, Jupiter Elementary will continue to increase teacher understanding and implementation of Conscious Discipline school-wide. Conscious Discipline is a philosophy that embraces belonging and building relationships.

Parent Survey results indicated that 75% of our families stated that email or text is the best way for them to receive important information in regards to the school or their child. Jupiter will continue to utilize these forms of communication in addition to newsletters, posts on our school website and student FOCUS accounts. Sixty-four percent of families feel they were given opportunities to provide feedback into school decisions.

Jupiter will continue to solicit family feedback during our Title 1 family nights and parent/teacher conferences.

Several key sources of data were utilized when planning for the 22-23 school year which include school-wide parent surveys, faculty "insight surveys" and a new student survey called "Youth Truth". These data sets were invaluable when looking at the various areas of culture and promoting a positive environment.

- The parent survey results indicated a positive response in the following categories: Feeling welcome at school

(89% yes), effectiveness of school's information being sent online (94% received online) and information being

sent from the Principal. Areas of improvement included: Increase in parent/teacher communication, and more

resources relating to classroom assistance. Focus areas for improvement planning include ensuring that FOCUS

& Google classroom resources are available for all parents with relevant information. Weekly parent academic

resources will be sent with the Principal's newsletter to provide extra resources for parents to help their children with standards.

- Student data from our "Youth Truth" survey indicate that we were below the average for BPS in the following

categories: Academic engagement, academic rigor and relationships. These focus areas will be addressed with

the reinforcement of standards aligned instruction, developing positive relationships with students and raising the level of rigor in daily instruction. Monthly department meetings will include specific action analysis of these standards and ensure that items are being addressed. Additionally, student leaders will meet with school administration each semester to gain further insight into which practices are most effective as viewed by the students.

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

Classroom teachers teach students social-emotional learning strategies through classroom morning meetings, as well as throughout the school day. Teachers also implement the research based strategy "Conscience Discipline" school-wide to create a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Jupiter Title 1 staff and faculty members have Title I academic nights in ELA, Math and Science. Jupiter's PTO and staff plan social events that include; father/daughter dance, mother/son dance, fall festival, spring carnival, student talent night, PRIDE awards, school concerts, and teacher meet and greet. Our School Advisory Counsel (SAC) provides input into our Title I Parent/Family Engagement Plan, School-Family Compact for Learning Form and our School Improvement Plan.