

Brevard Public Schools

Roy Allen Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Roy Allen Elementary School

2601 FOUNTAINHEAD BLVD, Melbourne, FL 32935

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

Demographics

Principal: Sean Chance M

Start Date for this Principal: 6/27/2014

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)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (63%) 2017-18: C (51%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: A (64%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Roy Allen Elementary School

2601 FOUNTAINHEAD BLVD, Melbourne, FL 32935

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

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-6</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p>Yes</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>62%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>37%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	C	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.

To serve every student with excellence as the standard.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Roy Allen will serve our community and enhance students' lives by delivering the highest quality education in a culture of dedication, collaboration and learning, while building leaders one child at a time.

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
Migliore, Lori	Principal	To work with instructional staff to ensure that lessons are consistently focused on complex content that appropriately challenges students to meet grade level standards. Also, to make the learning environment safe, welcoming and encourage students to take risks necessary to master the content. Additionally, ensures that teachers are intentionally planning and facilitating the learning through use of high-quality, standards-aligned materials, monitoring data with a focus on the lowest 25% and collaborating with the school community.
Jefferson, Kathy	Assistant Principal	Ensures that students are supported to engage in their learning and to be responsible for doing the thinking that the lesson demands. Also, ensures that supports are put into place to give the students every opportunity of success. Monitors student progression with a focus on the lowest 25%.
Gelfond, Kami	Teacher, ESE	As the ESE Lead, ensures that all I.E.P's are being implemented and that all students are receiving the supports needed to be successful with the standards. Additionally, serves as the SAC chair.
Franklin, Lorelee	Instructional Coach	Works with classroom teachers to ensure the quality of each lesson meets the intent of standards. She coaches teachers to improve instructional delivery to meet the needs of all students. Facilitates MTSS and monitors student progress with focus on the lowest 25%.
Hoyt, Sue	Teacher, K-12	As the ESOL teacher, monitors ELL student progression and works with classroom teachers on research and evidenced based instructional strategies that beset serve ELL students. Ensures that all ELL students are are making adequate progress. Attends all MTSS meetings to provide valuable insights and provides professional development to all instructional staff in the area of reading.

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	107	99	99	90	90	96	111	0	0	0	0	0	0	692
Attendance below 90 percent	7	5	3	3	2	8	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
One or more suspensions	2	5	2	6	7	9	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 FSA ELA	4	0	0	2	7	21	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 FSA Math	0	0	0	0	10	17	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	44

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	4	7	2	3	6	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

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	4	9	2	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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

52

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 10/14/2019

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	11	8	6	5	9	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
One or more suspensions	9	2	0	4	7	11	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	44
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	15	29	21	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	83

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	8	6	4	5	9	9	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	48

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	59%	62%	57%	62%	63%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	62%	60%	58%	59%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	62%	57%	53%	53%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	68%	63%	63%	76%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	70%	65%	62%	76%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	53%	51%	61%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	63%	57%	53%	46%	56%	51%

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	107 (0)	99 (0)	99 (0)	90 (0)	90 (0)	96 (0)	111 (0)	692 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	7 ()	5 ()	3 ()	3 ()	2 ()	8 ()	7 ()	35 (0)
One or more suspensions	2 ()	5 (0)	2 (0)	6 (0)	7 (0)	9 (0)	8 (0)	39 (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)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 FSA ELA	4 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	7 (0)	21 (0)	15 (0)	49 (0)
Level 1 FSA Math	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	10 (0)	17 (0)	17 (0)	44 (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	62%	64%	-2%	58%	4%
	2018	62%	63%	-1%	57%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	43%	61%	-18%	58%	-15%
	2018	54%	57%	-3%	56%	-2%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		-19%				
05	2019	67%	60%	7%	56%	11%
	2018	47%	54%	-7%	55%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				
06	2019	50%	60%	-10%	54%	-4%
	2018	55%	63%	-8%	52%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	62%	61%	1%	62%	0%
	2018	63%	62%	1%	62%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	59%	64%	-5%	64%	-5%
	2018	62%	59%	3%	62%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	68%	60%	8%	60%	8%
	2018	64%	58%	6%	61%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
06	2019	66%	67%	-1%	55%	11%
	2018	63%	68%	-5%	52%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	60%	56%	4%	53%	7%
	2018	55%	57%	-2%	55%	0%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	40	58	43	44	58	38	47				
ELL	58	63		64	53	58	42				
ASN	70			70							
BLK	50	56		55	67						
HSP	58	56	57	66	64	61	47				
MUL	63	57		73	71						
WHT	59	64	63	69	73	56	70				
FRL	53	59	59	62	66	56	56				
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	32	40	37	32	37	30	40				
ELL	40	53		55	56						
BLK	33	30		52	55		60				
HSP	60	56	50	62	43	14	64				
MUL	58	74		58	37						
WHT	58	53	49	66	50	29	56				
FRL	50	48	38	57	41	22	50				
2017 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	32	43	46	41	61	40	8				
ELL	38	50	60	63	81						
BLK	62	57		52	36						
HSP	53	63	53	71	80	58	40				
MUL	63	33		84	92						
WHT	63	60	46	79	78	65	55				
FRL	54	59	59	71	71	62	40				

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	66
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	83
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	525
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	47
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	60
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	70
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	57
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	62
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	66

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	65
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 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.

When reviewing the Cohort Comparison, Fourth grade ELA performed 19% below the Cohort and 11% below the Same Grade Comparison. The greatest contributing factor is FSA Writing being included in the ELA score. Historically Roy Allen third grade students perform at or above the State and District average on the FSA ELA, however the same students do not maintain their previous level of performance once Writing is included. Writing in the primary grades has been a focus, and will continue to be closely monitored. Writing across all content areas must take place daily along with common authentic formative writing assessments to determine individual student, class and grade level progress toward meeting proficiency of all ELA standards. Although Roy Allen does not fall below the threshold on the Federal Index for any subgroup. Students with disabilities continues to be the lowest performance subgroup scoring 47% on the Federal Index. Ensuring that all students are

included in the MTSS Process and Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction is monitored at monthly Kid Talk Meetings will allow for timely and specific intervention.

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

When comparing the school grading components using schoolwide data Roy Allen did not experience a decrease in any of the seven grading components. Upon closer review of grade level data, 4th grade ELA percent at proficiency decreased from 54% to 43% in 2019, as did 6th grade from 55% to 50%. There was also a slight decrease for students scoring level 3 or higher in Math for 3rd and 4th grade. Teaching to the full intent of the standard continues to be a focus at Roy Allen, and ensuring that student tasks are rigorous requiring students to demonstrate mastery of the standards.

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.

When comparing Roy Allen to the State Average, fourth grade students under-performed the State and District in the area of Math by 5%. Roy Allen fourth grade math performance declined from 62% in 2018 to 59% in 2019. Upon closer review of grade level data, 4th grade ELA percent at proficiency decreased from 54% to 43% in 2019, as did 6th grade from 55% to 50%. Writing in the primary grades has been a focus, and will continue to be closely monitored. Writing across all content areas must take place daily along with common authentic formative writing assessments to determine individual student, class and grade level progress toward meeting proficiency of all ELA standards. By building capacity for teachers to teach to the full extent of the standard, and ensuring that student tasks are rigorous and require them to demonstrate mastery of the standards, student engagement and student performance will increase.

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

Science continues to be an area of focus and improvement during the 2018-19 school year, evidenced by the percent of students scoring level 3 or higher, increasing from 46% in 2017, to 57% in 2018 improving to 63% in 2019. Analysis by subgroups also shows a substantial increase with learning gains for all subgroups in ELA and Math. As an example, Math learning gains for the FRL subgroup improved 41% to 66%, and the Hispanic Subgroup increased from 43% to 64%. Even greater growth was seen with the same subgroups with regards to the lowest 25%. During the 2019 school year i-Ready was implemented along with providing a Math Coach utilizing Title I funds. Teachers were able to provide timely and specific feedback and adjust instruction to ensure mastery of standards. . Based on the Rtl process providing immediate and targeted interventions, differentiation and increased student engagement, students demonstrate increased success in school based on FSA results.

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

Although Roy Allen does not fall below the threshold on the Federal Index for any subgroup. Students with disabilities continues to be the lowest performance subgroup scoring 47% on the Federal Index. Ensuring that all students are included in the MTSS Process and Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction is monitored at monthly Kid Talk Meetings will allow for timely and specific intervention which will decrease the number of students scoring Level 1 on FSA.

By implementing Sanford Harmony SEL program, schools culture will improve which in turn will decrease discipline concerns and reduce the number of suspensions resulting in higher student achievement.

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

1. Standards based instruction in all content areas to the full intent of the standard.
2. Closing the achievement gap of the lowest 25%, ESE and African American subgroups
3. Increasing FSA ELA performance for fourth grade students.
4. Provide a positive learning environment with the implementation of Sanford Harmony SEL Curriculum

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Learning Gains for the Lowest 25% in ELA and Math ELA and Math Learning Gains for the Lowest 25%
Rationale	Rationale: Our math learning gains for the lowest 25% increased by 30% last year, however still remains 12% below our over all Math Learn gains of 70% with an even greater gap for SWD students at only 38% learning gains. Our ELA learning gains for the lowest 25% increased by 17% last year, resulting in 62% learning gains in ELA for both lowest 25% and our over ELA Learn gains. However there is an achievement gap for SWD in regards to learning gains for the lowest 25% at only 43% learning gains, which is a 6% increase from the previous year.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	During the 19-20 school year, the math learning gains for our lowest 25% will increase from 58% to 62% and SWD will increase from 38% to 42%. ELA learning gains for SWD will increase from 43% to 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Lori Migliore (migliore.lori@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Schoolwide RtI following the MTSS process will occur daily in all grade levels and will be monitored monthly at Kid Talk/ Data Talk Meetings to ensure timely and specific interventions for all students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The root cause of achievement gap for our lowest 25% has to do with teacher knowledge of how to support all students including our SWD. Coaching in the use of research based intervention programs and on going progress monitoring will benefit all students including L25%.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Create a master schedule providing a common intervention time daily for all grade levels, ensuring that daily intervention is non-negotiable for all students. Identify all students as Tier 1, Tier 2/3 or substantially deficient utilizing District provided Decision Trees and determine instructional groupings. 2. MTSS Leadership Team will attend District Training and provide site based professional development for all teachers, ensuring a common vision and collective efficacy for the MTSS process at Roy Allen. 3. Scheduled Monthly Kid Talk with the Team Meetings will ensure that all intervention group data is reviewed to determine areas of concern in order to provide timely and specific feedback for all students. 4. A Data Board will be maintained to track the progress of the lowest 25% in ELA and Math utilizing i-Ready data, District Assessments, student grades and additional data as defined by the District's Decision Trees. 5. i-Ready online Reading instructional program will be implemented for all students kindergarten through sixth grade 45 minutes per week providing targeted instruction based on students current level of performance. i-Ready reports will be reviewed to determine individual student needs and instructional

groupings for timely
remediation.

**Person
Responsible**

Kathy Jefferson (jefferson.kathy@brevardschools.org)

#2

Title Standards based instruction and increased student engagement

Rationale The data supports that setting high expectations for all students, having common vision of what standards based instruction looks like and providing an environment that encourages collaboration among faculty improves student achievement. By building capacity for teachers to teach to the full extent of the standard, and ensuring that student tasks are rigorous and require them to demonstrate mastery of the standards, student engagement and student performance will increase.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve The goal of Roy Allen Elementary is to increase the percent of students scoring at proficiency as evidenced by improved performance on FSA. As of Spring 2019, Reading (59%) and Math (68%) of students performed at or above satisfactory (Level 3 or higher) on the FSA. The goal is for 62% of students to perform at or above proficiency in reading and 72% at or above proficiency in math. In the area of science, the expectation is for students at proficiency to increase from 63% in 2019 to 65% in 2020. Based on the Rtl process providing immediate and targeted interventions, differentiation and increased student engagement, students will demonstrate increased success in school as evidenced by improved classroom performance, student work samples, i-Ready diagnostics results from fall, winter and spring with 100% of student reaching their annual growth goal.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome Lori Migliore (migliore.lori@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy Emphasis on the Rtl Process along with effective feedback after observations, providing specific action steps for improvements will document and ensure standards-aligned instruction is occurring in all levels of instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy Roy Allen continues to focus on standards based instruction ensuring that teachers teach to the full intent of the standard. According to Paul Bambrick-Santoyo, Leverage Leadership, "Effective observation and feedback isn't about evaluation, it's about coaching." Feedback must be simple and focus on only one or two areas at a time, while providing specific action steps for improvements. Administrative walk-throughs will document and ensure standards-aligned instruction is occurring in all levels of instruction. Classroom observations from administration, instructional coaches, and peers, will be followed with specific honest feedback to improve instructional practices. The primary goal of standards based instruction is for students to develop a deeper understanding of "big ideas" and transfer learning to new situations. A collaborative planning approach will be utilized to make data driven decisions, ensuring that the needs of all students are being addressed. Collaborative teams will identified underperforming students to provide unified and accelerated support.

Action Step

Description

1. Provide Professional Development in the area of academic writing and scoring using FSA/QLA rubrics and display samples of student work reflective of the completed writing process with standards posted.
2. Grade levels will create a student portfolio consisting of monthly student writing (to a prompt) based on a topic of classroom instruction. Review student writing samples to ensure consistency in scoring and expectations.
3. To address writing instruction for ELL students, teachers will use the "Can-Do" chart in

combination with the

Performance Definition in writing to plan instruction that will move students from one level of WIDA to the

next. This strategy is useful for all students.

4. Develop observation and feedback tool and schedule including Collegial Instructional Rounds with feedback

utilizing the IPG document to focus on coaching each other.

5. Maintain weekly common planning to discuss short and long term instructional focus and target skills.

Utilizing district provided Standards Focus Documents, teachers will be able to focus on the 3 shifts

necessary to ensure teaching to the full intent of the standard to create long term plans.

6. Schoolwide implementation of Sanford Harmony SEL curriculum. School wide implementation: Meet Up

(daily) and Buddy Up (4-5 times/week) Units of study include: Unit 1 Diversity and Inclusion, Unit 2 Empathy

and Critical Thinking, Unit 3 Communication, Unit 4 Problem Solving and Unit 5 Peer Relationships.

7. Provide opportunities for new teachers to observe Kagan Structures in use through peer observations. As

well as continue Professional Development in the area of student engagement and rigor.

Person

Responsible

Lori Migliore (migliore.lori@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).