



---

## **Table of Contents**

---

<b>School Demographics</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>School Information</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Needs Assessment</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b>	<b>19</b>
<b>Budget to Support Goals</b>	<b>0</b>

# Columbia Elementary School

1225 WACO BLVD SE, Palm Bay, FL 32909

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Rachel Roberts**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/1/2017

<b>2019-20 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	80%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students <b>Students With Disabilities</b> White Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: C (41%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Dustin Sims</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I

\* 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](http://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 inspire and grow a diverse critical thinking community of competent, flexible and fearless thinkers. (Revised Summer 2020)

#### Provide the school's vision statement

To inspire and grow a diverse critical thinking community of competent, flexible and fearless thinkers. (Revised Summer 2020)

### 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
Roberts, Rachel	Principal	Instructional leader for the school, monitoring data to inform instruction.
Hodge, Jesse	Assistant Principal	Assistant principal, provides instructional feedback, collaborative planning, observations of teachers.
Newell, Lainey	Instructional Coach	Coaches teachers, leads professional development, coordinates interventions, partially funded with Title I.
Jones, Laurie	Teacher, K-12	Reading and math interventionist.
Brancaccio, Paulette	Teacher, K-12	Title I Teacher, reading and math interventionist.

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Thursday 6/1/2017, Rachel Roberts

**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.*

3

**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.*

5

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

37

**Demographic Data**

<b>2020-21 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2018-19 Title I School</b>	Yes
<b>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b> (as reported on Survey 3)	80%
<b>2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
<b>School Grades History</b>	2018-19: B (55%) 2017-18: D (40%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: C (41%)
<b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>	
<b>SI Region</b>	Northeast
<b>Regional Executive Director</b>	<a href="#">Dustin Sims</a>
<b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>	N/A
<b>Year</b>	
<b>Support Tier</b>	
<b>ESSA Status</b>	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .	

**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	56	56	61	61	47	32	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	371
Attendance below 90 percent	0	3	2	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
One or more suspensions	0	3	2	4	6	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	1	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	17
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

**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	3	2	5	1	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

**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	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

Tuesday 9/8/2020

**Prior Year - 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	61	55	61	59	37	59	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	400
Attendance below 90 percent	14	24	27	28	10	29	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	156
One or more suspensions	1	4	6	1	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	11	20	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

**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	15	14	20	11	15	23	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	125

**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	8	2	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

**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
Number of students enrolled	61	55	61	59	37	59	68	0	0	0	0	0	0	400
Attendance below 90 percent	14	24	27	28	10	29	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	156
One or more suspensions	1	4	6	1	0	2	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	11	20	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	57

**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	15	14	20	11	15	23	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	125

**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	8	2	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

**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	51%	62%	57%	41%	60%	56%



School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Learning Gains	69%	60%	58%	50%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	58%	57%	53%	44%	46%	48%
Math Achievement	47%	63%	63%	42%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains	64%	65%	62%	49%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	45%	53%	51%	35%	49%	47%
Science Achievement	49%	57%	53%	20%	57%	55%

**EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey**

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (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.**

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	46%	64%	-18%	58%	-12%
	2018	41%	63%	-22%	57%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	60%	61%	-1%	58%	2%
	2018	42%	57%	-15%	56%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		18%				
Cohort Comparison		19%				
05	2019	43%	60%	-17%	56%	-13%
	2018	26%	54%	-28%	55%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
06	2019	51%	60%	-9%	54%	-3%
	2018	51%	63%	-12%	52%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		25%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	43%	61%	-18%	62%	-19%
	2018	42%	62%	-20%	62%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	49%	64%	-15%	64%	-15%

<b>MATH</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
	2018	46%	59%	-13%	62%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
05	2019	39%	60%	-21%	60%	-21%
	2018	20%	58%	-38%	61%	-41%
Same Grade Comparison		19%				
Cohort Comparison		-7%				
06	2019	53%	67%	-14%	55%	-2%
	2018	60%	68%	-8%	52%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		33%				

<b>SCIENCE</b>						
<b>Grade</b>	<b>Year</b>	<b>School</b>	<b>District</b>	<b>School-District Comparison</b>	<b>State</b>	<b>School-State Comparison</b>
05	2019	47%	56%	-9%	53%	-6%
	2018	18%	57%	-39%	55%	-37%
Same Grade Comparison		29%				
Cohort Comparison						

**Subgroup Data**

<b>2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2016-17</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2016-17</b>
SWD	15	55	47	19	56	53	23				
ELL	48	78		48	68						
BLK	51	64		44	63	40	40				
HSP	42	72	62	34	56	40					
MUL	59	73		41	60						
WHT	51	71	53	54	70	56	61				
FRL	47	67	58	44	63	44	49				

<b>2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b>											
<b>Subgroups</b>	<b>ELA Ach.</b>	<b>ELA LG</b>	<b>ELA LG L25%</b>	<b>Math Ach.</b>	<b>Math LG</b>	<b>Math LG L25%</b>	<b>Sci Ach.</b>	<b>SS Ach.</b>	<b>MS Accel.</b>	<b>Grad Rate 2015-16</b>	<b>C &amp; C Accel 2015-16</b>
SWD	13	38	16	15	29	17	6				
ELL	23	58		36	42						
BLK	33	37	38	37	45	33	21				
HSP	44	50		42	47						
MUL	46	65		41	50						
WHT	43	52	50	44	52	39	22				
FRL	39	48	41	40	46	34	21				

**ESSA Data**

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

<b>ESSA Federal Index</b>	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	56
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	63
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	446
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%
<b>Subgroup Data</b>	
<b>Students With Disabilities</b>	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>English Language Learners</b>	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	61
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Asian Students</b>	
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
<b>Black/African American Students</b>	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	50
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
<b>Hispanic Students</b>	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	54
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	58
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	59
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	55
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

Columbia has been on a strong track of increased performance, however, as a school we continue to struggle with the lowest performing subgroup: SWD. The students in this subgroup perform well below the state average and have an overall index score of 38%. Students in this subgroup underperform on state assessments and perform well below their peers. Columbia's students with disabilities were previously placed in self-contained classrooms with little focus on grade level standards. In 2018-19, these students were moved into an inclusion model, with push in support with the aim to keep students in the general education classroom with work provided at the level of the standards. Last year,

2019-20, iReady data showed an uptick in student performance in this area. However, there will be a continued focus in 2020-2021 to support these students. Currently, around 50% of SWD are eLearners, which will require a focus on serving these students virtually with rigor.

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

All data components increased over the previous year's FSA scores. However, exploring grade level performance has shown decreases over the past. These include the following: Sixth grade mathematics performance for the 2018-19 school year, which was a decrease of 7%, from 60% to 53%. The data are specific to the cohort of students from the 2018-19 school year, however, math will continue to be a focus area for this school year. In the 2019-20 school year, Columbia focused on standards-aligned instruction including professional development, support from district resource teachers, ongoing coaching and specific strategies. The fall 2020-21 school year shows a school-wide decline in mathematic performance across grade levels. This includes cohort and like group comparisons from previous years. Data indicate that students have taken a large slide in mathematical understanding. Additionally, a higher than average mobility rate has contributed to this gap and will require continued focus in the 2020-21 school year.

**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**

The largest gap Columbia Elementary has is the gap between school mathematics achievement at 47% compared to the state average of 63%. This is a 16% difference between the school and the state. However, this was an increase over the previous year's performance, which was a 20% gap. While Columbia did focus on mathematics in the previous year, (see above), the school will continue to place emphasis on mathematics during this school year.

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

Columbia made incredible gains in the 2018-19 school year, which was the last year tested. Due to COVID-19 school closures, there was no state assessment given last year. The overall growth for the school was 102 points and the school made gains in every component. Columbia Elementary made a 19% gain in ELA Learning Gains, a 29% gain in Science Achievement, and a 15% gain in Math Learning Gains. These accomplishments moved the school out of DA focus status. The contributing factors included standards-aligned instruction, professional learning communities, collaborative planning, ongoing feedback, the use of formative assessments (standards mastery) with focused re-teach, science coaching, literacy coaching and rigorous instruction.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?**

The EWS data show that retentions have not improved student achievement. Additionally, students spending time out of school on suspension does not improve student achievement.

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

1. Increase in math achievement
2. Increase in math lowest 25% performance
3. Increase in reading achievement
4. Increase in reading lowest 25% performance

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

## #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Standards Aligned Math Instruction; this area of focus relates to overall student achievement in the area of mathematics.

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Columbia Elementary continues to lag behind the district and state average for proficiency in Math performance, with a 16% difference with the district and the state. Furthermore, the learning gains were 64% for Columbia and 62% for the state, which was encouraging. Currently, the iReady diagnostic given in fall of 2020 shows a downward trend over the previous year, across all grade levels.

Nearly 1/4 of all students at Columbia are currently eLearners. This adds an additional challenge to provide strong math instruction for all students.

By continuing to support this area of focus, students at Columbia will be prepared for state and local assessments and college and career readiness.

**Measurable Outcome:** This will be measured by an increase in student achievement from 47% proficiency on the mathematics FSA to 53% proficiency.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Rachel Roberts (roberts.rachel@brevardschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** The strategies that will be utilized this year include ongoing professional development, standards-aligned instruction, and dedicated intervention blocks.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Research shows these are effective methods for increasing student achievement.

### Action Steps to Implement

1. Plan series of PD supports for preplanning including scaffolding supports for both in person and eLearner students. (T)

**Person Responsible** Jesse Hodge (hodge.jesse@brevardschools.org)

2. Hire PLC consultant who will work with teachers weekly on planning for mathematical instruction, including supports for eLearners. This includes weekly collaborative planning, unfolding (unpacking) of the standards, task alignment and data analysis. (T)

**Person Responsible** Rachel Roberts (roberts.rachel@brevardschools.org)

3. Weekly PLCs with support from the consultant with a focus on collaboration. The master schedule has been reworked to provide two 75 minute PLCs each week.

**Person Responsible** Rachel Roberts (roberts.rachel@brevardschools.org)

3. Ongoing feedback through informal walk throughs, with a focus on mathematical instruction.

**Person Responsible** Jesse Hodge (hodge.jesse@brevardschools.org)

4. Develop and monitor intervention block with a focus on mathematics for grades 1st to 6th, with ongoing progress monitoring. Hire 2 Title I teachers to support interventions in math (T).

**Person Responsible** Laurie Jones (jones.laurie@brevardschools.org)

5. Learning cycle focused on standards-aligned instruction in mathematics with common formative assessments using the standards mastery assessment.

**Person Responsible** Jesse Hodge (hodge.jesse@brevardschools.org)

6. ASP/CARES funds will be applied to increased instructional time weekly with a focus on standards-aligned mathematical instruction (includes reading). (T)

**Person Responsible** Jesse Hodge (hodge.jesse@brevardschools.org)



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

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Columbia Elementary's SWD continue to perform well below grade level expectations. This area has placed the school in Focus Status for ESSA. SWD have been continuously mainstreamed over the course of the last few years, however, we have yet to see improvements in their performance on state assessments. Columbia has engaged with FDLRS each year to create the inclusion schedule for students and to progress monitor the school using the BPIE.

**Measureable Outcome:** The goal for this focus area is to increase student performance for students with disabilities on state wide assessments (FSA). We aim to move student performance on ELA, Math and Science by 10 percentage points in each tested subject area. (ELA 15% to 25%, Math 19% to 29%, Science 23% to 33%).

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Jesse Hodge (hodge.jesse@brevardschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Implement instructional differentiation on standards-aligned grade level tasks for all students with disabilities.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** By implementing a scaffolded method of differentiation for all students, we aim to increase student performance. The rationale for this evidence-based strategy is derived from the TNTP Opportunity Myth white paper, which highlights the disproportionality of standards-based instruction for low performing students.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Train all teachers in understanding scaffolding strategies for students during pre-planning. (T--Literacy Coach)

**Person Responsible** Lainey Newell (newell.lainey@brevardschools.org)

2. Provide ongoing professional development on the use of scaffolding strategies throughout the year. (T--Literacy Coach)

**Person Responsible** Lainey Newell (newell.lainey@brevardschools.org)

3. Provide consultation and PD during ongoing PLCs weekly to increase focus on SWD, including targeted scaffolding supports for grade level content. (T--PLC consultant)

**Person Responsible** Lainey Newell (newell.lainey@brevardschools.org)

4. Progress monitor students using standards mastery assessments from iReady. These benchmarks will be given in paced intervals using the iReady Standards Mastery Assessments and data will be analyzed by teachers during PLCs (T-iReady workbooks and Literacy Coach/PLC consultant).

**Person Responsible** Lainey Newell (newell.lainey@brevardschools.org)

5. Students who have partial to low mastery will be grouped and re-taught on the standard with a focus on mastery using iReady lessons.

**Person Responsible** Jesse Hodge (hodge.jesse@brevardschools.org)

### #3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Informal walkthroughs and student responses on a student survey have highlighted the need for increased engagement in learning. This includes the use of formative checks for understanding and multiple modalities by which students demonstrate their understanding.

**Measureable Outcome:** The outcome of this focus area would be an increase on student survey in the area of engagement on the Youth Truth survey, moving Columbia from the 2.3 (bottom quartile) to 2.6 (mid-range).

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Jesse Hodge (hodge.jesse@brevardschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Marzano (1997) ranks the effectiveness of student engagement to be one of the highest yield instructional practices. This focus area will include training teachers on high yield practices for engagement focused on demonstration of learning and formative checks for understanding.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** As stated above, this focus area is a high yield instructional practice area. This was chosen based on the Marzano best practices along with evidence from the book, Best Practices in Urban School Transformation by Dr. Joe Johnson.

### Action Steps to Implement

1. Utilize the Youth Truth survey as the basis for understanding student perspectives.

**Person Responsible** Paulette Brancaccio (brancaccio.paulettea@brevardschools.org)

2. Train teachers on high-yield instructional strategies for student engagement (virtually and in person) with the following books: The Distance Learning Playbook by Doug Fisher and Nancy Fry. (T)

**Person Responsible** Jesse Hodge (hodge.jesse@brevardschools.org)

3. Monitor teacher use of high-yield instructional strategies for student engagement including checks for understanding.

**Person Responsible** Jesse Hodge (hodge.jesse@brevardschools.org)

4. Include specific planning strategies for student engagement and checks for understanding through the PLC process.

**Person Responsible** Laurie Jones (jones.laurie@brevardschools.org)

### Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

**Columbia will utilize Title I to hire a science coach to continue the growth we have seen in the last year. (T)**

**Columbia will continue to focus on ELA instruction utilizing PLC, collaborative planning, PLC consultant, standards mastery assessments, small group instruction and standards-aligned, rigorous instruction.**

**Columbia will utilize Title I for 2 teachers to support small group instruction in reading and math, 1 IA to support small group reading, 1 Literacy Coach (.5 Title I) to support standards aligned reading instruction. Columbia will continue to purchase Study Island for progress monitoring and standards-aligned instruction in science.**

## 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 ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Based on information gleaned from our survey's given to our parents, we noticed a high interest in bringing families together. Our families expressed an interest in having nights that are not just solely based on academics, but also focused on just bringing our families together. We feel this will be a great opportunity to reach out to our community to participate in bringing the Columbia families together for a great bonding experience. Our students yearn for a warm and welcoming environment and we believe that with active families foster a positive educational career for our students.

Due to COVID-19 we will have virtual math and reading nights this year. These will be hosted on Zoom.

### **Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link**

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.