Surfside Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Surfside Elementary School

475 CASSIA BLVD, Satellite Beach, FL 32937

http://www.surfside.brevard.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Kassie Erenstoft R

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2020

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-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)	25%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (72%) 2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: A (69%)
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

Surfside Elementary School

475 CASSIA BLVD, Satellite Beach, FL 32937

http://www.surfside.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 KG-6	No	25%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	16%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Surfside Elementary School provides a safe and positive environment where high quality education occurs for all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Surfside Elementary will create a challenging, positive learning environment that promotes excellence and group achievement. Staff, students, and parents will work together to encourage children to realize their maximum potential for learning, problem solving, and responsible citizenship.

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
Erenstoft, Kassie	Principal	
Sicoli, Lauren	Assistant Principal	
Oehlmann, Patricia	Instructional Coach	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2020, Kassie Erenstoft R

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
6

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
33

Total number of students enrolled at the school
448

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
8

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
6

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	47	73	52	47	70	81	54	0	0	0	0	0	0	424
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
One or more suspensions	2	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	12	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	10	6	6	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	5	4	5	6	6	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	2	2	1	6	8	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	2	1	0	0	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 9/6/2022

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	43	68	49	48	70	78	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	409
Attendance below 90 percent	4	8	4	2	6	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	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	0	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	11	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	2	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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

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

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	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	43	68	49	48	70	78	53	0	0	0	0	0	0	409
Attendance below 90 percent	4	8	4	2	6	8	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	0	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	0	8	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	11	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	2	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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

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

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	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	77%	61%	56%				69%	62%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	69%						54%	60%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%						50%	57%	53%
Math Achievement	75%	49%	50%				79%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	80%						76%	65%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60%						68%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	91%	60%	59%				77%	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	72%	64%	8%	58%	14%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	71%	61%	10%	58%	13%
Cohort Comparison		-72%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	78%	60%	18%	56%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
06	2022					
	2019	54%	60%	-6%	54%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				

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	70%	61%	9%	62%	8%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	82%	64%	18%	64%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-70%				
05	2022					
	2019	71%	60%	11%	60%	11%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				
06	2022					
	2019	87%	67%	20%	55%	32%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	76%	56%	20%	53%	23%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-76%				

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	31	35	33	38	52	44					
HSP	79	90		77	90						
MUL	81	70		69	90						
WHT	77	68	54	75	78	55	90				
FRL	70	71	69	52	71	53	81				

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	36	69		39	77						
HSP	60			73							
MUL	50			50							
WHT	84	85	80	78	86	65	69				
FRL	67	77		60	68		42				

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	31	45	40	34	60	53					
HSP	75	30		75	60						
WHT	70	56	54	81	79	79	79				
FRL	58	42	43	69	73	73	73				

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	72
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	505
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	39
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

Students With Disabilities	
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

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 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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	84
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	78
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	71
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	67
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?

Our subgroup of students with disabilities continues to be a concern in the area of proficiency. While we do feel that many students in this category are making learning gains, they are not showing proficiency on grade level standards. Our science scores in fifth grade continue to improve.

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

The areas of greatest need are mathematics and proficiency of our students with disabilities. On iReady Diagnostic 3, only 44% of students made their typical growth in mathematics. This percentage was the same for students with and without disabilities. On the 2022 Math FSA, 74% of students scored a three or higher, and only 38% of students with disabilities scored a three or higher. On the 2022 ELA FSA, 77% of students scored a three or higher, and only 31% of students with disabilities scored a three or higher.

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

We need to provide our teachers with a comprehensive mathematics program, offer training on the new benchmarks and modeling opportunities. For our students with disabilities we need to provide time for collaboration between general education and exceptional student education teachers. Our students will need schedules that reflect both grade-level expectations as well as time for intervention and support on IEP goals. In addition, we need to work to support our ESE team so that they have the resources, tools and guidance needed to be successful.

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

Our fifth grade State Science Assessment (SSA) scores showed the greatest improvement. 91% of fifth graders were proficient on the 2022-2023 SSA. This is an increase from 76% in 2019. When looking at our iReady ELA data from Diagnostic 3 for the entire school, the median progress towards typical growth was 115%.

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

Our fifth grade team reviewed science data continually to analyze student progress towards mastery of science standards, including not only fifth grade standards but those covered in grades three and four that would be tested. With the roll out of new ELA benchmarks and a new ELA program, our focus was more so on ELA than math last year. The additional professional development and focus on intervention aided in this success.

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

Through Collaborative Planning sessions, we will work with teams on providing grade-level instruction to all students. When possible, they will work to enrich those showing mastery and provide support to those falling behind. Having more time for general education teachers and ESE teachers to collaborate will help with this. Additionally, during our Collaborative Planning sessions, we will review student data to determine what students learned, what they need more support with and how we can tell this through review of student work samples. During team data meetings, teachers will review student data within I-ready, as well as State Progress Monitoring data to help drive instruction and allow additional supports for targeted students.

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

We will offer training on the new Florida Benchmarks. This will include time to review new expectations and what may not have been covered in the previous year that will be gaps for students. Training on the new mathematics programs will also be offered. With the support of our math coach, we will offer modeling with opportunities for networking and collaboration afterwards. Continued professional learning on the MTSS process, inclusion and high-yield strategies will also be offered. Professional Development will be provided to teachers to analyze data from State Diagnostic Progress Monitoring K-6th grade and the next steps following the data.

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

We will provide Lexia to any students in grades one and two who are substantially deficient in reading. Through the development of a mentoring program, we will offer targeted support to students, prioritizing those with disabilities. Our math coach will model lessons for teachers and help to provide feedback and support as needed.

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

:

#1. 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.**	Our students with disabilities (SWD) subgroup fell below the federal index of 41% in 2022. 31% of SWD were proficient on the 2022 FSA ELA and 38% were proficient on the 2022 FSA Math.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	On the 2023 FAST PM3, at least 50% of SWD will be proficient in ELA and Math.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	We will monitor progress on this during PM1, PM2 and iReady diagnostics. During IEP meetings, we will continually review data and discuss student progress.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kassie Erenstoft (erenstoft.kassie@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	We will work to increase collective efficacy among our staff.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	Collective efficacy will allow our team to work in a more unified way, seeing all students as ours and their success a product of our collective work. Too often SWD are seen as the responsibility of the ESE teacher. However, their success is dependent upon the general education teachers, the ESE team, administration and leadership. We will work to reshape this thinking and realign the vision for success for all.

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.

Review the data for all SWD. Consider data from 2022 and beginning of the year data. Determine the best approach to serving each student during the 2022-2023 school year. Develop a schedule that will best serve all students.

Person Responsible   Kassie Erenstoft (erenstoft.kassie@brevardschools.org)

During collaborative planning, ensure that SWD are discussed by the team as a whole and subsequent action steps developed. Ensure that their data is monitored throughout the year and that their progress is tracked. Celebrate the successes and strategize as a full team.

Person Responsible   Kassie Erenstoft (erenstoft.kassie@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.**	On iReady Diagnostic 3, only 44% of students made their typical growth in mathematics. This percentage was the same for students with and without disabilities. On the 2022 Math FSA, 74% of students scored a three or higher, and only 38% of students with disabilities scored a three or higher. On PM1, (September FAST), 46% of students scored a Level 1 and in third grade 76% of students scored a Level 1.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	On iReady Diagnostic 3, 60% of students will meet their typical growth in mathematics. On 2023 Fast PM3, at least 80% of students in grades 3-6 will be proficient. At least 70% of third grade students will be proficient on 2023 FAST PM3.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	We will monitor progress on this during PM1, PM2 and iReady diagnostics. During MTSS meetings, we will continually review data (math unit assessments) and discuss student progress.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lauren Sicoli (sicoli.lauren@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	We will work to ensure standards focused instruction is implemented during math block.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	With the implementation of new BEST Standards as well as new Math curriculum it is imperative that instruction aligns with the new standards. During preplanning we reviewed the transition documents which provided an overview of the major changes in mathematical concepts within their 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.

Ensure that the master schedule reflects a full hour for math instruction Monday through Friday for all grade levels.

Person Responsible   Kassie Erenstoft (erenstoft.kassie@brevardschools.org)

During collaborative planning meetings, data from unit assessments will be reviewed to determine student mastery of standards as well as recognize reteaching opportunities of standards not met with mastery.

| **Person Responsible** | Lauren Sicoli (sicoli.lauren@brevardschools.org) |

Classroom walk-throughs will be utilized to ensure integrity of instruction.

| **Person Responsible** | Lauren Sicoli (sicoli.lauren@brevardschools.org) |

The leadership team will design an intervention program aimed at helping third grade students gain the necessary math skills needed to be successful on grade level standards. Current teachers and retired certified teachers will offer small group and individualized instruction to students on math standards. We will utilize ASP and ESSR funds to pay these teachers.

| **Person Responsible** | Lauren Sicoli (sicoli.lauren@brevardschools.org) |

#3. 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.	On the 2022 Florida Standards Assessment (FSA), 77% of students were proficient, earning a level three or higher.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	On the 2023 Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST), 80% of students will be proficient.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	We will monitor core ELA instruction through walkthroughs. We will also monitor progress towards this goal using PM1 and PM2 of the FAST.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kassie Erenstoft (erenstoft.kassie@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	We will support standards-aligned instruction of the new Florida ELA Benchmarks through collaborative planning, data chats and walkthroughs that include meaningful feedback.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	By supporting teachers during planning, as they review ongoing progress monitoring data and during everyday instruction, we hope to continue to strengthen our knowledge of the benchmarks and best practices needed to support students.

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

Provide time for teachers to collaborate regarding ELA instruction and upcoming Benchmarks.

| **Person Responsible** | Lauren Sicoli (sicoli.lauren@brevardschools.org) |

Continually review formative and summative data to determine if students mastered the standards, and how to respond if they didn't.

| **Person Responsible** | Lauren Sicoli (sicoli.lauren@brevardschools.org) |

Classroom walkthroughs to ensure teaching is aligned with standards and to provide ongoing feedback.

| **Person Responsible** | [no one identified] |

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 administrative team works daily to foster a climate that is rooted in trust and respect. We have an open door policy and encourage all of our staff members, students and parents to communicate openly with us about things that are going well and things that may need to be adjusted. We offer feedback to teachers that is meaningful and useful, while always seeking to encourage and highlight the amazing things happening on a daily basis.

FOCUS is a great way for parents to be involved with their student's school experience and education team. 31% of parents that responded to the 2021-2022 Parent Survey stated that they had never used FOCUS to review grades and communicate with the school. We hope to decrease this percentage this year to less than 20%.

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

Kassie Erenstoft - Empower staff to communicate openly, foster networking and collaboration and implement a schedule that promotes student growth.
Lauren Sicoli-Provide coaching opportunities aligning math standards to instruction effectively.
Patricia Oehlmann- Support teachings and parents in understanding data and school improvement.
PTO President-increasing volunteers and supporting staff throughout the year.