

Brevard Public Schools

Ralph M Williams Junior 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	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Ralph M Williams Junior Elementary School

1700 CLUBHOUSE DR, Rockledge, FL 32955

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

Demographics

Principal: Susan Schroeder M

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	41%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (58%) 2018-19: B (61%) 2017-18: A (64%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Ralph M Williams Junior Elementary School

1700 CLUBHOUSE DR, Rockledge, FL 32955

<http://www.williams.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	No	41%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	36%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Together with our families and community partners, Williams provides every student with a relevant and rigorous education to prepare them to learn, grow, and succeed in all aspects of their lives.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Williams community ensures that every crane learns, grows and succeeds.

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
Melendez, Josefina	Principal	Mrs. Melendez supports student and teacher growth. As a member of the leadership team, she works with her team to ensure student and staff needs are consistently met. As part of the planning for improvement process, she meets weekly with teachers to review student achievement, behavior, and attendance data. She supports teachers with professional development to ensure students achieve at their highest academic performance with both their academic and social needs being met in the classroom. Through observation and feedback she works with her staff to continuously improve the learning cycle and to support teacher's professional practices. She meets with our Crane community to plan for upcoming projects and initiatives.
Lundberg, Christine	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Lundberg supports all instructional staff with the implementation of the BEST standards. She provides support with the learning cycle through planning, modeling, observing, and providing feedback for teachers to improve core and intervention instruction with ELA. She collaborates with the design of school improvement processes.
Brancaccio, Paulette	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Brancaccio provides curriculum support for all teachers and assists teachers with classroom management and behavior management implementing year 3 of Conscious Discipline. She provides observation and feedback for teachers to improve the learning cycle and support the implementation of the BEST standards. Mrs. Brancaccio will assist with the facilitation of the MTSS and intervention process for all students and monitors the warning indicators for all grade levels.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Susan Schroeder M

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.*

5

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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

43

Total number of students enrolled at the school

446

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

5

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

5

Demographic Data**Early Warning Systems**

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	54	49	61	72	73	67	75	0	0	0	0	0	0	451
Attendance below 90 percent	7	7	11	11	19	20	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
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	14	8	10	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	20	15	14	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	4	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 7/12/2022

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	56	48	61	71	72	67	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	454
Attendance below 90 percent	1	5	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	4	13	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	9	15	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA ELA	0	0	0	1	4	13	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA MATH	0	0	0	1	9	15	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	2	0	4	15	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	56	48	61	71	72	67	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	454
Attendance below 90 percent	1	5	2	1	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	4	13	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	1	9	15	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA ELA	0	0	0	1	4	13	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA MATH	0	0	0	1	9	15	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	38

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	2	0	4	15	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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	62%	61%	56%				62%	62%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	66%						65%	60%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	42%						58%	57%	53%
Math Achievement	62%	49%	50%				69%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	70%						64%	65%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	48%						48%	53%	51%

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement	57%	60%	59%				64%	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	54%	64%	-10%	58%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	62%	61%	1%	58%	4%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
05	2022					
	2019	66%	60%	6%	56%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
06	2022					
	2019	69%	60%	9%	54%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				

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	55%	61%	-6%	62%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	83%	64%	19%	64%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				
05	2022					
	2019	62%	60%	2%	60%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-83%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2022					
	2019	73%	67%	6%	55%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	65%	56%	9%	53%	12%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-65%				

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	39	30	25	40	33	21				
BLK	32	46	47	48	65	40	38				
HSP	68	72		55	53						
MUL	56	73		70	73						
WHT	66	68	41	64	72	50	62				
FRL	54	63	44	48	63	44	36				
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	33	52	29	30	42	22	20				
ELL	73			73							
BLK	38	50		49	43						
HSP	73	50		67	40						
MUL	65			65							
WHT	73	72	61	68	60	44	59				
FRL	55	63		47	40	13	50				
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	24	47	45	39	58	52	33				
ELL	30										
ASN	75			67							
BLK	35	50	58	38	43	38	40				

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
HSP	62	64		72	71						
MUL	61	86		72	100						
WHT	66	65	55	74	63	41	69				
FRL	52	61	50	60	55	39	36				

ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	407
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	

Asian Students	
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	45
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	62
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	68
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	60
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	50
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?

In Math we see a downward trend in proficiency levels overall for grades 3-6 (2019 69%, 2021 65%, 2022 62%). However, grades 5 and 6 showed a substantial increase in math proficiency (5th 2021 53% to 61% 2022; 6th 2021 69% to 76% 2022). Fifth grade also increased ELA proficiency levels from 63% to 70%.

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

The ESSA subgroup SWD demonstrates the greatest need for improvement with only 30% proficiency. Based on FSA data for ELA, 3rd grade dropped from 71% in 2021 to 50% in 2022. As a result of this decline, Williams became a RAISE school on the Universal Level. In Math the 3rd grade also declined from 65% in 2021 to 46% in 2022.

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

As a group, 3rd grade and ESE students were substantially deficient in foundational reading skills potentially due to Covid. Administration, the literacy coach, and the math coach will collaborate with teachers to monitor student performance data. The data will inform teachers and drive instructional practices on a daily basis. Together with administration, teachers will engage in conversations to understand what quality Tier 1 instruction looks like for every student.

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

In 2021, 66% of 4th graders were proficient in ELA and in 2022 that percentage rose to 71%. In 2021, 69% of 6th graders were proficient in Math and in 2022 that percentage rose to 76%. In 2021, 53% of 5th graders were proficient in Math and in 2022 that percentage rose to 61%.

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

Williams grade level teams met weekly with administration and the reading coach to keep track of student growth, set goals for individual students, and ensure students were being given appropriate interventions. Individual student data was progress monitored with fidelity to ensure interventions were being effective.

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

In order to accelerate learning at Williams Elementary, we will build student's academic vocabulary. As a school we are focusing on engaging students in learning by incorporating Kagan strategies. Kagan structures foster student conversation and collaboration to provide opportunities for students to discuss content. Students will use academic vocabulary in their discussions to demonstrate mastery of the content.

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.

Teacher led professional development will be offered to train all teachers on Kagan structures to foster student engagement in learning. The literacy coach will introduce small group work based on research done by Jan Richardson. Administration and literacy coach will discuss explicit instruction, scaffolding, differentiating, and the use of academic vocabulary.

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

Continuous data analysis and reflection is paramount to school-wide success. We will continue to maintain time in the daily schedule for grade level teams to collaborate and plan. Teams will also continue to meet with administration on a monthly basis to look at student needs and determine next steps. Professional development will continue to be teacher-led and purposeful, based on student needs. We will incorporate vertical team discussions to identify learning gaps and understand how to prepare students to be successful in the subsequent grade.

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.	<p>In 2022, the overall proficiency dropped 6% on the FSA reading going from 68% to 62% at a level 3 (proficiency). ESE and Black students continue to underperform compared to other students in subgroups. When designing small group instruction, it is critical to ensure that students in this subgroup are monitored closely in their performance and included in small group instruction when necessary.</p>
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	<p>65% of all K-6 students will attain grade level proficiency on the FAST. 33% of our ESE students will be at or above grade level proficiency level. 48% of our Black students will be at or above grade level proficiency level.</p>
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	<p>FAST PM1, PM2 and PM3 growth 3x a year in ELA. i-Ready Diagnostic growth 3x a year in ELA. Benchmark Advance assessments (quarterly) in ELA.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	<p>Josefina Melendez (melendez.josefina@brevardschools.org)</p>
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being	<p>Deliberate action at all stakeholder levels to use data-driven analysis for school improvement is required to close the achievement gap. Data analysis will determine the rate of accelerated learning that is needed by planning differentiated, small group instruction for students during the reading core instruction. Student data will be closely monitored through bi weekly meetings with the leadership team. Collaborative planning will focus on whole group and differentiated small group instruction that allows for flexible groupings based on skill need. Collaborative planning sessions among the grade level, reading coach, and/or administration will occur to engage round table discussions on</p>

implemented for this Area of Focus.

analysis of the standards, implementation of the curriculum, and strengthening core instruction for all students.

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

According to an article from The Pathway to College Network, "Using Data to Improve Educational Outcomes"; the use of data is a powerful tool to strengthen academic outcomes for all students—especially underserved students. Data use informs teacher preparation and training needs, supports revised instructional practices to improve student performance, and measures the effectiveness of ongoing academic and social support programs. Greater reliance on data has led some teachers to be more accountable to one another through collaborative school improvement work and reflective practice. Importantly, data has been used to challenge untested assumptions and beliefs about some students' inherent abilities. Williams administration and staff will work together to ensure all students will receive targeted, rigorous reading 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.

1. Analyze data from FAST PM1-PM3, iReady diagnostics and foundational skill assessments
2. Provide collaborative planning sessions for grade levels and the leadership team.
3. Establish learning cycle calendar to support collaborative planning organization.
4. Establish progress monitoring schedule and data analysis meetings.
5. Administer Standards Mastery assessments according to the learning cycle calendar.
6. Analyze data from FAST assessments, i-Ready diagnostics, scheduled district assessments, and foundational skill assessments.
7. Design lessons for re-teach and provide additional scaffolding as needed.
8. Offer After School Programming (support).

Person Responsible

Josefina Melendez (melendez.josefina@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.

In 2022, the overall proficiency dropped by 3%, going from 65% in 2021 to 62%. ESE and Black students continue to underperform compared to other students in subgroups.

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

70% of all K-6 students will attain grade level proficiency on the FAST.
 50% of our ESE and Black students will be at or above grade level proficiency levels.

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

Bi weekly data chats with teachers and the leadership team will triangulate FAST data, iReady data, District Assessments, and teacher created formative assessments to monitor all students with fluency, conceptual knowledge, and problem solving skills in mathematics. ESE and Black students will be monitored to see where they are performing and what supports they need to increase mathematical proficiency . Through data chats, students who are performing below grade level will be selected to receive supplemental explicit math instruction in our After School Program. Students will use the iReady instructional path in ASP along with small group instruction to strengthen mathematical skills. iReady and FAST data will be monitored to determine achievement and deficits.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Josefina Melendez (melendez.josefina@brevardschools.org)

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

Explicit instruction often is described as the cornerstone of effective mathematics instruction for students with learning difficulties (Hudson et al., 2006; Jitendra et al., 2018; Witzel et al., 2003). There are three main components of explicit instruction:

- Modeling: facilitated by the teacher
- Practice: involves the students and the teacher
- Supports: consist of an ongoing dialogue between the teacher and students. Supports are

implemented for this Area of Focus. employed during modeling and during practice. Supports are described within the explanations of modeling and practice.
i-Ready path for math will support students with their targeted, specific skills needed to be proficient at grade level.
Small group instruction in math provides explicit instruction and practice with mathematical skills. vocabulary, and concepts.

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

Students have gaps with mathematical concepts. Students performing below grade level need support and direct instruction to become proficient at their current grade level.

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. Analyze data from FAST, i-Ready diagnostic and math assessments.
2. Determine students performing below grade level.
3. Create 1- 2 ASP classes per grade level for 2nd -6th grades per student needs.
4. Develop targeted instructional plan with the ASP team.
5. Design lessons for re-teach and provide additional scaffolding as needed.
6. Use iReady instructional path for students to fill gaps in mathematic proficiency.
7. Implement small group direct instruction to support student pathway.
8. Offer After School Programming (support) beginning January 2023.

Person Responsible Josefina Melendez (melendez.josefina@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 2022, students in the 5th grade performed at 57% proficiency overall on the SSA. This is an increase from 2021 when students performed at 53% proficiency. In 2019-2020, students were at 65% proficiency in 18-19 student performed at 70% proficiency. It is critical to assess and progress monitor student mastery of the science standards.

Measurable**Outcome:**

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

60% of 5th grade students will perform at or above proficiency on the SSA.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will utilize common formative district assessments to determine mastery of the standards.

Person

responsible for monitoring outcome:

Paulette Brancaccio (brancaccio.paulettea@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-**based****Strategy:**

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

Collaborative planning to align tasks to grade level standards, and analyzing data will support grade level teams in their planning for Science instruction. Our planning sessions will include identifying scaffolds to support all learners in access grade level content toward mastery of standards. 4th grade and 5th grade teachers will collaborate to utilize the PENDA science program, science interactive notebooks, and hands on learning to engage students in science standards. Grade levels will collaborate to design engaging lessons and hands on instruction with the 5 E model for instruction to meet the science standards expectation.

Rationale for**Evidence-****based****Strategy:**

Explain the rationale for

Students have gaps with science concepts and standards. Historical student achievement data for Williams on the SSA has been at or above state level of proficiency. Students need lessons that are designed to enrich and remediate understandings of past standards missed.

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. Analyze district assessment with 5th grade teachers.
2. Determine reteaching strategies from 4th grade science assessment.
3. Administer 4th and 5th grade district unit tests to determine mastery of standards.
5. Establish progress monitoring schedule and data analysis meetings.
3. Design lessons with 4th and 5th grade teachers with PENDA and district lessons.
4. Use PENDA with fidelity in grades 3-6.

Person Responsible Paulette Brancaccio (brancaccio.paulettea@brevardschools.org)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus****Description and****Rationale:**

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

The ESSA Federal Index for SWD is 30% and it is the only subgroup underperforming at Williams Elementary. All teachers will focus on differentiating instruction to ensure SWD are offered multiple ways to learn and demonstrate mastery of grade level standards.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The SWD will achieve a 35% Federal Index score based on grade level proficiency in ELA and Mathematics.

Monitoring:

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

At the end of every PM cycle, the MTSS coach and administration will analyze and disaggregate the SWD scores.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Josefina Melendez (melendez.josefina@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based**Strategy:**

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

Williams Elementary will implement and monitor the MTSS process every 6 weeks to monitor the progress of every SWD.

Rationale for Evidence-based**Strategy:**

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

Teachers believe SWD do not require additional interventions because they've already been identified with a learning disability. However, SWD do need the added layer of support. The intervention process needs to be progress monitored and after every 6 weeks the data collected will demonstrate if the intervention is effective. Adding this layer of support will give SWD the skills needed to be successful.

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.

The MTSS facilitator will coach all teachers on differentiating instruction to meet the needs of all students. Together with administration, the MTSS facilitator will conduct walk throughs to look for evidence of instruction being differentiated for all students.

Person Responsible

Christine Lundberg (lundberg.christine@brevardschools.org)

The MTSS facilitator will coach all teachers on differentiating instruction to meet the needs of all students. Together with administration, the MTSS facilitator will conduct walk throughs to look for evidence of instruction being differentiated for all students.

Person Responsible Christine Lundberg (lundberg.christine@brevardschools.org)

On a monthly basis, administration and the MTSS facilitator will monitor intervention data.

Person Responsible Christine Lundberg (lundberg.christine@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 shows that 24% of students in grades K-2 are not on track to score grade level or above on the statewide ELA assessment. 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 50% of 3rd Graders, 29% of 4th Graders and 30% of 5th Graders scored below grade level. (Levels 1 and 2). Increasing Primary Literacy Achievement so that gaps will not be as prominent in grades 3-5. Planning sessions need to have a clear structure to focus on the alignment of benchmarks, resources, student tasks, assessments, and the transfer of 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 30%.
Long Term--By the Spring 2023 FAST, literacy achievement will increase by 70%.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

Short Term--From FAST-STAR-PM1 to PM2, literacy achievement will increase by 30%.
Long Term--By Spring 2023 FAST, literacy achievement will increase by 70%.

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.

PM1, PM2, FAST; i-Ready D1 and D2; Walkthroughs with feedback; Benchmark Advance Assessments, Intervention Data: intervention instruction to specifically target identified gaps.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Melendez, Josefina, melendez.josefina@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?

95% Group (strong level of evidence) aligns with BEST standards and the Foundational Benchmarks under PA. Instructional materials and processes are geared towards struggling readers and permit teachers to begin instruction at student's lowest skill deficit, with a focus on PA and Phonics. This program uses systematic and explicit instruction on foundational skills utilizing evidence-based practices. Benchmark

Advance materials are aligned aligned with B.E.S.T standards and focus on tightening up delivery of instruction focusing on the systematic, explicitness of instruction and reinforcing the "why" - with Science of Reading. Explicit and Systematic instruction, scaffolded instruction, corrective feedback and differentiation of instruction will be implemented throughout all lessons. Collaborative planning will occur weekly to support consistent, high quality implementation of Benchmark Advance. This also allows for instructional strategies, resources, tools, and materials to be scaffolded and differentiated. The i-Ready program (promising level evidence will be used for instruction and data analysis.

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, align with the Brevard K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan, meet Florida's definition of evidence-based, are systematic and/or explicit, and are geared towards struggling reader 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
Literacy Coach will facilitate benchmark-aligned planning. The literacy coach will meet bi-monthly to support teachers with collaborative planning during IMPACT meetings. In addition to planning, the literacy coach will model, co-teach and engage in reflective conversations and data chats. While planning, there will be a focus on the instructional model, strategies, questioning and assessments that align to the benchmark(s). The coach will support intended learning. The literacy coach will plan for the supports that teachers will need before, during, and after planning as well as send teachers the agenda, items, tasks, and other resources in advance for them to complete the pre-work.	Lundberg, Christine, lundberg.christine@brevardschools.org
Ongoing Assessment will be utilized for foundational reading skills, along with DIBELS measures, PASI/PSI and/or Running Records to monitor reading skills development. Students performing below grade level will be placed in a Tier 2 intervention group daily, while students performing significantly below grade level will be placed in a Tier 3 intervention group daily for more intensive intervention. Data chats will occur regularly with the Literacy Coach and Assistant Principal around Benchmark Advance Assessments, i-Ready, FAST, and intervention OPM. Daily exit tickets and other formative assessments are used to determine what scaffolds or reteaching is needed.	Lundberg, Christine, lundberg.christine@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.

Every day, the principal and assistant principal are visible at arrival and dismissal for parents to approach. Once the school day begins, the principal does the announcements with students to set a positive tone over the call system. Parents are included in ongoing feedback on school based performance and needs assessment

through monthly Mornings with Mel meetings with administration and the SRO. They also have a portion of the agenda for open comment at School Advisory Council meetings. Annually, we conduct a parent survey to

provide feedback on all areas of school operations. We are working diligently to grow Our Partners in Education program. Our goal is to achieve funding that would be spent on school-wide resources that would benefit all students.

This year we are embedding a set of student engagement strategies that will positively impact our two lowest rated categories in the Youth Truth Survey. The two lowest ratings received are a 2.48 in Academic Challenge and 2.69 in Relationships. Both of these categories scored in the 30th percentile rank.

Professional development this year is focusing on implementing Kagan strategies and structures to promote both learning academically challenging content and building positive relationships with peers during the learning process. We are focusing on four Kagan strategies that all teachers will master: Stand Up, Hand Up, Pair Up; Quiz-Quiz Trade; Talking Chips; and Rally Robin/Pair Share.

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

This year we are partnering with Special Olympics in the Unified Champion Schools Program. Williams houses the 3rd largest ESE program in Brevard County schools. Our program begins in PreK and goes through 6th grade. Every Crane in our school learns, grows and succeeds, and on October 19 we will celebrate that message. That day numerous students and staff will wear t-shirts with a message of inclusion and unity. Many of our ESE students participate in general education classes, and we want to promote the message that all students belong and succeed in our school.

Crane families play an integral role in shaping our positive culture and school environment. The Williams PTO is a visible force of engaged parents who strive to support students and teachers throughout the school in different capacities. For example, PTO members assist with open house, picture day, and other school-wide events.

Individual PTO members volunteer in classrooms and assist teachers however needed. Administration continues to host Mornings with Mel, School Advisory Council meetings, and family night events. The PTO participates and assists in each of these events to model and encourage increased community engagement. Once a month the principal sends a message to all parents regarding school updates, accomplishments, and celebrations. The principal also welcomes parents who have lunch with their child/children on Wednesdays.

New this year is the development of the Crane Leadership Team. This team was developed as a result of the 21-22 Insight Survey results where teachers indicated a need for more consistent interactions with administration.

The index score in 21-22 is a 3.6 versus 7.7 noted in 20-21. The Crane Leadership Team consists of one teacher per grade level who meet with the principal on a monthly basis to discuss school-wide concerns regarding academic instruction, school-wide policies and procedures. The intent of the team is to develop the leadership capacity of each team member, in addition to maintaining clear communication between administration and teachers. The team also fosters a collaborative culture because it allows all teachers to contribute their thoughts and ideas to give administration. Administration makes better informed decisions as a result of these discussions.