

Brevard Public Schools

# Sea Park Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## 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>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>14</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

# Sea Park Elementary School

300 SEA PARK BLVD, Satellite Beach, FL 32937

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

## Demographics

**Principal: Stephanie Hall E**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/21/2022

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-6   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2021-22 Title I School</b>  | No  |
| <b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 39%   |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2021-22: A (67%)<br>2020-21: (69%)<br>2018-19: A (64%)<br>2017-18: A (69%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</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> .   |   |

## 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.**

Our mission is to work collaboratively to create an enriched environment that supports all students and help them strive for academic excellence. (Revised 2022)

**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**

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

| Name             | Position Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|------------------|---------------------|---|
| Hall, Stephanie  | Principal           | <p>The principal is the Instructional Leader in charge of executing and monitoring personnel, resources and strategies to ensure all students have equitable access to standards-based instruction. Supports the MTSS team and equips teachers with tools they need to disaggregate student performance data. Perform classroom observations and provide continuous feedback on instructional practices.</p>  |
| Lizek, Angele    | Assistant Principal | <p>Supporting the principal in executing and monitoring personnel, resources, and strategies to ensure all students have equitable and equal access to effective standards-based instruction. Conduct classroom observations to provide teachers with continuous feedback on instructional practices. Supports the MTSS team and equips teachers with tools they need to disaggregate student performance data. Participate in parent conferences, refers students and parents to appropriate resources, oversees the utilization of district curriculum.</p> |
| Willman, Debra   | Instructional Coach | <p>The instructional coach will serve as member of the MTSS/IPST team. The role of the coach is to complete the coaching cycle and model standards-aligned lessons. Provide support to the teacher by modeling lessons, providing feedback from classroom observations and sharing resources to the teachers. Share effective instructional strategies, progress monitoring interventions, and diagnostic data with teachers to improve instruction.</p>  |
| Schroeder, Sarah | Guidance Counselor  | <p>The Guidance Counselor will operate as an active member of the school leadership team and MTSS/IPST team. Focus on developing Tier 1 and II academic and behavior plans. Conduct focus group sessions to address social/emotional needs of identified students and conduct training to proactively combat bullying. Support families that are in transition with providing resources available throughout the community.</p>   |
| McGill, Samantha | Instructional Media | <p>The Media Specialist will provide enrichment and support to the classroom teacher by planning lessons that enrich instruction in all subject areas. The Media Specialist will share resources to the classroom teachers that are available online to improve instruction.</p>  |

| Name            | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|-----------------|----------------|--|
| Esmond, Teri    | Teacher, ESE   | Resource teacher, head up students with disabilities task force, serves on leadership team to communicate needs of SWD . |
| Hargis, Lindsay | Teacher, ESE   | Resource teacher, head up students with disabilities task force, serves on leadership team to communicate needs of SWD . |

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Tuesday 6/21/2022, Stephanie Hall E

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*

2

**Number of teachers with a 2022 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**

27

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

338

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

6

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.**

8

**Demographic Data**

**Early Warning Systems**

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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                              | 34          | 51 | 44 | 41 | 40 | 41 | 55 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 306   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 0           | 2  | 7  | 6  | 4  | 5  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 27    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 1  | 2  | 7  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 13    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 1  | 3  | 8  | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 22    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0  | 0  | 1  | 3  | 7  | 6  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 17    |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 17    |

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/29/2022

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                              | 43          | 39 | 40 | 42 | 41 | 44 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 285   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 2           | 2  | 3  | 3  | 3  | 0  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 17    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5  | 4  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 11    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8  | 4  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 15    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

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

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

**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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |

**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                              | 43          | 39 | 40 | 42 | 41 | 44 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 285   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 2           | 2  | 3  | 3  | 3  | 0  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 17    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5  | 4  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 11    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 8  | 4  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 15    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

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

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

**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 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1     |

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data Review**

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

| School Grade Component      | 2022   |          |       | 2021   |          |       | 2019   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 71%    |          |       | 70%    |          |       | 75%    | 62%      | 57%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 65%    |          |       | 75%    |          |       | 65%    | 60%      | 58%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 54%    |          |       | 57%    |          |       | 52%    | 57%      | 53%   |
| Math Achievement            | 71%    |          |       | 70%    |          |       | 77%    | 63%      | 63%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 71%    |          |       | 72%    |          |       | 63%    | 65%      | 62%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 62%    |          |       | 69%    |          |       | 41%    | 53%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 74%    |          |       | 72%    |          |       | 75%    | 57%      | 53%   |

**Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments**

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

| ELA               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 01                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 02                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 03                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 78%    | 64%      | 14%                        | 58%   | 20%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 74%    | 61%      | 13%                        | 58%   | 16%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -78%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |

| ELA               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|                   | 2019 | 69%    | 60%      | 9%                         | 56%   | 13%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -74%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 06                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 80%    | 60%      | 20%                        | 54%   | 26%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -69%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 01                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 02                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 03                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 86%    | 61%      | 25%                        | 62%   | 24%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 74%    | 64%      | 10%                        | 64%   | 10%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -86%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 73%    | 60%      | 13%                        | 60%   | 13%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -74%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 06                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 83%    | 67%      | 16%                        | 55%   | 28%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -73%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 75%    | 56%      | 19%                        | 53%   | 22%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 06                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -75%   |          |                            |       |                         |

**Subgroup Data Review**

| 2022 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 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 |
| SWD                                       | 38       | 39     | 40          | 47        | 43      | 30           |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 77       |        |             | 54        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 61       | 54     |             | 78        | 77      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 73       | 67     | 58          | 74        | 75      | 65           | 84       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 68       | 57     | 45          | 72        | 70      | 64           | 69       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD                                       | 44       |        |             | 44        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 83       |        |             | 78        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 72       | 75     | 50          | 73        | 70      | 70           | 68       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 61       | 75     |             | 61        | 63      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD                                       | 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       |         |           |                   |                     |

**ESSA Data Review**

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

| ESSA Federal Index  |      |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  | TS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 67   |
| 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 |      |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 468  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 7    |
| Percent Tested  | 98%  |
| Subgroup Data   |      |
| Students With Disabilities  |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 40   |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES  |

| <b>Students With Disabilities</b>  |     |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%      | 0   |
| <b>English Language Learners</b>   |     |
| 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   |
| <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                                |     |
| 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   |
| <b>Hispanic Students</b>   |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 66  |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                      | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%               | 0   |
| <b>Multiracial Students</b>  |     |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students   | 68  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%            | 0   |
| <b>Native American Students</b>  |     |
| 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   |
| <b>Pacific Islander Students</b>   |     |
| 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   | 71 |
| 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                                | 64 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0  |

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

**What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?**

Our fourth grade shows the most learning loss when compared to other grade levels. Math is lower in all grade levels than reading according to IReady EOY Spring 2022. SWD in both math and reading are below the 41%. The school outperforms the district in all four strands in math, with Geometry being our weakest domain.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?**

2021-2022 FSA data shows that an area with greatest need for improvement are Students with Disabilities - SWD (which are also Lowest 25%) are low in both math proficiency 47% and reading proficiency 38%.

When we dive into the components of Reading across grade levels it shows vocabulary as a common weak area. We know that Collective Efficacy effect size is 1.57, the idea that the faculty, working together, has what it takes to improve student learning is particularly important for schoolwide improvement. Through collaborative planning, teachers can proactively make instructional decisions that meet all student needs.

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

ESE staffing was not enough last year and this year we were awarded two Resources teachers that service K-6 versus one. Additionally, a review of SWD schedules and proper coding of time spent with regular peers is important to provide a clear picture of how we serve students. Individual schedules for students and staff is shared within the first month of school. Providing 1:1 support for students beyond the school day to meet their needs and address gaps in learning.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?**

Both Reading and Math Achievement ranked 71% OGL. Learning gains for math were somewhat higher for math at 71% versus ELA at 65%. But the most significant growth is with the Lowest 25% in math at

62% compared to Lowest 25% in ELA at 54%. Our science scores for OGL is 74%. Additionally, our IReady progress monitoring data in both reading showed that our intervention groups made significant progress. This is a result of monthly review of data at subgroup level.

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

Intervention groups were discussed bi-weekly with administration and care was placed in choosing interventions that were evidence based. Additionally, SWD had access to Lexia lessons to support them at their level. Intervention was implemented with fidelity.

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

Utilization of Resource teachers to front-load SWD on upcoming content before it is presented by teacher. Continue to look at inclusive practices to ensure that SWD needs are being met so they can access grade level material. ADD ADDITIONAL STRATEGIES LEARNED AT PAC MEETING.

**Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.**

Professional Development will continue to be how to support all learners to be successful with the standards. PD to support the classroom teacher with scaffolding instruction for students with disabilities in both reading and math. This may include technology support for students and teachers. PD support for self-contained teacher in planning instruction weekly to meet the needs of her students. Math PD on implementing the new curriculum. Additional PD for teachers who want to receive their Reading Endorsement.

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

This is year two implementing inclusion. We have refined schedules to provide time for planning between the ESE Resource teacher and classroom teacher. Students with disabilities will improve social and communication skills, increase academic achievement and positive behavior, and foster the development of relationships with peers at school and in the community. Teachers will become more skilled in teaching all students, learn to share responsibilities for educating all students, and develop more satisfying and collegial professional relationships.

**Areas of Focus**

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**  
**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**

In analyzing our 2021-2022 FSA Data, ELA learning gains (FSA) decreased from 75.5% in 2020-2021 to 65% in 2021-2022. ELA Lowest 25% Learning gains decreased from 57.1% in 2020-2021 to 53.8% in 2021-2022. Math learning gains remained stagnant from 71.7% in 2020-2021 to 71.3% in 2021-2022. Math lowest 25% learning gains decreased from 69.2% in 2020-2021 to 61.5% in 2021-2022.

To increase student achievement our focus is to strengthen Instructional Practice to ensure alignment to the Florida B.E.S.T. Standards. Teachers are implementing new curriculum in ELA and Math and will need support.

**Measurable Outcome:**  
**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

75% of PreK-6 grade students will achieve mastery on the summative end of the year FAST Assessment.  
 ELA proficiency (Level 3-5) will increase from FSA 2021 71% proficient to FAST 2022 75% proficient.  
 Math proficiency (Level 3-5) will increase from FSA 2021 71% proficient to FAST 2022 75% proficient.

**Monitoring:**  
**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

Weekly leadership team meetings focus on classroom walkthrough data, i-Ready, FAST progress monitoring, adopted Core Curriculum Assessments (Benchmark, Reveal Math, and EdGems) and other available data and analyze in weekly data digs. Specific actions are developed weekly to focus on instruction. Bi-weekly data meetings with teachers facilitated by Literacy and Math Coaches guide instructional decisions for core, tier II and tier III instruction.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Stephanie Hall (hall.stephanie@brevardschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**

Implementation of systematic explicit instruction with on-going progress monitoring of student performance data to target instruction.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

In the review of research by Clarke, R.E., Kirschner, P.A. & Sweller, J. (2012) Putting Students on the Path to Learning: The case for fully guided instruction studies indicate that teachers are more effective when providing explicit guidance with practice and feedback rather than requiring student discovery while learning new skills/concepts.

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.



During classroom walkthroughs instructional coaches will monitor implementation of the Math adopted core curriculum Reveal (K-5) and EdGems (Grade 6); and the adopted core ELA Curriculum Benchmark Universe (K-5) and Saavus (Grade 6). Administration will meet with teachers and give immediate feedback for continuous teacher improvement. Sea Park Elementary's 2022-2023 TNP Survey improving Teacher Feedback from 6.8 (2021-2022) to 7.3 (2022-2023).

**Person Responsible** Stephanie Hall (hall.stephanie@brevardschools.org)

Professional Learning aligned to the science of reading and evidence based strategies including explicit, systematic, scaffolded and differentiated instruction. Professional Development delivered on October PD Friday and February Professional Development Day. PD to include Instructional Assistants and delivery of small group instruction.

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

Literacy Coach will facilitate bi-weekly data meetings and participate in grade level planning to align instruction to ensure students are mastering the B.E.S.T. standards in ELA and Math. Teachers will complete GoogleShare document with Tier 2 and Tier 3 Interventions to monitor students at risk.

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

Communicate to parents the Read-At-Home Plan and provide additional resources regularly to support student learning from Pre-K to 6th Grade. This includes monthly in writing communication to parents for all Tier 2 and Tier 3 students or below 15th percentile on IReady.

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

Teachers will receive feedback on implementation of Tier 1 expectations including Best Practice "Look Fors". These include complex content that challenges students, students fully engaged, doing the thinking, a safe and welcoming environment that encourages students to take risks, intentional planning and facilitating within the classroom, and students demonstrating and applying their learning.

**Person Responsible** Stephanie Hall (hall.stephanie@brevardschools.org)

All students not meeting grade level standards and benchmarks in grades 3-5 will be invited to participate in the after-school Academic Support Program. ASP Reading and ASP Math will be held from the middle of January through March 2023. Fall tutoring is provided for students using ESSER funds to focus on achievement gaps as a result of the pandemic.

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

All parents will receive communication through PMP letters, parent reports for K-2 STAR Assessments, student reports from FAST 3-6, Interim reports and quarterly progress reports. Increased parent communication and involvement promotes higher student achievement by utilizing the student planners as a consistent source of communication as well as FOCUS for documentation.

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

Implementation of Reveal (K-5) and EdGems (Grade 6) with fidelity. This will require Professional Development throughout the year and Collaborative Planning on a monthly basis with administration, and between grade levels weekly.

**Person Responsible** Stephanie Hall (hall.stephanie@brevardschools.org)

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

**Area of Focus Description and**

**Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** Looking at Least Restrictive Environment trend over three years we continue to be below the district average for including students with disabilities and we were higher than the district average for students in a separate class. This indicates that staff need professional development in inclusion and how to meet the needs of all students when they have difficulty learning when presented material.

**Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**

Percentage of students as measured by the LRE (Least Restrictive Environment) will either match the district or exceed the district. District data:  
**MEASURABLE GOAL:**  
 SWD will increase from ELA proficiency of (21-22 FSA) 38% to (22-23 FAST) 50%.  
 SWD will increase from Math proficiency of (21-22 FSA) 47% to (22-23 FAST) 50%.

**Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**

Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) is a framework that helps educators provide academic and behavioral strategies for students with various needs. MTSS takes a proactive approach identifying students with academic or behavioral needs. Early assessment and intervention for these students can help them catch up with their peers sooner. The key components of MTSS include:  
 Universal screening of all students early in the school year; FAST PM for VPK - Grade 6  
 Tiers of interventions that can be amplified in response to levels of need  
 Ongoing data collection and continual assessment utilizing i-Ready  
 Schoolwide approach to expectations and supports

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Debra Willman (willman.debra@brevardschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being**

High Leverage Strategies include matching intensity of instruction to students needs and developing concepts that build on one another. Teachers match the intensity of instruction to the intensity of the student's learning and behavioral challenges. Intensive instruction involves working with students with similar needs on a small number of high priority, clearly defined skills or concepts critical to academic success. Teachers group students based on common learning needs; clearly define learning goals; and use systematic, explicit, and well-paced instruction. They frequently monitor students' progress and adjust instruction accordingly. Within intensive instruction, students have many opportunities to respond and

**implemented for this Area of Focus.** receive immediate, corrective feedback. Teachers sequence lessons that build on each other and make connections explicit, in both planning and delivery. Planning involves careful consideration of learning goals, and what is involved in reaching the goals.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**  
**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.**  
**Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

This is year three of inclusion and we have somewhat successfully implemented Tier 1 and Tier 2 interventions for students. We will continue to implement Tier 1 and Tier 2 interventions while focusing on increasing the intensity of Tier 3 interventions and matching intervention strategies and supports for ALL students.

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Support Self-Contained VE classroom with supports for small group instruction and planning to include district personnel. Create individual schedules to include visuals for all students. Professional development and support in creating interventions for all ESE students and monitored monthly by administration.

**Person Responsible** Teri Esmond (esmond.teri@brevardschools.org)

Schedule weekly collaborative planning between classroom teachers and ESE resource teachers. Administration will monitor implementation of planning through classroom walkthroughs and teacher lesson plans.

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

Communicate to parents the Read-At-Home Plan and provide additional resources regularly to support student learning from Pre-K to 6th Grade. The New World Reading Scholarships offer parents access to a stipend for reading tutoring. This includes monthly in writing communication to parents for all Tier 2 and Tier 3 students or below 15th percentile on IReady.

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

Utilize BPS Intervention Decision trees as a guide to target students that are BGL. Bi-weekly review of student progress in intervention groups to determine effectiveness of strategies. Identified students that are BGL including ESE students will be tracked on our electronic progress monitoring sheet using multiple data points for Reading and Math. Small group differentiated instruction will be implemented through classroom observation, i-Ready and Lexia. Formal completion of BPS IPST Form 6 to identify student weaknesses and strengths, develop hypothesis for student deficit; create a sound intervention using evidence-based strategies/resources with a progress monitoring tool that directly measures intervention strategy. Follow Intervention Cycles to track and analyze student movement toward targeted benchmark, making appropriate instructional changes as needed. Implementation of scientifically evidence-based

interventions with fidelity will include the following resources: 95% Group, i-Ready Toolbox Resources, Lexia Resources, and LLI Intervention.

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

SLD Content Specialist to share evidence based strategies and resources to support ESE students and homeroom teachers.

**Person Responsible** Stephanie Hall (hall.stephanie@brevardschools.org)

Instructional Assistants to receive PD for High Leverage Strategies monthly with discussion throughout the year. Administration to follow up with corrective feedback on utilizing these strategies with consistency.

**Person Responsible** Stephanie Hall (hall.stephanie@brevardschools.org)

Frequent classroom walkthroughs to observe teachers and instructional assistants implementing High Leverage Strategies. Give feedback on what is working well and areas in need of improvement.

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

### 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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

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

The Youth Truth Survey indicated in 3rd-6th grade ranked the highest in Engagement. 4th grade lowest score was in Culture at 8%. The lowest ranked question in culture for fourth grade was "Does your class stay busy and not waste time?" This measure describes the degree to which students experience an orderly, respectful classroom environment. Students indicated on survey within Academic Challenge they ranked "Do you learn interesting things in class?" as one of the lowest questions. This does not align with our mission statement to work collaboratively to create an enriched environment that supports all students and help them strive for academic excellence. Sea Park has weekly Fun Fact Friday questions for students to collect and review aspects of the Youth Truth Survey. There is evidence of a Growth Mindset in all classrooms that foster mistakes and learning from them. The staff spend time creating a warm and friendly environment in the beginning of the school year and teach procedures and expectations. The School Creed which is repeated daily by all staff and students reminds everyone of how we should treat others and act at school. It sets the tone for the day. Student work is displayed not only in every classroom but throughout the bulletin boards. These are updated monthly acknowledging accomplishments in Reading and Math at all grades levels.

Several key sources of data were utilized when planning for the 22-23 school year which include school-wide parent surveys, faculty "insight surveys" and a new student survey called "youth truth". These data

sets were invaluable when looking at the various areas of culture and promoting a positive environment. 69% of parents wanted more academic support materials for families. A school newsletter is sent out weekly through Blackboard Connect that provides links to homework help, topics of interest and upcoming events. Additionally, teachers added to their newsletters helpful hints to support student success. Our parent survey indicated positive responses in feeling welcome at school (79% yes) effectiveness of school's information being sent online (82% received online) and information being sent from the Principal. Areas of improvement included: academic support materials for families to use at home. During Open House, the Guidance Counselor provided Community Resources to support all families to increase family engagement. Focus areas for improvement planning include ensuring that FOCUS & Google classroom resources are available for all parents with relevant information. Weekly parent academic resources will be sent with the Principal's newsletter to provide extra resources for parents to help their children with standards.

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

Teachers-their role is to provide a positive environment so that students can be successful. They should model, teach and reteach the rules and expectations and tie behavior back to Sea Parks School Creed.

Administration-support the classroom teacher in shared spaces such as hallways, cafeteria and fields to set expectations and procedures for all. Communicate with parents and students so that there is a clear understanding of rules and procedures.

Parents-are responsible to ready their children for school and ultimately parents must maintain discipline and control of their children's behavior whether at school or away from school.

Students-to conduct themselves in keeping with their levels of development, maturity and demonstrated capabilities with proper regard for the rights and welfare of other students and school staff, the educational purpose underlying all school activities, and the care of school facilities and equipment.