

Brevard Public Schools

Quest Elementary School



2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	8
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	17

Quest Elementary School

8751 TRAFFORD DR, Melbourne, FL 32940

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

Demographics

Principal: Christine Boyd E

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2017

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)	14%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19: A
School Grades History	2017-18: A 2016-17: A 2015-16: A 2014-15: A 2013-14: A
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	

Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

Our mission is a Quest for educational excellence in a nurturing 21st century environment that promotes exemplary character, independent thinking, and a desire for lifelong learning.

(revised/discussed 18-19)

Provide the school's vision statement

A collaborative learning community on a journey to reach its highest potential.

(revised/discussed 18-19)

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Boyd, Christine	Principal	Administrators review data, reflect on best practices, and develop professional development based on data. This is done with the Shared Leadership committee, SAC, PTO, and other forums like Coffee with the Principals, engaging all stakeholders. Once data is reviewed and input is collected, the team moves forward in editing the goals to meet needs of the site.
Erenstoft, Kassie	Assistant Principal	Administrators review data, reflect on best practices, and develop professional development based on data. This is done with the Shared Leadership committee, SAC, PTO, and other forums like Coffee with the Principals, engaging all stakeholders. Once data is reviewed and input is collected, the team moves forward in editing the goals to meet needs of the site. Mrs. Erenstoft also assists with FSA testing, as well as supports our ESE team.
Phillips, Tauna	Assistant Principal	Administrators review data, reflect on best practices, and develop professional development based on data. This is done with the Shared Leadership committee, SAC, PTO, and other forums like Coffee with the Principals, engaging all stakeholders. Once data is reviewed and input is collected, the team moves forward in editing the goals to meet needs of the site. Mrs. Phillips also assists with FSA testing, as well as being the MTSS coordinator and ESOL supervisor.
Ondo, Randi	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coach sits with administration to review data, reflect on best practices, and develop professional development based on data. This is done with the Shared Leadership committee, SAC, PTO, and other forums like Coffee with the Principals, engaging all stakeholders. Once data is reviewed and input is collected, the team moves forward in editing the goals to meet needs of the site. Randi also assists all grade levels with the iReady diagnostic testing.

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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	162	171	180	158	187	169	155	0	0	0	0	0	0	1182
Attendance below 90 percent	7	9	8	7	11	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	3	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	7	7	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	28
Level 1 on statewide assessment (Math)	0	0	0	4	8	9	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	26

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	0	2	1	2	2	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		3	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

75

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/16/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
Attendance below 90 percent														
One or more suspensions														
Course failure in ELA or Math														
Level 1 on statewide assessment														

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
-----------	-------------	-------

Students with two or more indicators

Prior Year - 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
Attendance below 90 percent	40	21	22	9	18	17	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	146
One or more suspensions	1	0	2	2	2	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	2	13	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	1	1	0	0	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	12

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	81%	62%	57%	85%	60%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	67%	60%	58%	69%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	57%	53%	70%	46%	48%
Math Achievement	88%	63%	63%	89%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains	79%	65%	62%	74%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	67%	53%	51%	74%	49%	47%
Science Achievement	82%	57%	53%	72%	57%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey								
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Number of students enrolled	162 (0)	171 (0)	180 (0)	158 (0)	187 (0)	169 (0)	155 (0)	1182 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	7 ()	9 ()	8 ()	7 ()	11 ()	7 ()	6 ()	55 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	7 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	7 (0)	7 (0)	9 (0)	5 (0)	28 (0)

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Level 1 on statewide assessment (Math)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4 (0)	8 (0)	9 (0)	5 (0)	26 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	79%	64%	15%	58%	21%
	2018	87%	63%	24%	57%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	82%	61%	21%	58%	24%
	2018	89%	57%	32%	56%	33%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	88%	60%	28%	56%	32%
	2018	74%	54%	20%	55%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		14%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
06	2019	75%	60%	15%	54%	21%
	2018	86%	63%	23%	52%	34%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	87%	61%	26%	62%	25%
	2018	90%	62%	28%	62%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	86%	64%	22%	64%	22%
	2018	88%	59%	29%	62%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	85%	60%	25%	60%	25%
	2018	81%	58%	23%	61%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
06	2019	93%	67%	26%	55%	38%
	2018	92%	68%	24%	52%	40%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		12%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	81%	56%	25%	53%	28%
	2018	71%	57%	14%	55%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	51	54	37	68	74	55	63				
ELL	70	52		92	70	75					
ASN	89	58		97	92						
BLK	70	79		82	79						
HSP	80	60	65	80	69	55	83				
MUL	80	62		92	84	70					
WHT	82	69	66	89	79	71	80				
FRL	63	58	45	70	65	43	76				

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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	55	53	53	64	67	61	46				
ELL	72	68		92	68						
ASN	85	71		93	67		91				
BLK	79	50		88	71						
HSP	84	67	55	87	78	54	76				
MUL	76	69		78	76		63				
WHT	87	70	75	90	73	78	70				
FRL	74	65	63	82	75	80	63				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	76
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	81
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	610
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	57
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	73
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	84
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	78
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	70
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	
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	77
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	60
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year’s low performance and discuss any trends

Lowest 25% in both ELA and Math have a data component with the lowest performance. Particular subgroups, ESE, ELL, and low Socioeconomic are all contributing factors. Not having all activities aligned to standards based instruction, in both ELA and Math, as well as building our inclusion model for ESE and ELL students are factors as well.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline

The biggest decline was in our ESE, lowest 25%. The factors were an increase of students in ESE, change in ESE staffing, and inconsistent data collection supporting accommodations.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends

Quest, overall, is about 30% higher than the state average in most sub-groups. However, the economically disadvantaged has a smaller gap increase than other subgroups. This is reflected into our Hispanic population and our lowest 25%, as well as our ELL subgroup.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

Our 5th Grade, level 3-5 Percentage increased from 74 to 88. This was the largest percentage increase in all grade levels, in ELA or Math. The fifth grade team focused on common planning and aligning assessments with the standards. They also incorporated a Walk to Intervention at their grade level.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Though it was not shown in our EWS data, one potential area of concern is our learning gains for our top 25 %. Our learning gains dropped this past school year. When the data was broken down more specifically, it showed that our Level 5's do not always stay Level 5's and our other higher students are not moving up in levels.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year

1. Lowest 25 %
2. ESE and ELL Subgroup
3. Highest 25%

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	L25% and ESE Subgroup
Rationale	Our lowest 25% decreased in both ELA and Math. ELA decreased by 5%. Math decreased by 7 percent. Our ESE subgroup fell within that lowest 25% typically.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Our ESE subgroup, lowest 25% will increase the learning gains from 65 to 70 in ELA and 67 to 72 in Math.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Christine Boyd (boyd.christine@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Standards based planning, Standards Focus Boards, iReady Standards Mastery leading 3rd grade level planning. Using a variety of service models for our ESE subgroup, collaborative planning with ESE and Gen. Ed. Teachers, and training our Activity team on ESE subgroups strategies per BPIE.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Standards based planning, with iReady Standards Mastery and using Standards Focus Boards will increase the learning gains of our ESE and L25%, evidence by common planning, teaching to the rigor of the standards, iReady data and FSA data.
Action Step	
Description	<p>ELA</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers will use Complex Text in lessons across all settings and use the IPG reflection sheet during post-conferences with administration. 2. Teachers will us academic common language, in writing, across all grade levels and teachers in the ESE department will use Graphic Organizers for writing support with our ESE Subgroup 3. Administration and Teachers will conduct data chat meetings regularly and teacher will meet in a common PLC time block for the school. The teachers will organize, supervise and teach a RTI Walk to Intervention using common planning and iReady, LAFS or MAFS lessons. 4. The Instructional Coach and Staff will conduct a K-2 Writing Night for Parents 5. The Writing team will provide a writing PD, as well as a PD in Details of Writing for grades 2-6. <p>Math (iReady Data Monitoring)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers will implement Eureka with Fidelity 2. Teachers will provide students interventions with iReady lessons, as well as Zearn 3. Administration will provide a Eureka parent night to assist parents in supporting the program 4. The district and Administration will provide Eureka PD to staff, supported by the online video PD <p>Standards Focus Boards (Feb. PD)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers will post learning Targets and Communicate them to Students during lessons 2. Administration will provide a Standards Focus Board PD for Staff

**Person
Responsible**

Christine Boyd (boyd.christine@brevardschools.org)

#2	
Title	Learning Gains of Highest 25%
Rationale	Though it is not listed in EWS data, the highest 25% of students show a pattern of decreasing from a 5 to a 4 or not keeping the learning gains from year to year.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	80% of our highest 25% will show a Learning Gain
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Christine Boyd (boyd.christine@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Standards based planning, Standards Focus Boards, Using the IPG for classroom visits and post conferences with teachers, iReady lessons used for differentiation within the Walk to Intervention, common iReady vocabulary instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Standards based planning, with iReady Standards Mastery and using Standards Focus Boards will increase the learning gains of our highest 25% evidence by common planning, teaching to the rigor of the standards, iReady data and FSA data.
Action Step	
Description	<p>ELA</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers will use Complex Text in lessons across all settings and use the IPG reflection sheet during post-conferences with administration 2. Teachers will use academic common language, in writing, across all grade levels and the ESE department will use of Graphic Organizers, in writing, for ESE Subgroup 3. Administration and Teachers will conduct data chat meetings regularly and schedule and use common PLC times. Teachers will organize, monitor, and provide enrichment in a RTI Walk to Intervention, using common planning and iReady lessons 4. The Instructional Coach and Staff will conduct a K-2 Writing Night for Parents 5. The Writing team will provide a writing PD, as well as a PD in Details of Writing for grades 2-6. <p>Math (iReady Data Monitoring)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers will implement Eureka with Fidelity 2. Teachers will use interventions or enrichment with iReady lessons, Eureka lessons, as well as Zearn 3. Administration will provide a Eureka parent night to assist parents in supporting the program 4. The district and Administration will provide Eureka PD to staff, supported by the online video PD <p>Standards Focus Boards (Feb. PD)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers will post learning targets and communicate them to students throughout the lesson 2. Administration will provide a Standards Focus Board PD for Staff

Person Responsible

Christine Boyd (boyd.christine@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

This will be supported by having Parent Evenings; Eureka Math Night, Parent Writing Night, Reading Strategies to Support your Child at home. Noted the need in parent survey with 75% of our parents wanted Academic Support Resources at home.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A	Areas of Focus: L25% and ESE Subgroup	\$0.00
2	III.A	Areas of Focus: Learning Gains of Highest 25%	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00