

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

# **Table of Contents**

| School Demographics            | 3  |
|--------------------------------|----|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4  |
| School Information             | 7  |
| Needs Assessment               | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement       | 14 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 0  |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 0  |

# **Port Malabar Elementary School**

301 PIONEER AVE NE, Palm Bay, FL 32907

http://www.portmalabar.es.brevard.k12.fl.us

Demographics

# Principal: Gregory Rubick M

Start Date for this Principal: 1/9/2020

| 2019-20 Status<br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
|---|--|
| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-6  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| 2021-22 Title I School  | Yes  |
| 2021-22 Economically<br>Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3)   | 100%   |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an<br>asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged<br>Students |
| School Grades History   | 2021-22: B (57%)<br>2018-19: B (59%)<br>2017-18: C (51%)   |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info  | ormation*  |
| 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. Fo  | or more information, <u>click here</u> .   |
|   |  |

#### **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 <u>www.floridacims.org.</u>

#### Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

# **Table of Contents**

| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4  |
|--------------------------------|----|
| School Information             | 7  |
| Needs Assessment               | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement       | 14 |
| Title I Requirements           | 0  |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 0  |

Brevard - 2061 - Port Malabar Elementary School - 2022-23 SIP

# Port Malabar Elementary School

301 PIONEER AVE NE, Palm Bay, FL 32907

#### http://www.portmalabar.es.brevard.k12.fl.us

**School Demographics** 

| School Type and Gr<br>(per MSID I |                     | 2021-22 Title I School | l Disadvant         | Economically<br>taged (FRL) Rate<br>ted on Survey 3) |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Elementary S<br>PK-6              | school              | Yes                    |                     | 100%   |
| Primary Servio<br>(per MSID F     | ••                  | Charter School         | (Reporte            | Minority Rate<br>ed as Non-white<br>Survey 2)        |
| K-12 General E                    | ducation            | No                     |                     | 52%  |
| School Grades Histo               | ory                 |                        |                     |  |
| Year<br>Grade                     | <b>2021-22</b><br>B | 2020-21                | <b>2019-20</b><br>B | <b>2018-19</b><br>B                                  |
| School Board Appro                | val                 |                        |                     |  |

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 <a href="https://www.floridaCIMS.org">https://www.floridaCIMS.org</a>.

#### 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.

Our mission is to work together to build a safe, respectful and nurturing environment focused on maximizing each child's sense of well-being and acquisition of skills for life and learning.

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

The staff of Port Malabar Elementary School is dedicated to addressing the needs of the whole child by creating a school environment wherein every child may experience success both socially and academically, as well as develop enthusiasm for learning and a sense of community while maintaining individuality and creativity.

#### 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<br>Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|---------------------|------------------------|---|
| Rubick,<br>Gregory  | Principal              | Greg Rubick is the principal and serves as the instructional leader, overseeing<br>all aspects of school improvement including personnel, student achievement,<br>and school safety. He facilitates collaboration and problem solving among the<br>staff to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices utilizing<br>the MTSS process. Mr. Rubick is a member of the IPST, the School Advisory<br>Council, and PTO where he communicates school-wide data involving all<br>stakeholders. He also ensures that school safety is up to date.                                      |
| Scott,<br>Tera      | Assistant<br>Principal | Tera Scott is the assistant principal, and supports various aspects of school improvement including curriculum, assessments, student discipline, and facility security and safety. Additionally, she coordinates the Beginning Teacher Program, plans some professional development, and serves as the school testing coordinator. She heads the guidance department and helps facilitate the IPST/MTSS meetings. She ensures teachers are closely monitoring student progress through data chat meetings. She is also the ESOL coordinator, oversees facilities, and monitors our at-risk students . |
| Kahler,<br>Stefania | Other                  | Stefania Kahler is our Title I coordinator, ensuring Title I budget/framework is in compliance. She works with Tier 2 and Tier 3 instructional groups. She supports tiered interventions, data collection, and student progress monitoring. She co-facilitates the MTSS team and meets with teachers bi-weekly to monitor students who are academically at risk. Mrs. Kahler plans and organizes Family Involvement events, provides professional development, and is the Treasurer of the School Advisory Council.   |
| King,<br>Michelle   |                        | Michelle King is our Literacy Coach and serves as a School Advisory Council<br>member. She monitors instruction and student mastery of the BEST standards<br>and oversees all Reading programs. Mrs. King meets weekly with teachers to<br>plan and model standards based lessons and district initiatives. She co-<br>facilitates bi-monthly data meetings to analyze student data and plan tiered<br>instruction and acceleration. She plans professional development opportunities<br>for teachers, leads the Literacy Leadership Team, and serves as a member of<br>the MTSS team.                |

#### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Thursday 1/9/2020, Gregory Rubick 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.

7

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

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school 44

**Total number of students enrolled at the school** 633

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year. 4

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

**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 |
|--|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator  | κ           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 88          | 84 | 68 | 89 | 90 | 78 | 99 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 596   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 12          | 18 | 17 | 24 | 13 | 18 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 126   |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 1           | 2  | 2  | 5  | 4  | 7  | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 36    |
| 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  | 7  | 17 | 21 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 64    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 5  | 20 | 20 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 69    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 1           | 8  | 11 | 15 | 12 | 17 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 79    |

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                            |   |   |   |   |    | Gra | de L | .ev | el | Grade Level |    |    |    |       |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|----|-----|------|-----|----|-------------|----|----|----|-------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Indicator                            | κ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4  | 5   | 6    | 7   | 8  | 9           | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 2 | 6 | 7 | 10 | 16  | 15   | 0   | 0  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 56    |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

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

| Indicator                           |   |   | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |  |  |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|--|
| Indicator                           | κ | 1 | 2           | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |  |  |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 1 | 6 | 5           | 9 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 25    |  |  |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0           | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |  |  |

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

Monday 9/5/2022

#### The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

| Indicator  | Grade Level |    |    |     |    |    |    |   |   |   | Total |    |    |       |
|--|-------------|----|----|-----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|----|----|-------|
| indicator  | κ           | 1  | 2  | 3   | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10    | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 74          | 72 | 85 | 100 | 87 | 96 | 77 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0     | 0  | 0  | 591   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 8           | 14 | 6  | 7   | 5  | 13 | 9  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0     | 0  | 0  | 62    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 2  | 5  | 2   | 7  | 16 | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0     | 0  | 0  | 36    |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0  | 0  | 3   | 6  | 2  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0     | 0  | 0  | 13    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 2   | 4  | 4  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0     | 0  | 0  | 12    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0  | 4  | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0     | 0  | 0  | 15    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0  | 4  | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0     | 0  | 0  | 21    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 1           | 6  | 14 | 16  | 19 | 24 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0     | 0  | 0  | 96    |
| Level 1 on 2021 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 3   | 14 | 13 | 9  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0     | 0  | 0  | 39    |
| Level 1 on 2021 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 4   | 29 | 23 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0     | 0  | 0  | 78    |

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

| Indicator                            |   |    |   |   |    | Gra | de L | eve | el |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|----|---|---|----|-----|------|-----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                            | κ | 1  | 2 | 3 | 4  | 5   | 6    | 7   | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 8 | 10 | 6 | 7 | 21 | 25  | 19   | 0   | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 96    |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator                           | κ           | 1  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 8           | 10 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 33    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0  | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8     |

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

| Indicator  |    |    |    |     | Gr | ade | Lev | el |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|----|----|----|-----|----|-----|-----|----|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator  | κ  | 1  | 2  | 3   | 4  | 5   | 6   | 7  | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOLAI |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 74 | 72 | 85 | 100 | 87 | 96  | 77  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 591   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 8  | 14 | 6  | 7   | 5  | 13  | 9   | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 62    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0  | 2  | 5  | 2   | 7  | 16  | 4   | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 36    |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3   | 6  | 2   | 2   | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 13    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2   | 4  | 4   | 2   | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 12    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0  | 4   | 11  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 15    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0   | 0  | 4   | 17  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 21    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 1  | 6  | 14 | 16  | 19 | 24  | 16  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 96    |
| Level 1 on 2021 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3   | 14 | 13  | 9   | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 39    |
| Level 1 on 2021 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4   | 29 | 23  | 22  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 78    |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |    |   |   |    |    |    |   |   |   | Total |    |    |       |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|----|---|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|----|----|-------|
| Indicator                            |             | 1  | 2 | 3 | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10    | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 8           | 10 | 6 | 7 | 21 | 25 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0     | 0  | 0  | 96    |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indiantar                           | Grade Level |    |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    | Total |    |       |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|-------|----|-------|
| Indicator                           | K           | 1  | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11    | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 8           | 10 | 5 | 4 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 33    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0  | 0 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0     | 0  | 8     |

## 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 Grade Component      | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |  |
| ELA Achievement             | 58%    | 61%      | 56%   |        |          |       | 61%    | 62%      | 57%   |  |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 59%    |          |       |        |          |       | 67%    | 60%      | 58%   |  |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 43%    |          |       |        |          |       | 68%    | 57%      | 53%   |  |
| Math Achievement            | 56%    | 49%      | 50%   |        |          |       | 58%    | 63%      | 63%   |  |
| Math Learning Gains         | 67%    |          |       |        |          |       | 62%    | 65%      | 62%   |  |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 58%    |          |       |        |          |       | 50%    | 53%      | 51%   |  |
| Science Achievement         | 55%    | 60%      | 59%   |        |          |       | 47%    | 57%      | 53%   |  |

#### Subgroup Data Review

|           |             | 2022      | SCHOO             | OL GRAD      | E COMF     | ONENT              | S BY SI     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2020-21 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2020-21 |
| SWD       | 35          | 40        | 33                | 35           | 56         | 55                 | 23          |            |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 41          | 64        | 60                | 47           | 59         |                    | 20          |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 52          | 60        | 30                | 48           | 79         |                    | 33          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 49          | 53        | 56                | 49           | 60         | 58                 | 37          |            |              |                         |                           |
| MUL       | 64          | 54        |                   | 61           | 75         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 64          | 61        | 44                | 62           | 64         | 56                 | 63          |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 50          | 53        | 38                | 50           | 61         | 53                 | 39          |            |              |                         |                           |
|           |             | 2021      | SCHOO             | OL GRAD      | E COMF     | PONENT             | S BY SI     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2019-20 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2019-20 |
| SWD       | 40          | 62        | 60                | 19           | 42         | 38                 | 25          |            |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 44          | 53        |                   | 41           | 60         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 38          | 52        |                   | 35           | 38         |                    | 55          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 46          | 61        | 70                | 44           | 64         |                    | 50          |            |              |                         |                           |
| MUL       | 52          |           |                   | 45           |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 71          | 62        | 58                | 54           | 51         | 33                 | 46          |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 49          | 63        | 64                | 37           | 48         | 46                 | 40          |            |              |                         |                           |
|           |             | 2019      | SCHOO             | OL GRAD      | E COMF     | PONENT             | S BY SI     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
| Subgroups | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2017-18 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2017-18 |
| SWD       | 33          | 55        | 59                | 36           | 53         | 41                 | 24          |            |              |                         |                           |
| ELL       | 52          | 57        |                   | 56           | 67         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK       | 42          | 63        | 82                | 41           | 57         | 61                 | 30          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP       | 61          | 63        | 50                | 57           | 58         | 38                 | 50          |            |              |                         |                           |
| MUL       | 64          | 71        |                   | 63           | 67         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| WHT       | 66          | 69        | 67                | 63           | 64         | 47                 | 55          |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL       | 53          | 66        | 70                | 48           | 59         | 51                 | 39          |            |              |                         |                           |

#### 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  | 54   |
| 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 | 38   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 434  |

| ESSA Federal Index   |     |
|--|-----|
| Total Components for the Federal Index   | 8   |
| Percent Tested   | 97% |
| Subgroup Data  |     |
| Students With Disabilities   |     |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                     | 37  |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?             | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%      | 0   |
| English Language Learners  |     |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                      | 47  |
| 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                                | 50  |
| 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  | 51  |
| 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   | 64  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | NO  |

| Multiracial Students   |     |
|--|-----|
| 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   | 57  |
| 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                                | 47  |
| 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?

Port Malabar students showed a decrease in overall ELA learning gains (-2) and ELA lowest 25% learning gains (-24) in 4-6. We also saw a drop in overall proficiency in grades 3-6 (-1).

Contrarily, Port Malabar students showed some of the most significant increases in math the school has ever experienced. Overall math learning gains increased by 16 points and learning gains in our lowest 25% increased by 20 points in grades 4-6. Our overall math proficiency increased by 8 points in grades 3-6. We contribute this to meaningful iReady pre-req reports Professional Development, meaningful walkthroughs with a the focus on small group instruction and utilizing those iReady pre-req reports, and walkthroughs with district math content specialist, Ms. Shruti. These walkthrough provided information that drove meaningful conversations with teachers regarding instructional practices.

Port Malabar students have been on a downward trend in ELA during the past 3 school years. After discussions with various stakeholders, many felt that ELA scores for 2021-2022 may have suffered more than math due to students and teachers being exposed to new ELA standards and new ELA curriculum, that did not align with FSA. Math saw significant increases, which we contributed to the fact that teachers were trained how to use iReady pre-requisite reports, and expected to implement more intensive small group instruction in their classrooms for math.

Science proficiency also increased by 7 points in grade 5.

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

We experienced a significant decline in ELA learning gains in our lowest 25% in 2022, dropping from 66% to 42%. 46% of 4th graders were at proficiency in 2022, a drop of 18%, and 57% of 5th graders were at proficiency in 2022, a drop of 7%.

As stated above, our 4th graders showed the most significant drop in ELA components, and was the lowest in all 3 components when compared to all other grades (46% in overall proficiency, 52% overall learning gains, and 23% in learning gains in lowest 25%). Because of the overall proficiency being below the 50% threshold, Port Malabar has been identified as a RAISE (Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence) school for the second year in a row. This was also the same cohort that put Port Malabar into RAISE status as 3rd graders, and if you look at the cohort itself, dropped from 49% proficiency as 3rd graders to 46% proficiency as 4th graders (-3%).

In our primary level, we saw a significant drop in iReady proficiency levels in our 2nd grade. Looking at iReady diagnostic 3, our 2nd graders dropped from 53% on or above grade level in 2021, to 38% on or above grade level in 2022, this is a 15% drop, which was most significant drop out of all grade levels, K-12.

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

This grade cohort (current 5th graders) has the highest concentration of our SWD/SLD population. Because of this, we feel this is our greatest need to address. New actions that need to be taken are addressing the needs of our SWD population in this cohort, specifically our students with specific learning disabilities.

For our 5th grade cohort, specifically our SLD population, extra support will be put in place, not just during Smart time and/or designated intervention times, but during the actual 90 minute reading block while the students are exposed to rigorous grade level content, through the use of our full Inclusion/ push-in ESE teacher, which is a new allocation for us this year. For our 2nd graders, we will use our ASP/tutoring funds to make sure they are given priority for our after school/before school tutoring services.

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

In ELA, our greatest improvements with regards to iReady D3 assessments, were in grades 1st (+16% on or above grade level), 3rd (+12% on or above grade level) and 6th grade (+22% on or above grade level) when comparing 2021 and 2022 scores.

In ELA with regards to FSA, our greatest improvements were in 6th grade overall proficiency (+16%), overall learning gain (+10%), and learning gains in our lowest 25% (+8%).

In math, our greatest improvements with regards to iReady D3 assessments were in grades 1st (+9% on or above grade level), 3rd (+14% on or above grade level, 5th (+10% on or above grade level) and 6th (+16% on or above grade level.

In math, with regards to FSA, our greatest improvements were in overall proficiency in grades 3rd (+22%), and grade 6th (+17%). We also showed great improvements in 5th grade overall learning gains (+8%) and overall learning gains in our lowest 25% (+16%). The most significant improvements were in 6th grade overall learning gains (+25%) and learning gains in our lowest 25% (+28%), some of the highest Port Malabar has experienced.

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

Some of the contributing factors/new actions to this improvement was staffing instructional staff in areas of their greatest strength in our grades that are departmentalized. We also provided a 90 minute math block to our 6th grade cohort, as well as trained the staff on how to use iReady pre-requisite reports to better group our students for small group math interventions, and a more accurate picture of their needs to close the learning gaps. we also implemented a morning "Jump Start" program to address our lowest 25%, which provided additional iReady instruction time to that subgroup.

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

We will continue to utitlize the iReady pre-requisite reports for our math intervention groups, we will also be continuing with our morning "Jump Start" program, though, we will have students access both iReady ELA and math instruction (based on needs), and every grade will have a 90 minute math block, in order to sustain our math improvements. We will continue to use the BPS Instructional Agreements for the 2022-2023 school year (teachers also received a copy) when doing walkthroughs/look-fors,

# 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.

We will provide training to those teachers on how to access and use iReady pre-requisite reports for both math and ELA, and provide a refresher course for those teachers who were trained during the 2021-2022 school year. We will provide training on how to analyze our new FAST assessment progress monitoring assessments, and triangulate that data with iReady diagnostic data to drive instruction.

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

We will also be utilizing an additional ESE push-in teacher to work exclusively in our 5th grade (RAISE grade level) 90 minute reading blocks, focusing on support for our SWD subgroups. Using ASP funds, we will continue to offer after/before school tutoring to assist those students with highest needs. We will also be continuing with our morning "Jump Start" program, though, we will have students access both iReady ELA and math instruction (based on needs) for this school year.

#### Areas of Focus

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

1

## **#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**

| Area of Focus<br>Description<br>and Rationale:<br>Include a<br>rationale that<br>explains how<br>it was<br>identified as a<br>critical need<br>from the data<br>reviewed. | Port Malabar was identified as being below the 41% threshold for Federal Percent of<br>Points Index in our SWD subgroup (37%), a drop of 6%. Out of 186 students in grades<br>3-6, 40 of those were in the lowest 25%. Of those 40, 26 of those students, fall into our<br>SWD subgroup, which equals to 65% of our lowest 25%.   |
|---|---|
| Measurable<br>Outcome:<br>State the<br>specific<br>measurable<br>outcome the<br>school plans<br>to achieve.<br>This should be<br>a data based,<br>objective<br>outcome.   | When looking at ELA learning gains in our lowest 25%, which greatly consists of our SWD population, Port Malabar was only at 33%. Our goal is to increase by 9%, putting us at 42% of our lowest 25%, SWD population making learning gains in ELA.  |
| Monitoring:<br>Describe how<br>this Area of<br>Focus will be<br>monitored for<br>the desired<br>outcome.  | We will monitor SWD usage time on their iReady ELA instructional pathway, the expectation is 30 minutes a week, minimum for all students. We will also work with teachers, monitor student success rate on their iReady instructional lessons, specifically those students within the SWD subgroup. F.A.S.T. Progress 1 monitoring as well as the progression between PM1 and PM2 for our SWD subgroup will take place, as well as triangulating that data with iReady D1 and D2 data to ensure SWD population is making progress, meet with teachers during grade level meetings to discuss those struggling students in order to make a plan to provide additional support. |
| Person<br>responsible<br>for monitoring<br>outcome:   | Michelle King (king.michelle@brevardschools.org)  |
| Evidence-<br>based<br>Strategy:   | The specific subgroup will be our target group for our morning Jump Start tutoring program, which this year will focus on ELA. By providing this level of support, this will provide these students approximately 100 minutes of ELA instruction a week, in addition to their classroom ELA instruction.<br>This will also be our target group for our after-school tutoring program, funded by   |
| Describe the evidence-  | ESSER Academic Support funds.   |
| based strategy<br>being<br>implemented<br>for this Area of<br>Focus.  | 5th grade has one of our highest concentration of of our SWD subgroup, and has the highest number of students with SLD, therefore, we will provide ESE support for their 90 minute reading block utilizing our push-in ESE resource teacher in accordance with Best Practices for Inclusion Education (BPIE). The ESE resource teacher will work exclusively with that SWD subgroup, with clarifying direction, assisting with rigorous and challenging tasks, and provide reading comprehension strategies for those students.   |

We will conduct walk-throughs with literacy coach, using the Science of Reading strategies as look fors, as well as the Literacy Profile, Evidence of Instruction, and the Instructional Agreements. These walkthroughs, using the walkthrough tool, will allow us to have more impactful conversations with teachers, providing valuable feedback with the purpose of improving core instruction. Teacher will be trained on the Literacy Profile 5 components, so they know and understand instructional expectations. Through this training, teachers will also gain a better understanding of how to use differentiation and scaffolding in their small group instruction.

Using our morning Jump Start program last year, with a focus on math, we saw our schools highest levels and increases in both proficiency levels and learning gains. Our Rationale for schoolwide math proficiency levels increased by 8 percentage points, overall learning Evidencegains increased by 16 percentage points, and our learning gains in our lowest 25% based increased by 20 percentage points. While we contribute much of that to 90 math blocks Strategy: and small group instruction, we believe that extra 100 minutes of math instruction a Explain the week also added to that success. we believe this will do the same for ELA. rationale for selecting this By conducting walk-throughs with the literacy coach, with focus on specific look-fors specific including but not limited to the Science of Reading strategies, we hope to see strategy. consistency in instructional delivery during the ELA block. **Describe the** resources/ Utilizing our ESE resource teacher for exclusively push-in instruction, research shows criteria used inclusive educational settings lead to stronger math and reading skills, higher for selecting attendance and graduation rates, and fewer behavioral problems, according to an this strategy. evaluation of more than 280 studies from 25 countries by Abt Associates.

#### 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.

Using Performance Matters, we will identify our SWD subgroup who scored below grade level on FSA and/or iReady D3 from the 2021-2022 school year. We will dedicate purposeful time during grade level meetings to discuss and monitor these students through state/district assessments, and end of unit tests.

Person Michelle King (king.michelle@brevardschools.org)

#### Responsible

We will target this group to provide additional instructional support through our Morning Jump Start program, focusing on ELA, as well as our after-school tutoring program provided with ESSER ASP funds. We will monitor their success rate through their iReady instructional pathway lessons.

Person Michelle King (king.michelle@brevardschools.org) Responsible

We will utilize an additional allocation this year, an ESE resource teacher that will strictly serve in a capacity of push-in support to our gen. ed. classrooms to provide additional support to our SWD population. This person will collaborate with gen ed. teachers when planning best strategies for our SWD subgroup, as well as sit in all grade level meetings to provide additional input/feedback on student success in that particular subgroup.

#### Person

Michelle King (king.michelle@brevardschools.org) Responsible

We will create a weekly walk-through schedule, with specific look-fors and tasks embedded within teacher instruction based on the RAISE Science of Reading trainings, that our Literacy Coach, Assistant Principal, and Principal will attend. Feedback will be provided to teachers based on classroom walkthroughs to improve core instruction.

#### Person Responsible Tera Scott (scott.tera@brevardschools.org)

Teacher will be trained on the Literacy Profile 5 components, so they know and understand instructional expectations. Through this training, teachers will also gain a better understanding of how to use differentiation and scaffolding in their small group instruction.

Person Responsible Gregory Rubick (rubick.gregory@brevardschools.org)

## **#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

| Area of Focus<br>Description<br>and<br>Rationale:<br>Include a<br>rationale that<br>explains how<br>it was<br>identified as a<br>critical need<br>from the data<br>reviewed. | <ul> <li>2021-22 FSA Grade 3 ELA data shows 56% of students performing at proficiency compared to district average of 58% this was a 7% increase for PME from the year before. Because 4th Grade ELA proficiency scores dropped below 50% (46%), Port Malabar was identified as a "RAISE" school by the Florida Department of Education, meaning teachers will receive Professional Development on evidence-based strategies, assistance with implementing data-informed instruction, and training on using high-quality instructional materials and multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) from the state. Port Malabar also dropped below the 41% threshold of students scoring 3+ on FSA ELA in our SWD subgroup (37%)</li> <li>2021-2022 Overall (Grades 3-6) FSA ELA achievement data shows that 58% of Port Malabar students were at proficiency (levels 3+) compared to the district average of 60%. This indicates that 42% of students in Grades 3-6 scored below Level 3. Breaking that down by grade levels, 56% of 3rd grade, 46% of 4th grade, 58% of 5th grade, and 72% of 6th grade scored 3+ on FSA ELA.</li> <li>When looking at End of Year progress monitoring assessments for 2021-2022 (iReady D3), 26% of K-2 students currently on grade level, LLI (Leveled Literacy Intervention) is needed to increase reading volume by engaging students in large amounts of successful daily reading. LLI elevates the expertise of teachers to explicitly teach vocabulary, fluency, and comprehension skills in small tier 2 groups (T) to maximize growth.</li> <li>79 of our students, through grades K-6, are receiving tier 3 intervention and have been diagnosed with fluency and decoding concerns. Bartons is an intense intervention for very small groups of students who struggle to easily and accurately decode words when reading , who by second grade are slow and inaccurate readers and who have always struggled with spelling.</li> <li>58% of students grades 3-6 at Port Malabar Elementary School are proficient in ELA based on 22 FSA ELA Achievement data. Implementation of high qua</li></ul> |
|--|--|
|  | instructional materials with fidelity will support the explicit instruction of vocabulary,<br>phonics, phonemic awareness. fluency and comprehension. High quality reading<br>instruction requires that teachers understand more than simply what to teach.<br>Collaborative planning for instruction and use of high quality instructional materials will<br>support teachers to understand how to identify their students' instructional needs, select<br>appropriate materials, and organize instruction to maximize learning, and differentiate<br>instruction to meet individual needs.   |
| Measurable<br>Outcome:<br>State the  | Grade 3 ELA proficiency (levels 3+) will increase from 56% to 60% on the 2022-2023 ELA FAST PM3.   |
| specific<br>measurable<br>outcome the  | Overall (Grades 3-6 ELA proficiency (levels 3+) will increase from 58% to 62% on the 2022-2023 ELA FAST PM3.   |
| school plans<br>to achieve.<br>This should<br>be a data  | With assistance from Title I teachers providing tier 2 and tier 3 supports to improve accelerated learning, our percentage of level 1s/Lowest 25% in grades 3-6 making learning gains will increase from 42% to 50%. Additionally, we will increase in our 2nd on ELA D3 proficiency levels, from 56% in 2022 to 61% in 2023.  |

| based,<br>objective<br>outcome.   | Additionally, our ESSA Federal Index subgroup data indicates our lowest percentage is in<br>our Students with Disabilities subgroup at 37%. Utilizing small group and push-in<br>instruction with our ESE Resource teachers, as well as the implementation of our<br>Benchmark Advance Program with fidelity, we will increase by 5% to 42% in this<br>particular subgroup.<br>Ongoing Progress Monitoring (OPM) will occur using the following measures:  |
|---|--|
| Monitoring:<br>Describe how<br>this Area of<br>Focus will be<br>monitored for<br>the desired<br>outcome.  | <ul> <li>iReady Diagnostic Growth (Fall 2022, Spring 2023)</li> <li>FAST Progress Monitoring Assessments (BOY, MId-Year, EOY)</li> <li>Benchmark and Savvas Unit Assessment Data (Grades 1-6)</li> <li>Kindergarten Literacy Survey (Kindergarten students only, at the end of each quarter)</li> <li>DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency passages (for selected students Grades 3-6, as determined by the Decision Trees)</li> <li>Oral Reading Records (for selected students Grades K-3, as determined by the Decision Trees)</li> <li>PASI and PSI (for selected students Grades K-6, as determined by the Decision Trees)</li> </ul>  |
| Person<br>responsible<br>for<br>monitoring<br>outcome:  | Tera Scott (scott.tera@brevardschools.org)   |
| Evidence-<br>based<br>Strategy:<br>Describe the<br>evidence-<br>based<br>strategy<br>being<br>implemented<br>for this Area<br>of Focus.   | <ul> <li>Overall Tier 1 performance will improve when implementing and monitoring the following strategies:</li> <li>1. Daily whole group and small group instruction as written into district created Daily Overview plans for Benchmark and Savvas curriculum, all students exposed to grade level texts while intentional scaffolding occurs for students in need</li> <li>2. Daily read alouds that help build knowledge and vocabulary for students</li> <li>3. Differentiated iReady online instruction lessons are utilized, minimum of 30 minutes per week for each child</li> <li>4. Formative and summative data is analyzed to make acceleration or intervention decisions for students</li> <li>5. Classroom walk-throughs occur and provide teachers with feedback to improve instruction based on Science of Reading and BPS Instructional Agreements look-fors, and the 5 core components from Literacy Instruction, as well as frequent coaching cycles</li> <li>6. Grade level teams plans together to navigate new standards and new curriculum</li> </ul> |
| Rationale for<br>Evidence-<br>based<br>Strategy:<br>Explain the<br>rationale for<br>selecting this<br>specific<br>strategy.<br>Describe the<br>resources/<br>criteria used<br>for selecting<br>this strategy. | Tier 1, whole group instruction will allow for equal and consistent exposure to grade level curriculum and rigor for all students.<br>Small group reading instruction is an opportunity for differentiated grade-level groups each day. Teachers will expose all students to grade level BEST standards and scaffold the instruction as needed to provide students access to grade-level text. Text sets that accompany the new curriculum help to create an in-depth understanding of the topic and build vocabulary.<br>Nationwide data supports the use of iReady instruction and progress monitoring tools as a research-based, rigorous resource for teachers to use to meet the requirements of the LAFS. Correlations between iReady data and 2022 FSA scores for Port Malabar were very strong, indicating that when used with fidelity and monitored closely, iReady can be an effective tool used throughout all of our classrooms.  |

#### **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.

Ensure teachers have access to all necessary beginning-of-the-year assessments and student materials (i.e. DIBELS ORF for all 3rd grade students and all 4th-6th level 1 students, copies of the KLS, iReady and FLKRS student preparedness videos, etc.). Train new teachers who are unfamiliar with assessments. Plan assessment schedules (iReady, FAST Progress Monitoring, FLKRS) that minimize the loss of instructional time.

#### Person

Responsible Tera Scott (scott.tera@brevardschools.org)

Continue collaboration within the Literacy Leadership Team and develop data meeting dates for the school year. Analyze 2021-2022 FSA data and seek input for school improvement. Determine a plan for monitoring iReady usage and success rate.

#### Person

Responsible Michelle King (king.michelle@brevardschools.org)

Work with leadership team, Title 1 coordinator, and teachers to develop an intervention plan for below grade level and substantially deficient students, and possible acceleration/enrichment for high achieving students. Use Data Meetings throughout the year to discuss ongoing progress monitoring data for students (iReady, Benchmark Unit/Weekly assessments, DIBELS, Oral Reading Records, PASI, PSI, KLS, etc.) and determine the future need for intervention or acceleration. Utilize Title 1 teachers to provide intensive intervention for students in need, by pulling small groups, based on progress monitoring and data from district assessments, these teachers will use supplemental resources (95% Group, Scholastic, etc.) to assist in the accelerated learning process. (T)

#### Person

Responsible Stefania Kahler (kahler.stefania@brevardschools.org)

Meet with grade level teams to assess student data, assist with planning and determine coaching cycles and instructional support needs based on that student data, as well as utilizing the Science of Reading when planning those coaching cycles.

#### Person

Responsible Michelle King (king.michelle@brevardschools.org)

Continue to provide ongoing Professional Development for teachers with regards to the Benchmark Advance/Savvas curriculum and BEST Standards. Observe and monitor instruction to ensure fidelity of this process and positive impact, through classroom walk throughs.

#### Person

**Responsible** Tera Scott (scott.tera@brevardschools.org)

Continue to use Benchmark Advance district pacing lesson guides to ensure ELA curriculum tasks/ lessons are being completed with fidelity. Administration will consistently refer to the BPS Leading and Learning Instruction agreement for the 2022-2023 school year, ensuring pedagogical expectations are being met through classroom walkthrough cycles and observations.

#### Person Responsible Gregory Rubick (rubick.gregory@brevardschools.org)

Utilize Academic Support funds to hire a part-time certified teacher to provide intensive small group reading instruction. Students will be identified using unit assessments, iReady diagnostic scores, 22-22 FSA data, and FAST Progress monitoring Assessments. Progress will be monitored through weekly grade level data chats.

Person Responsible Tera Scott (scott.tera@brevardschools.org) Title I will coordinate Parent and Family Engagement activities to support academic success at home, through events such as Family Literacy Night, and by providing ELA materials and training to parents & families. (T)

#### Person Responsible Stefania Kahler (kahler.stefania@brevardschools.org)

Provide teachers and students with access to annual online subscriptions to MyOn, Accelerated Reader, Flocabulary, Generation Genius to support ELA and Social Studies instruction. Purchase recommended trade books to support, ELA instruction. (T)

Person Responsible Stefania Kahler (kahler.stefania@brevardschools.org)

## **#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

| Area of<br>Focus<br>Description<br>and<br>Rationale:<br>Include a<br>rationale<br>that explains<br>how it was<br>identified as<br>a critical<br>need from<br>the data<br>reviewed. | Looking at our FSA math scores, every grade increased in every cell from 2021 to 2022<br>except for 4th grade, which decreased in every cell. In overall math proficiency, 4th grade<br>dropped from 56% in 2021 to 51% in 2022. In overall learning gains, 4th grade dropped<br>from 75% in 2021 to 69% in 2022, and in learning gains for lowest 25%, 4th grade dropped<br>from 75% in 2021 to 69% in 2022. There was also a significant drop in our 4th grade on<br>spring iReady math diagnostic 3. in spring 2021 52% were on or above grade level on D3,<br>while only 41% were on or above grade level in spring 2022.<br>We also looked at and identified a significant drop in 2nd grade from 2021 to 2022 Spring<br>iReady diagnostic 3. In 2021, 53% of students were on or above grade level, while only<br>38% percent were on or above grade level in 2022.  |
|--|--|
| Measurable<br>Outcome:<br>State the<br>specific<br>measurable<br>outcome the<br>school plans<br>to achieve.<br>This should<br>be a data<br>based,<br>objective<br>outcome.         | In the 2021-2022 school year, I was trained on how to use iReady pre-requisite reports in order to identify students who need more support. I took this knowledge and brought it back to my school and trained my teachers. This allowed them to be more strategic and precise when providing specific supports to students who needed it to master mathematical concepts. This year, we will continue to utilize iReady math instructional pathways for students and pre-req reports. We hope this will have a positive impact on our areas of critical need. Our goal is to increase on/above grade level percentage on the iReady Diagnostic 2 from 29% in 2021-22 school year, to 37% in 2022-23 school year. For 4th grade, being our other area of critical need, our goal is to increase on/above grade level percentage on the iReady Diagnostic 2 from 42% in 2021-22 school year to 50% in 2022-23 school year. For 4th grade F.A.S.T., PM3, our goal is to increase overall math proficiency from 51% in 2021-2022 SY, to 56% in the 2022-23 SY. We will increase our percentage in overall learning gains from 69% in 2021-2022 SY to 73% in 2022-2023 SY. |
| Monitoring:<br>Describe<br>how this<br>Area of<br>Focus will<br>be<br>monitored<br>for the<br>desired<br>outcome.<br>Person<br>responsible<br>for                                  | I will monitor student usage time on their iReady math instructional pathway, the expectation is 30 minutes a week, minimum. I will also work with teachers, monitor student success rate on their iReady instructional lessons in order to identify those students that may need tier 2/3 interventions. I will also monitor F.A.S.T. Progress 1 monitoring assessments, and triangulating that data with iReady, meet with teachers during grade level meetings to discuss those struggling students in order to make a plan to provide additional support. Additionally, during walkthroughs, one my look-fors will be teachers implementing small group instruction during their 90 minute math block.   |
| monitoring<br>outcome:<br>Evidence-<br>based<br>Strategy:<br>Describe the<br>evidence-<br>based  | One of the strategies we implemented this year was to provide every teacher with a 90 minute math block. Data shows that more exposure to mathematical concepts and standards closes those learning gaps. Additionally, we will be offering our morning "Jump Start" program just as we did in the 2021-2022 school year. This provided extra time for our struggling students to work on their iReady instructional pathways, which accumulated to approximately 100 extra minutes of math instruction per week. Using our walkthrough  |

strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Rationale for

tool, we will conduct walkthroughs during 90 minute blacks blocks, with a focus on ensuring teachers are using the curriculum with fidelity during core instruction, as well as implementing small group instruction utilizing the resources from Reveal and Edgem to fill in mathematical gaps within our struggling students.

Evidencebased During the 2021-2022 school year, we were able to provide 6th graders with a 90 minute Strategy: Explain the math block. We also placed a teacher that was strong in math in this position. Because of rationale for this, 6th grade saw the highest learning gains PME has seen in math. I believe more selecting exposer to math concepts will assist in all grades, not just 6 grade. Additionally, having a 990 minute math block will allow more for whole group tier 1 instruction, as well as small this specific strategy. group tier 2 instruction and support to address learning gaps in students. We also saw significant increases in math proficiency levels and learning gains in our other grades that Describe the resources/ we attribute to our morning "Jump Start" program, that focused on math instruction through the iReady platform. 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.

Reserve Early Release and other professional development sessions for math collaboration and team planning, with the focus on the new curriculum and standards. Members of the Leadership Team will be available to support teachers.

#### Person

Gregory Rubick (rubick.gregory@brevardschools.org)

#### Responsible

Use Reveal and Edgem end of unit assessment data, iReady diagnostic data, and F.A.S.T. progress monitoring data to progress monitor students, identify students in the lowest 25th percentile, plan for intervention, and plan for enrichment opportunities. Utilize Title I funds to purchase supplemental materials, technology items as needed (laptops, headphones, etc.) and staff to provide math interventions. (T)

#### Person

**Responsible** Gregory Rubick (rubick.gregory@brevardschools.org)

Continue to train/re-train teachers how to use iReady prerequisite reports to identify students needing indepth review on skills and concepts needed to master state standards. Monitor the use of these reports and small group instruction through walk-throughs and grade level data chats.

#### Person

**Responsible** Gregory Rubick (rubick.gregory@brevardschools.org)

Utilize Academic Support funds to hire a part-time certified teacher to provide intensive small group math instruction. Students will be identified using iReady diagnostic scores, 21-22 FSA data, and F.A.S.T. progress monitoring assessment.

#### Person

**Responsible** Gregory Rubick (rubick.gregory@brevardschools.org)

New this year will be a school assigned math coach which will meet with Adminstration and grade level teams to provide support and feedback during meetings regarding scaffolding to address instructional gaps, as well as clarification and consistency with regards to new curriculum and new standards.

#### Person Responsible Gregory Rubick (rubick.gregory@brevardschools.org)

There will be scheduled classroom walk through cycles, conducted by myself, Mrs. Scott and our district assigned math coach to monitor classroom instruction, implementation of new curriculum/standards, and follow ups to monitor the outcome of implementing instructional strategies.

#### Person

# **Responsible** Gregory Rubick (rubick.gregory@brevardschools.org)

We will continue our program called "Jump Start". This program will target level 1 students and provide them additional morning instruction on iReady before the school day begins. They will work on their instructional pathways in iReady, which will fill in the gaps/skills the students are missing. (T)

#### Person Responsible Gregory Rubick (rubick.gregory@brevardschools.org)

Title I will coordinate Parent and Family Engagement activities to support academic success at home, through events such as Family Math Night, and by providing math materials and training to parents & families. (T)

## Person

# Responsible Stefania Kahler (kahler.stefania@brevardschools.org)

Utilize Title I Teachers to provide intensive, small group intervention to students identified as performing below grade level. Teachers will follow District Decision Tree to determine appropriate interventions and progress monitoring pieces. (T)

#### Person

Responsible [no one identified]

## #4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

| Area of Focus<br>Description and<br>Rationale:<br>Include a rationale<br>that explains how<br>it was identified<br>as a critical need<br>from the data<br>reviewed.                                | With an increased focus on Science, Port Malabar Science proficiency scores increased by 7 percentage points in 2022 (from 48% to 55%). Our data from the spring 2022 SSA shows that Port Malabar students (grade 5) performed 2% below the district and 7% above the state in Overall Science Achievement. We would like to continue focusing on Science as an area that needs improvement, and continue this upward trend.   |
|--|--|
| Measurable<br>Outcome:<br>State the specific<br>measurable<br>outcome the<br>school plans to<br>achieve. This<br>should be a data<br>based, objective<br>outcome.                                  | Overall Science Achievement (students in grade 5 scoring at or above proficiency) will increase by 5% to 60% at or above proficiency, in the spring of 2023. This will continue to exceed the previous state proficiency level of 48% and the district's proficiency level of 55%.   |
| Monitoring:<br>Describe how this<br>Area of Focus will<br>be monitored for<br>the desired<br>outcome.  | OPM tool- Unify/Performance Matters Summative Assessments: Physical and Chemical Changes Summative and Solar System & Beyond Summative. PENDA user reports   |
| Person<br>responsible for<br>monitoring<br>outcome:  | [no one identified]  |
| Evidence-based<br>Strategy:<br>Describe the<br>evidence-based<br>strategy being<br>implemented for<br>this Area of<br>Focus.   | Teachers will use Destination Science: The Quest for Quality Instruction, (the district curriculum materials) with an increased focus on the 5E Model of Unit Planning (Engage, Explore, Explain, Elaborate, and Evaluate). We will continue to collaborate with District Content Specialists, in order to assist teachers in planning and implementing an effective science curriculum. We will continue the use of PENDA (district provided) to provide students with supplemental Science instruction and practice, both in school and at home. |
| Rationale for<br>Evidence-based<br>Strategy:<br>Explain the<br>rationale for<br>selecting this<br>specific strategy.<br>Describe the<br>resources/criteria<br>used for selecting<br>this strategy. | The Destination Science curriculum guides were developed using nationally based research and our district BSCS committee. Continuing to fully implement the program with fidelity and support will enhance core science 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.

Progress monitor student science data through Performance Matters when students take formative and summative assessments, reflect on instructional practices.

#### Person

**Responsible** Tera Scott (scott.tera@brevardschools.org)

Identify students in need of Science support and create a plan for Science Academic Support Program for Spring of 2023, for selected students.

#### Person Responsible Stefania Kahler (kahler.stefania@brevardschools.org)

Utilize Title I funds to support 4th grade science standards focused on Florida ecosystems. (T)

| Person      | Stofania Kabler (kabler stofania@brovardschools erg) |
|-------------|--|
| Responsible | Stefania Kahler (kahler.stefania@brevardschools.org) |

Teachers in grades 3-6 will continue PENDA training and utilization of the program for at least 30 mins per week. A student/teacher incentive program will be put in place to monitor and encourage PENDA usage.

Person Stefania Kahler (kahler.stefania@brevardschools.org)

#### Responsible

Provide teachers with access to Generation Genius and BrainPop to support science standards in grades K-6. (T)

Person Responsible Stefania Kahler (kahler.stefania@brevardschools.org)

Participate in district funded hands-on science exploration experiences- Starbase Patrick Program for 5th grade; Destination Space for 6th grade.

Person Responsible Tera Scott (scott.tera@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

In our primary level, we saw a significant drop in iReady proficiency levels in our 2nd grade. Looking at iReady diagnostic 3, our 2nd graders dropped from 53% on or above grade level in 2021, to 38% on or above grade level in 2022, this is a 15% drop, which was the most significant drop out of all grade levels, K-12. Overall, 26% of our K-2nd graders are not on track to score on or above grade level on the statewide ELA assessment. Classroom wlakthroughs will be conducted this year using our tool for look-fors, this will make our walkthroughs more purposeful, and the feedback more impactful for improving core instruction.

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

As stated above, our 4th graders showed the most significant drop in ELA components, and was the lowest in all 3 components when compared to all other grades (46% in overall proficiency, 52% overall learning gains, and 23% in learning gains in lowest 25%). Because of the overall proficiency being below the 50% threshold, Port Malabar has been identified as a RAISE (Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence) school for the second year in a row. This was also the same cohort that put Port Malabar into RAISE status as 3rd graders, and if you look at the cohort itself, dropped from 49% proficiency as 3rd graders to 46% proficiency as 4th graders (-3%). We also considered that 7 of our 19 (37%) 5th graders that scored in our lowest 25%, fall into our SWD subgroup. Overall, 44% of our 3rd graders, 54% of our 4th graders, and 42% of our 5th graders scored below grade level on the FSA ELA. Classroom wlakthroughs will be conducted this year using our tool for look-fors, this will make our walkthroughs more purposeful, and the feedback more impactful for improving core 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)

With 74% of our students grades K-2 scoring at or above grade level on Spring iReady D3, that still leaves 26% scoring below grade level. Our goal is to decrease that percentage by 6%.

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

With only 53% our our students grades 3-5 scoring at or above proficiency levels on FSA ELA, which is a 6% drop from the previous year 2021-2022, and is also 6% less than the current district level (59%), our goal is to increase that by 7% to reach 60% proficiency in ELA for grades 3-6.

#### 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.

We will monitor all grades, but focus on grades k-2 and current 5th graders' usage time on their iReady ELA instructional pathway, the expectation is 30 minutes a week, minimum for all students. We will also monitor student success rate on their iReady instructional lessons, and work with teachers to identify and target those students that are not making adequate progress. F.A.S.T. Progress 1 monitoring will be ongoing as well as tracking progression between PM1 and PM2, and triangulating that data with iReady D2 and D3 data to ensure those students are making progress. Admin will meet with teachers during grade level meetings to discuss those students identified as struggling in order to make a plan to provide additional support. Consistent and meaningful walk-throughs will take place, to ensure standards are being taught, and those look-fors are in place, based on the RAISE webinars focused on the Science of Reading.

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Scott, Tera, scott.tera@brevardschools.org

#### **Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

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

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidencebased Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

The specific grade levels will be our target group for our morning Jump Start tutoring program, which this year will focus on ELA. By providing this level of support, this will provide these students approximately 100 minutes of ELA instruction a week, in addition to their classroom ELA instruction.

We will be implementing our RAISE first grade tutoring program this year, which will be a new additional program. This will take place during school hours, and our Literacy Leadership Team will come up with a plan to monitor and track those students receiving this additional support.

My AP, literacy coach and myself, will be conducting walk-throughs during the 90 minute ELA block, which

specific task embedded within those walkthroughs, along with Look-fors based on the Science of Reading, which we will be participating in through the biweekly RAISE webinars, as well as 5 core components from Literacy Instruction.

#### 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?

Last year when implementing the morning "Jump Program" we focused on math. We saw significant increases in proficiency levels, overall learning gains, and learning gains in our lowest 25% on the FSA Math grades 3-6. We feel by focusing this year "Jump Start" program on ELA will have a the same positive impact on our ELA scores this year.

Though our FSA ELA scores dropped, we feel the after-school tutoring program greatly assisted our students specifically in grades k-1, based on iReady D3 scores. We saw an increase in our kindergarteners on or above grade level, going from 91% in 2020-2021 to 93% in 2021-2022.

By implementing the new RAISE First Grade tutoring program and conducting collaborative and purposeful walkthroughs and coaching cycles between principal, AP, and literacy coach, based on the Science of Reading tasks/look-fors, we feel this will have significant impact on ELA instruction in our classrooms.

#### 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<br>Monitoring          |
|---|---|
| Literacy Leadership team will meet bi weekly to analyze iReady diagnostic data, as well as iReady instructional pathway data (usage and success rate) for those focused grade levels. The Literacy Leadership Team will triangulate iReady data with F.A.S.T. Progress monitoring data to have the most accurate picture of students, in order to provide the appropriate supports for ELA success.   | Scott, Tera,<br>scott.tera@brevardschools.org |
| The Literacy Leadership will meet and collaborate after purposeful classroom walkthroughs, in order to maintain consistency with observed look-fors and embedded tasks. These conversations will also drive the instructional we have with teachers in order to continuously improve classroom instruction.   | Scott, Tera,<br>scott.tera@brevardschools.org |
| Admin will participate in bi weekly RAISE webinars with the literacy coach to gain knowledge and training on the Science of Reading. We will use this information to drive our walk-throughs to ensure these observations are purposeful and conversations are impactful.   |   |
| The Literacy Leadership Team will meet with grade levels on a weekly basis to discuss observations in walkthroughs, look-for expectations, and to provide insight and training on the Science of Reading to teachers, based on the bi-weekly webinars the LLT attend.   | Scott, Tera,<br>scott.tera@brevardschools.org |
| We will work collaboratively with grade levels, meeting weekly in our grade level data chats to analyze assessment data in order to identify struggling students to provide support, identify teacher needs, and make impactful decisions in collaborative and supportive fashion in order to improve classroom instruction. Walkthroughs will be conducted using our walkthrough tool with look-fors based on Instructional Agreements, Literacy Profile, and Evidence of Instruction in order to provide meaningful feedback with the goal of improving core instruction. | Scott, Tera,<br>scott.tera@brevardschools.org |
| The Literacy Leadership Team will provide ongoing professional learning with regards<br>to improving instruction in the ELA 90 minute reading block. This will be focused on<br>whole group/small group instruction, embedding the Science of Reading within<br>instruction, scaffolding, and assessment data analysis in order to provide additional<br>supports to students identified as struggling/below grade level.   | Scott, Tera,<br>scott.tera@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.

Our school has begun our process of becoming a PBIS school. With foundations already in place, we have put other positive interventions/strategies in place, using our P.R.I.D.E. (Prepared, Respectful, Individual, Dependable, and Enthusiastic) award system as the foundation. We have put procedures in place to address desired cafeteria behavior, as well as created positive behavior referrals that will receive schoolwide recognition. Teachers have been trained/informed on these strategies and will be consistent in using this within their classrooms. In addition, based on needs assessment from last year, our 5th and 6th graders will receive a Life Skills activity on their activity wheel. I will also create a Principals' Student Council, comprised on 4th, 5th and 6th graders, to meet with me each month to gather feedback and input on school culture/environment.

Youth Truth Survey Data

Highest areas compared to all other elementary schools, "engagement" and "culture" Highest areas overall as a school, "engagement" and "relationships" Lowest areas compared to all other elementary schools, "instructional methods" and "belonging" Lowest areas as a school, "culture" and "belonging"

Strengths of PME perceived by students (compared to elementary responses in district and nation,) NOT OUR HIGHEST AS A SCHOOL, BUT COMPARATIVELY Engagement and Culture Highest rated theme/question Engagement: Does your teacher want you to do your best? PME 94%, 2021 DIST 93% NAT 95% PME 94%, 2021 Highest rated theme/question Culture: Do students in your class treat your teacher with respect? PME 39%, 2022 DIST 39% NAT 47% PME 46%, 2021

Areas for improvement perceived by student (compared to elementary responses in district and nation) NOT OUR LOWEST AS A SCHOOL, BUT COMPARATIVELY Instructional Methods and Belonging Lowest rated theme/question Instr. Meth: Does your teacher ask you if you understand what you are learning? PME 52%, 2022 DIST 59% NAT 64% PME 60% 2021 Lowest rated theme/question Belonging: Can you be yourself with other students? PME 44% 2022 DIST 50% NAT 57% PME 54% 2021

Parent Survey Data

• Positives – for question "Do you feel welcome at your child's school?" increased from 91% yes in 2020-2021 to 95% in 2021-2022

For question "How often did you attend a parent meeting or event at your child's school that supported your child's academic success?" increased from 44% yes in 2020-2021 to 49% in 2021-2022 For question "Have you been given opportunities to provide input/feedback in school decisions?" increased from 72% yes in 2020-2021 to 79% in 2021-2022

For question "How often does your child's school or teacher provide you with information about ways you can help your child's learning at home?" increased from 45% often in 2020-2021 to 55% in 2021-2022

We also received better feedback regarding discipline, and how it's improved and we're gonna try and tighten a little more this year

• Negatives – for question "How often do you communicate with your child's teacher?" decreased from 57% often in 2020-2021 to 47% - often in 2021-2022

we also dropped 2% often "How often does your child's teacher communicate with you about your child's progress?" so keep that communication piece in mind – I know we have some parents who we call and leave messages, or we cant because the mailbox is full,

#### Insight Survey Data

We are below the district average in just one area – Academic Expectations, district as a whole was lowest 11 dimensions

Academic Expectations, Academic Opportunity, Professional Development, Diversity Equity and Inclusion, Instructional Planning for Student growth, School Operations, Learning Environment, Observation and feedback, Peer Culture, Evaluation, Leadership Most significant Increase – Peer Culture (7.4 to 7.9) and Leadership (7.2 to 7.&)

Area of significant growth/increase in Peer Culture There is a low tolerance for ineffective teaching at my school, +9% Area of significant growth/increase in Leadership I understand how my actions contribute to school priorities and goals, +17%

Most significant decreases – Academic Expectations (5.0 to 2.5) and School Operations (7.7 to 7.0)

Area of most significant decrease within Academic Expectation All students in my class can master grade-level standards by the end of the school year, -12% Area of most significant decrease within School Operations Procedures at my school maximize the time students spend learning, -13%

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

Mrs. Scott/Mrs. King - PBIS coordinators Support - Mr. Rubick/Mrs. Kahler Guidance Counselor - Mrs. Tsairis Behavior Support Specialist - Mrs. Coleman