

Brevard Public Schools

Ocean Breeze Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	16
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Ocean Breeze Elementary School

1101 CHEYENNE DR, Indian Harbour Beach, FL 32937

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

Demographics

Principal: Shelley Michaud

Start Date for this Principal: 7/9/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	<i>[Data Not Available]</i>
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Economically Disadvantaged Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (73%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: A (70%) 2015-16: A (71%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	[not available]
* 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Ocean Breeze Elementary School’s mission is to develop motivated and confident life-long learners who are prepared for future challenges (updated 2019).

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to maintain a safe, respectful, and inclusive school community where responsibility for learning is shared, and everyone counts. Ocean Breeze will nurture and encourage every child to discover personal strengths and talents, develop a passion for learning, and acquire the skills to be a creative and collaborative problem solver. (updated 2019).

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Michaud, Shelley	Principal	Oversee the day to day operations of the school including: fiscal monitoring, data analysis, supervision and evaluation, curriculum and instructional planning, behavior management, facilitate collegiality and collaboration, engage stakeholders, talent & recruitment management, and all other duties necessary in building leadership.
Hill- Brodigan, Elizabeth	Assistant Principal	Assist the principal in the oversight of the day to day operations of the school including: fiscal monitoring, data analysis, supervision and evaluation, curriculum and instructional planning, behavior management, facilitate collegiality and collaboration, engage stakeholders, talent & recruitment management, and all other duties necessary in building leadership.
Lang, Adam	Instructional Coach	Support staff with the collection and analysis of student data to inform instructional decisions and promote student growth and performance. Model and support best practice in literacy instruction. Facilitate data and assessment meetings, and provide intervention or intervention support to substantially deficient students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/9/2018, Shelley Michaud

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

5

Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*

4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

41

Total number of students enrolled at the school

535

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

1

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

1

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

The number of students by 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	63	72	84	81	69	79	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	527
Attendance below 90 percent	7	1	5	2	5	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	4	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/23/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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	58	70	77	63	65	77	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	503
Attendance below 90 percent	8	8	6	7	4	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	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	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

2020-21 - Updated

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	58	70	77	63	65	77	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	503
Attendance below 90 percent	8	8	6	7	4	7	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	76%			80%	62%	57%	71%	60%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	74%			68%	60%	58%	51%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	65%			65%	57%	53%	33%	46%	48%
Math Achievement	74%			81%	63%	63%	79%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains	71%			79%	65%	62%	70%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	56%			65%	53%	51%	60%	49%	47%
Science Achievement	70%			76%	57%	53%	75%	57%	55%

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
03	2021					
	2019	86%	64%	22%	58%	28%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	73%	61%	12%	58%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-86%				
05	2021					
	2019	84%	60%	24%	56%	28%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				
06	2021					
	2019	80%	60%	20%	54%	26%
Cohort Comparison		-84%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	77%	61%	16%	62%	15%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	71%	64%	7%	64%	7%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				
05	2021					
	2019	79%	60%	19%	60%	19%
Cohort Comparison		-71%				
06	2021					
	2019	95%	67%	28%	55%	40%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	74%	56%	18%	53%	21%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

i-Ready Diagnostic

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	71/30	71/56	73/89
	Economically Disadvantaged	19/11	19/37	19/79
	Students With Disabilities	8/25	8/50	8/75
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	70/26	71/58	73/78
	Economically Disadvantaged	19/11	19/37	19/79
	Students With Disabilities	8/38	8/25	8/63
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	75/27	78/54	79/71
	Economically Disadvantaged	27/11	27/41	27/59
	Students With Disabilities	14/7	14/43	14/36
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	75/20	76/41	79/61
	Economically Disadvantaged	27/15	27/22	27/52
	Students With Disabilities	14/21	14/29	14/36
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	60/72	62/85	65/94
	Economically Disadvantaged	9/67	10/80	10/100
	Students With Disabilities	8/38	7/57	8/75
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	61/21	62/58	65/72
	Economically Disadvantaged	10/0	10/40	10/60
	Students With Disabilities	8/13	7/43	8/50
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	66/62	70/80	76/74
	Economically Disadvantaged	15/47	15/80	15/67
	Students With Disabilities	11/36	10/60	11/27
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	66/27	69/49	75/67
	Economically Disadvantaged	15/13	15/33	15/47
	Students With Disabilities	11/18	9/22	10/20
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	76/61	78/72	79/81
	Economically Disadvantaged	21/48	20/70	20/85
	Students With Disabilities	12/17	13/23	13/54
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	75/35	77/52	79/70
	Economically Disadvantaged	21/14	20/45	20/65
	Students With Disabilities	12/8	13/23	13/31
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students			70/73
	Economically Disadvantaged			18/67
	Students With Disabilities			11/64
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Grade 6			
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	90/59	92/66	93/67
	Economically Disadvantaged	34/47	33/55	33/55
	Students With Disabilities	10/20	9/22	9/33
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	90/36	91/55	93/68
	Economically Disadvantaged	34/24	33/42	33/58
	Students With Disabilities	10/10	9/22	9/33
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Subgroup Data Review

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	43	58		48	47		62				
HSP	76	55		71	64						
MUL	82	62		77	77						
WHT	77	79	76	76	75	59	76				
FRL	65	69	62	65	65	44	63				
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	51	55	52	57	67	64	40				
HSP	88	78		92	76						
MUL	88	82		71	82						
WHT	81	67	67	84	81	73	75				
FRL	73	68	64	73	66	59	61				
2018 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	29	30	25	27	39	33	31				
BLK	40			20							
HSP	73	40		82	67						
MUL	86	60		91	93						
WHT	71	52	35	81	70	58	77				
FRL	62	40	22	68	65	56	57				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	[not available]
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	486
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	95%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	52
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners 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	67
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	75
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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
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	74
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	62
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

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?

Learning gains for the lowest 25% are not consistent with the rest of the students in ELA nor math. These students are not showing growth commensurate with the total school population (74%). In ELA, this number stayed at 65% for both 2019 & 2021 (up from a significant increase from 2018 at 33%). Math, however, dropped from 65% in 2019 to 56% in 2021 (down from 60% in 2018). Total tested population learning gains in math 71%.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Learning gains for the lowest 25% in math are in greatest need of improvement.

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

E-learning, global pandemic, distance learning at the end of the 2020 school year, and implementing interventions with fidelity, particularly for the e-learners, was a significant challenge. The lowest 25% of students, who were learning from home, struggled more to attend to individual and small group instruction through a virtual format.

The e-learning model is not an option this year.

In addition, we have had varied math resources being used at different grade levels. K & 3 used Ready MAFS, while 1, 2, 4, 5 using Eureka. The district is in the process of adopting a new math curriculum and resources this year which should support consistency in math.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

ELA Learning gains showed the most improvement.

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

Continued refinement in our MTSS/intervention process. Identifying highest risk students from the beginning of the year and following up with regular meetings for progress monitoring. Our ELA Coach provides staff with learning gains data to target student needs, interventions, and chart progress.

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

- 1) Diagnosing essential missed learning using iReady diagnostic, forming intervention groups, creating an intervention plan and progress monitoring.
- 2) Scaffolding Intentionally: ELA curriculum provides more opportunities for small group instruction with scaffolding, prompts mini-lessons combine a variety of skills, as opposed to targeting only one at a time. Most rigorous work is approached in small group rather than independent times for support.
- 3) Building knowledge and vocabulary: ELA curriculum emphasizes common academic language and opportunities for teachers to build background knowledge prior to reading text.
- 4) Prioritizing Standards: All teachers are following the district pacing guide. Grades 3-6 are giving quarterly district Standards Mastery assessments in iReady.

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.

- *Regular/scheduled data meetings
- *Job embedded reading endorsement courses offered
- *Implement a more focused approach to school-wide intervention time
- *iReady trainers working with staff to examine data and support staff.

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

- *We will use ESSER funding to offer additional after school program opportunities for students who are struggling.
- *Lexia is purchased and used for the neediest students.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: We declined in math proficiency in all reporting categories (e.g. overall 81 to 74, LG 79 to 71, & L25% LG 65 to 56).

Measureable Outcome: Math proficiency will increase by, at least 3 percentage points, in each reporting category (e.g. overall 74 to 77, LG 71 to 74, and L25% LG 56 to 59).

Monitoring:

- iReady diagnostic
- iReady Math myPath progress monitoring
- Monthly data team meetings
- Learning gains report and calculation noting what each student needs to make a gain.
- Intervention/Form 7 data

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Shelley Michaud (michaud.shelley@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

- Implement standards based interventions for math at least 2x's per week for students struggling with math.
- All students will complete 30-45 mins of iReady math myPath.
- Daily small group instruction in math scaffolding skills and targeting learning gains.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

- iReady data is nationally normed and aligned with FSA outcomes.
- Interventions and scaffolding provide individualized instruction necessary to fill learning gaps for all levels.

Action Steps to Implement

-ESE and gen. ed. teachers will co-plan and share differentiation and accommodation strategies/ techniques. Teachers will implement scaffolding strategies and follow district pacing for math instruction.

Person Responsible Shelley Michaud (michaud.shelley@brevardschools.org)

-Data teams will meet regularly to track lowest 25%, interventions given, and target learning gains

Person Responsible Adam Lang (lang.adam@brevardschools.org)

-All students will complete 30-45 mins. per week on their iReady Math MyPath- teachers get weekly reports on the MyPath completion percentage.

Person Responsible Elizabeth Hill-Brodigan (hill-brodigan.elizabeth@brevardschools.org)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: In the 2017-2018 school year, OBE was targeted for support and intervention for our SWD subgroup in ELA. While we did not fall into this category for 2018-2019 or 2020-2021, we have continued to strengthen our SWD programming, including going through the inclusive scheduling process with Bill Pearlman. Even though gains have been made, our students with disabilities (and lowest 25%) score significantly lower than other subgroups and overall ELA proficiency. Our current ESE population is almost 16%.

Measureable Outcome: The percentage of students meeting proficiency in ELA will increase by 3 percentage points. Those who do not meet proficiency, will make a learning gain.

Monitoring:

- Monthly data meetings
- Intervention data and action based on decision trees
- iReady diagnostic & myPath data
- ESE progress reports/progress on goals and objectives
- Tracking learning gains and setting goals to address.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Shelley Michaud (michaud.shelley@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

- ESE teachers will provide push in services for ELA & math (inclusive scheduling), particularly in the to the maximum extent according to student needs.
- SWD students will be provided tiered interventions according to the MTSS process and decision trees.
- SWD students will complete 30-45 mins. per week on their iReady MyPath.
- ESE & Gen ed. teachers will meet to analyze student data, discuss student growth, differentiate materials, and team plan.
- Scaffolding of instruction to fill gaps.
- Standards Mastery (i-Ready)- teachers will adhere to Benchmark units/standards focus document/pacing guides & implement with fidelity.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: These strategies assisted us in not being TS & I by the State, as we were in 2018. With the impact of the pandemic (distance learning/e-learning/quarantines), we feel a need to continue to build on the inclusive scheduling model to maintain growth for our SWD population.

Action Steps to Implement

- Tiered interventions during SMART (intervention time).
- Scaffolding of instruction to fill gaps.
- Standards Mastery (i-Ready)- teachers will adhere to Benchmark units/standards focus document/pacing guides.
- Observations looking for task alignment with standard

Person Responsible Elizabeth Hill-Brodigan (hill-brodigan.elizabeth@brevardschools.org)

- Schedule ESE and gen ed. teams to allow for push in services as appropriate.
- Scaffolding of instruction to fill gaps.
- Standards Mastery (i-Ready)- teachers will adhere to Benchmark units/standards focus document and pacing guides.
- Observations looking for task alignment with standard

Person Responsible Shelley Michaud (michaud.shelley@brevardschools.org)

- Target top 50% of level 2's for learning gains
- Performance Matters data shared at regular data meetings to target learning gains.
- Completion of 30-45 mins. per week/per subject on iReady ELA MyPath.
- Standards mastery (i-Ready) analysis.

Person Responsible Adam Lang (lang.adam@brevardschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Over the past few years, we have worked to analyze tasks/activities to ensure they are standards aligned. Moving into the BEST standards, and implementing Benchmark, we will continue to emphasize standards alignment in both ELA.

Measureable Outcome: Each grade level will score at least 70% on Benchmark unit assessments.

Monitoring: Benchmark unit assessments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Adam Lang (lang.adam@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Staff will follow pacing guide/Standards Focus Document and Benchmark unit modules to ensure standards alignment in activities/tasks. They will conduct both formal and informal assessments and observation of standards mastery.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Benchmark and the Standards Focus Document/pacing guides are aligned to the BEST standards.

Action Steps to Implement

Delivery of daily standards aligned lessons, tasks, and assessments aligned to Standards Focus Document/Benchmark Units/Pacing Guides.

Person Responsible Shelley Michaud (michaud.shelley@brevardschools.org)

Delivery of daily standards aligned lessons, tasks, and assessments aligned to Standards Focus Document/Benchmark Units/Pacing Guides.

Person Responsible Elizabeth Hill-Brodigan (hill-brodigan.elizabeth@brevardschools.org)

Review of Benchmark unit assessments and determination of areas of need and refinement.

Person Responsible Adam Lang (lang.adam@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Our discipline data on safeschoolsforalex.org shows that we score low for discipline incidents. We are about in the middle when compared to the county ranking 23 or 56. Our highest incidents relate to bullying and students who have high levels of behavioral need and exhibit aggression.

We have a anti-bullying/kindness contract that parents and students sign at the beginning of each year. SEL is on the wheel and incorporates anti-bullying lessons and concepts. We work closely with BCBA and CPI trainers to support students who need more support. We receive quarterly reports on subgroup discipline data and regularly review restraint data to adjust plans and make modifications.

Part IV: 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 to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. 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.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

- Our school has a Facebook page to keep parents informed about events and happenings.
- We send out a monthly newsletter (Dolphin Digest) via BlackBoard, PeachJar, and FB.
- Event and other information is sent out via PeachJar.
- PTO (non-pandemic year) is incredibly involved and hosts a variety of family engagement activities throughout the year.
- Students are recognized with dolphin slips & acknowledgment when the show "Dolphins CARE" (Cooperate Achieve, Respect, and Empathize).
- In non-pandemic years, volunteers are welcomed and acknowledged through VOY awards and a breakfast or luncheon.
- Staff are acknowledged for excellence throughout the year by the PTO and other business partners (breakfasts, lunch, treats, coffee bar, etc....).
- Staff are regularly acknowledged by administrators kudos notes, "I noticed" notes, shout outs via email, Teacher Appreciation Week celebrations, small rewards (can of soda, snack, etc...), etc...
- BFT rep and admins have open communication to address issues presented by staff.
- SAC meets monthly to focus on supporting school improvement.

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

PTO- Family engagement activities, school-wide t-shirts to show our pride, classroom money available for teacher/student needs

SAC- Brainstorms ways to support school improvement

BFT- Open lines of communication

Principal- Shelley Michaud- Sends school-wide communication out

Assistant Principal- Elizabeth Hill-Brodigan- Works with business partners and brings in treats and thank you tokens

Administration- Makes personal phone calls home to students on their birthdays

Teachers/IPST Team- We have expanded our communication formats to include Zoom meetings with recorded links and flexible virtual parent meetings- to promote positive informed culture.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00