

Brevard Public Schools

Sea Park 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	0

Sea Park Elementary School

300 SEA PARK BLVD, Satellite Beach, FL 32937

<http://seapark.es.brevard.k12.fl.us>

Demographics

Principal: Ena Leiba A

Start Date for this Principal: 6/6/2010

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)	34%
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 Grade	2018-19: A
School Grades History	2017-18: A 2016-17: A 2015-16: C 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 to work collaboratively to create an enriched environment that supports all students and help them strive for academic excellence.

Provide the school's vision statement

Sea Park Elementary school community is committed to providing quality education in a supportive, engaging and academic rich environment.

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
Leiba, Ena	Principal	<p>Sea Park School Leadership Team</p> <p>The principal will foster the mission and the vision for the Leadership Team. The principal will actively engage in the IPST/ MTSS process and serve as members of the team. As the Sea Park Leadership Team, we are responsible for collaborating on research-based strategies that will drive instruction and support student achievement. The team will collaborate weekly on student data, instructional practices, and strategies that are working effectively across all grade levels. The principal will ensure that students that are working below grade level are promptly identified, coded in AS400 and receive intervention in a timely manner.</p>
Lizek, Angele	Assistant Principal	<p>The principal and assistant principal conduct classroom walk-throughs, formal and informal observations to provide feedback for continuous teacher improvement. The assistant principal will serve on the IPST/MTSS team. The role of the assistant principal is to assist in monitoring assessments and academic progress of students that are receiving intervention . The assistant principal will monitor progress monitoring data meetings, the effectiveness of the intervention being provided, and provide materials needed to support students.</p>
Willman, Debra	Instructional Coach	<p>The instructional coach will also serve as member of the MTSS/ IPST Team. The role of the coach is to provide support to the teacher, by modeling lessons, provide resources to the teachers when needed. The coach will also share effective instructional strategies, progress monitoring interventions, and share diagnostic data with teachers and the team</p>
Collins, Linda	Teacher, ESE	<p>The duties of the ESE Resource Teacher is to serve as the MTSS facilitator. She will also serve as the facilitator of the IPST. The ESE Resource teacher will facilitate IPST/MTSS meetings. She will assists in ensuring that effective interventions strategies are provided to teachers, and manage the weekly IPST/MTSS meetings. .</p>
Schroeder, Sarah	Guidance Counselor	<p>The Guidance Counselor will operate as an active member of the school leadership team. The duties will include but not limited to: providing social emotional support to students that are at risk, students that are in transition, and assists in monitoring the emotional well-being of lowest 25% sub groups.</p>

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	42	41	45	36	43	63	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	311
Attendance below 90 percent	17	19	10	9	9	19	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	96
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	3	4	6	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on Math FSA	0	0	0	5	3	5	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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

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

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	5	2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

28

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/6/2019

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	16	16	8	16	21	14	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	112
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	11	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	20

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	2	1	2	6	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	22

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	75%	62%	57%	78%	60%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	65%	60%	58%	69%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52%	57%	53%	52%	46%	48%
Math Achievement	77%	63%	63%	79%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains	63%	65%	62%	66%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	53%	51%	58%	49%	47%
Science Achievement	75%	57%	53%	81%	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	42 (0)	41 (0)	45 (0)	36 (0)	43 (0)	63 (0)	41 (0)	311 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	17 ()	19 ()	10 ()	9 ()	9 ()	19 ()	13 ()	96 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	3 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	4 (0)	6 (0)	3 (0)	16 (0)
Level 1 on Math FSA	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (0)	3 (0)	5 (0)	2 (0)	15 (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	78%	64%	14%	58%	20%
	2018	82%	63%	19%	57%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	74%	61%	13%	58%	16%
	2018	61%	57%	4%	56%	5%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	69%	60%	9%	56%	13%
	2018	86%	54%	32%	55%	31%
Same Grade Comparison		-17%				
Cohort Comparison		8%				
06	2019	80%	60%	20%	54%	26%
	2018	89%	63%	26%	52%	37%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	86%	61%	25%	62%	24%
	2018	82%	62%	20%	62%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	74%	64%	10%	64%	10%
	2018	77%	59%	18%	62%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	73%	60%	13%	60%	13%
	2018	70%	58%	12%	61%	9%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
06	2019	83%	67%	16%	55%	28%
	2018	94%	68%	26%	52%	42%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison		13%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	75%	56%	19%	53%	22%
	2018	80%	57%	23%	55%	25%
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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	40	50	47	40	42	35	33				
HSP	80			60							
MUL	75			81							
WHT	77	67	52	80	62	48	74				
FRL	60	58	50	58	53	29	53				

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	48	39	31	52	48	50					
HSP	67			67							
MUL	92			83							
WHT	80	70	48	82	64	56	80				
FRL	66	59	40	59	48	53	74				

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	64
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	448
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	41
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	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 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	66
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	52
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

Students with Disabilities were the lowest performing subgroup at Sea Park on the 2019 FSA. 40% of SWD students achieved a 3 or above on both the Reading and Math 2019 FSA. Only 33% of our fifth grade SWD students were proficient in Science.

2019 ELA Lowest 25% showed the lowest performance level. Although we have remained constant the last two years at 52% the district has increased from 46% to 57% (11+) and the state increased from 48% to 53% (5+). Our lowest 25% students are below both the district and state average and our scores are stagnant. A contributing factor is our current Reading program is not standard aligned and students do not have consistent access to complex text and tasks challenging students to meet or exceed the rigor of the standards.

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

2019 Math Lowest 25% decreased from 58% to 41% (-17 points). This was the first year of the school-wide implementation of Eureka Math. This standards aligned math program is rigorous and requires teachers to dive deeply into the math practices. On our second year of implementation students are becoming more familiar with the format, vocabulary and expectations of the curriculum.

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

Sea Park Elementary 2019 Science Level 3 and above score was 75% (22+) higher than the state average of 53%. Sea Park Elementary 2018 Science Level 3 and above score was 81% (26+) higher than the state average of 55%. Our school participates in the Maker Space program and emphasizes STEAM curriculum. Our fifth grade Science Academic Support Program utilizes the NGSSS Item specs and teaches the Science standards using the 5E Model of Instruction. In preparation for the Florida Standards

Science Assessment fifth grade students have a hands-on Science Day and the students are the teachers. Teachers in younger grades focus on the Science Priority Standards and utilize district resources.

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

Fourth Grade Reading proficiency increased from 61% to 74 % (13+) gain. Our fourth grade is departmentalized and we made an instructional change.

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

Attendance is an issue at Sea Park Elementary. A significant number of students have Attendance below 90%. If a student is not at school they are missing academics.

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

1. Standards Aligned Instruction in Math and Reading
2. Learning Gains of lowest 25% in Math
3. Learning Gains of lowest 25% in Reading

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Standards Aligned Instruction in ELA and Math
Rationale	If standards aligned instruction occurs consistently and students are given standards aligned tasks then students will master the standards taught.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>ELA Lowest 25% average will increase from 52% to the district average of 57%(+5)</p> <p>Math Lowest 25% average will increase from 41% to the district average of 53%(+13)</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Ena Leiba (leiba.ena@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>Collaborative Planning</p> <p>Writing across the content areas and text based writing with complex text in ELA</p> <p>Collective Efficacy</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Alignment of the level of the standard and text complexity. If standard aligned instruction occurs consistently students will master standards. High yield strategies are research based.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Focus Instruction on Priority Standards. ELA teachers utilize standards focused documents to plan and Math teachers utilize the Eureka Math standards aligned curriculum. 2. Collaborative Planning with Literacy Coach and vertical teams to develop Instructional Calendars and standards aligned lessons. 3. Create school based standards focus boards to be used in classrooms to frame lessons, identify learning targets, check for understanding and to drive instruction. 4. Use Complex Text in all grade levels. Utilize Instructional Practice Guide as a planning tool to focus lessons on high quality texts. 5. Conferencing periodically with all students to review data and set goals.. 6. Schedule and Conduct Weekly Classroom Walkthroughs by Administration to provide on-going feedback. Utilize Instructional Practice Guides for ELA and Math to ensure the work of instructional lessons are focused on standards. 7. Coaching provided by Literacy Coach and Peer Mentors as identified through observations. 8. Include children with disabilities in general education classrooms. 100% of students in Intermediate VE push into general education for one or more subjects. We are working on doing the same in Primary VE as part of our BPIE. 9. Utilize Standards Mastery Assessment in Third Grade to assess priority standard ELA instruction. 10. Collaborate with Media Specialist to support STEM education integrated with the ELA and Math Standards.

Person Responsible Angele Lizek (lizek.angele@brevardschools.org)

#2

Title Learning Gains for Lowest 25% in Math

Rationale Learning Gains for Sea Park's Lowest 25% in Math decreased from 58% to 41% (-17) on the 2019 Florida State Math Assessment. Only 35% of our Students with Disabilities in the lowest 25% made learning gains and 40% of our SWD achieved a Level 3 or above.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve Learning Gains for Sea Park's Lowest 25% in Math will increase by 13 points on the 2020 Florida State Math Assessment from 41% to 53%, meeting the district average of 53% and exceeding the state average of 51%.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome Ena Leiba (leiba.ena@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy Response to Intervention

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy Response to Intervention has been determined to have an effect size of 1.29 from Hattie's 2018 updated Visible Learning research.

Action Step

Description

1. Core Instruction Eureka is a highly aligned math curriculum. This is year two of school wide implementation.
2. Invite District Math Resource Teacher to assist with classroom walkthroughs to monitor standard aligned math instruction.
3. Use i-Ready for prescriptive pathways and deficits.
4. Target small group instruction for lowest 25% in math through Response to Intervention.
5. Utilize Activity Teachers to provide Rtl support.
6. Progress monitor lowest 25% through monthly data meetings.
6. Invite third - sixth grade students who are below proficiency in math to participate in the after school academic support program.

Person Responsible Debra Willman (willman.debra@brevardschools.org)

#3	
Title	Learning Gains for Lowest 25% in Reading
Rationale	In 2019-2020 we will focus on identifying and supporting the lowest 25% in ELA through i-Ready diagnostics and growth monitoring. The instructional component of i-Ready will be utilized for Response to Intervention combined with small group targeted instruction.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Sea Park Elementary's lowest 25% in ELA will increase from 52% to 57% (+5).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Angele Lizek (lizek.angele@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Response to Intervention small group targeted instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Response to Intervention has been determined to have an effect size of 1.29 from Hattie's 2018 updated Visible Learning research.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Strengthen Core Instruction focusing on Standards Aligned Instruction. 2. Schedule intervention block for lowest 25% in ELA. 3. Use i-Ready for prescriptive pathways and deficits. 4. Target small group instruction for lowest 25% in reading through Response to Intervention. 5. Utilize Activity Teachers for Rtl support. 6. Progress monitor lowest 25% through monthly data meetings. 6. Invite third - sixth grade students who are below proficiency in reading to participate in the after school academic support program.
Person Responsible	Debra Willman (willman.debra@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)

N/A