

Brevard Public Schools

John F. Turner, Senior Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	0

John F. Turner, Senior Elementary School

3175 JUPITER BLVD SE, Palm Bay, FL 32909

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

Demographics

Principal: Ashley Toll

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

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	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	79%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (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
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (41%) 2015-16: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement

To ensure every student reaches his or her highest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement

We work collaboratively as a community of learners to provide a safe, structured, and caring environment where all students are engaged learners who believe they can achieve.

Revised: August 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
Toll, Ashley	Principal	Serves as an Instructional coach, analyzes and shares data with stakeholders, manages the leadership team, and maintains the school budget.
Arnold, Megan	Teacher, K-12	Serves as a Title I Coordinator to oversee interventions, family and stakeholder engagement, maintains budget and Title I compliance components. 80% of the day is spent working with students in ELA intervention, 20% of the day is spent planning family engagement, maintaining budget and reviewing Title I compliance.
Keller, Sara	Assistant Principal	Serves as an instructional leader, shares curriculum updates and best practices, monitors and analyzes data, leads MTSS and prepares for state testing at the school.
McKenzie, Chantell	Instructional Coach	Serves as an instructional leader in the area of ELA. Provides modeling, feedback and supports teachers in planning. Supports the MTSS process by monitoring data and helping to provide interventions to students. Supports teachers to improve their craft through professional development.
Gladden, Michael	Teacher, K-12	Supports teachers and students with the School Wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support program. Supports teachers with behavioral expectations in the classroom. Models best practices for teachers. 80% of the day is spent working with students in ELA intervention, 20% is spent working with students and teachers with positive behavior support.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 7/1/2018, Ashley Toll

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.*

1

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

50

Demographic Data

2020-21 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	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	79%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (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
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (41%) 2015-16: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast

Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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	74	70	61	73	60	74	72	0	0	0	0	0	0	484
Attendance below 90 percent	2	2	0	0	1	7	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
One or more suspensions	0	6	6	1	0	7	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	14	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	15	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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	1	1	0	0	14	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

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	6	3	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/26/2020

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	74	67	68	65	77	83	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	523
Attendance below 90 percent	8	16	10	10	9	15	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	82
One or more suspensions	2	6	3	2	2	7	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	23	26	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	94

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	1	3	0	3	6	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	2	2	2	3	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	74	67	68	65	77	83	89	0	0	0	0	0	0	523
Attendance below 90 percent	8	16	10	10	9	15	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	82
One or more suspensions	2	6	3	2	2	7	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	4	23	26	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	94

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators	1	3	0	3	6	9	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	36

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year	2	2	2	3	0	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	45%	62%	57%	48%	60%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	60%	58%	50%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	57%	53%	43%	46%	48%
Math Achievement	44%	63%	63%	45%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains	57%	65%	62%	50%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41%	53%	51%	44%	49%	47%
Science Achievement	43%	57%	53%	41%	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	48%	63%	-15%	57%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	47%	61%	-14%	58%	-11%
	2018	48%	57%	-9%	56%	-8%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	42%	60%	-18%	56%	-14%
	2018	36%	54%	-18%	55%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2019	40%	60%	-20%	54%	-14%
	2018	53%	63%	-10%	52%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	49%	61%	-12%	62%	-13%
	2018	55%	62%	-7%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	51%	64%	-13%	64%	-13%
	2018	34%	59%	-25%	62%	-28%
Same Grade Comparison		17%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	39%	60%	-21%	60%	-21%
	2018	27%	58%	-31%	61%	-34%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
06	2019	29%	67%	-38%	55%	-26%
	2018	63%	68%	-5%	52%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		-34%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	39%	56%	-17%	53%	-14%
	2018	41%	57%	-16%	55%	-14%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
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	24	53	63	27	54	45	25				
ELL	28	39	60	41	58	53					
BLK	33	57	64	36	60	42	23				
HSP	35	42	58	40	51	45	31				
MUL	44	40		44	60						
WHT	54	58	62	48	57	28	55				

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
FRL	43	49	58	43	55	36	42				

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	28	37	33	23	50	50	18				
ELL	33	57		38	43						
BLK	28	30	23	30	36	43					
HSP	40	53	73	42	38	20	10				
MUL	46	28		32	36		70				
WHT	57	60	50	52	60	63	50				
FRL	47	47	42	43	47	43	37				

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	51
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	65
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	408
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	43
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	49
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
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	45
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	46
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	47
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	52
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	49
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Economically Disadvantaged Students

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

The 2019 State Science Assessment was our lowest performing area. Turner students scored at 43% proficiency on this assessment.

During 2018-2019 classroom walkthroughs, it was evident that science was not being taught to the depth of the standard in every grade level. Hands-on science was not being done regularly in grades K-6.

A science coach was hired for the 2019-2020 school year. The science coach was responsible for helping teachers plan hands on lessons and analyzing data from district assessments. Student science scores were monitored closely in Performance Matters throughout the year to help make decisions on what lessons needed to be retaught. As a result of hiring the science coach through Title I funds, district science assessment data increased in the areas of nature of science and physical science.

FSA Math Lowest 25% was at 41% in 2019. This area shows a priority need. Possible reasons for

this decline are 3rd and 4th grade moving to Eureka without any district provided training. They did not attend the district training that other schools who adopted it as a whole attended. In the 2019-2020 school year, teachers were given training on how to implement Eureka with fidelity. District math resource teachers came out to model and provide feedback for the Eureka program during the school year. All grade levels increased their diagnostic score on the i-Ready diagnostic from window 1 to window 2.

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

The FSA ELA school proficiency scores declined from 48% in 2018 to 45% in 2019. This area declined

while the learning gains in ELA increased overall by 3% in 2019 and the learning gains of the

lowest 25% increased by 17%.

Possible reasons for the decline were the lack of understanding the depth and rigor of the standards, lack of complex text presented to students, and decreased writing across the curriculum. Teachers focused on filling gaps in student instruction through intervention.

For the 19-20 school year, students in grades K, 2, 3, and 5 made significant growth on their i-Ready ELA diagnostics. Students in grades 1, 4, and 6 made very little growth from diagnostic 1 to diagnostic 2. Reasons for this include 8/11 new teachers in those grade levels. Turner also lacked a literacy coach in the 19-20 school year. This did not allow for the new teachers to have coaching or modeling.

The 2019 ESSA Subgroup data show that our students with disabilities are close to falling

below the 41% federal index. Turner has a federal index of 43% for SWD. In the 19-20 school year, Turner was given an extra ESE resource teacher allocation. This extra allocation allowed us to service students with smaller group sizes. Turner still has the third ESE resource teacher allocation for the 20-21 school year. This will allow us to continue serving students in smaller groups.

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

Math achievement showed a gap of 19% between school and state data in 2019. Contributing factors to this gap include, teacher understanding of standard aligned tasks, school attendance, students coming to Turner already 2 or more years behind in Math. In the 19-20 school year, teachers in K-5 were given training in Eureka math. Classroom walkthroughs revealed a need for modeling in the area of presenting the problem sets, and support with student discourse. District resource teachers provided training on 3 early release Fridays in those areas.

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

ELA Lowest 25% learning gains showed the most improvement in the 18-19 school year. This was due to consistency with tier 2 and tier 3 interventions. Students also spent the required amount of time on i-Ready assessments which instruct students where they are academically. Intervention was planned around needs of individual students. Cycles for interventions occurred and met daily. Interventionists were trained in 95% Group, Barton, and LLI.

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

The EWS data reveal an area of concern on the Level 1's on state assessments. Turner has 43 students who scored a level 1 on FSA ELA or Math in the 18-19 school year. Turner plans to improve this area by improving tier 1 instruction by providing professional development on standards aligned tasks, implementing standard focused boards, and using district mentor teachers to model in the classrooms. Attendance in the 19-20 school year did drop below 95% to 94.46%. When students are not attending school regularly, we can't fill the instructional gaps that were created over the COVID-19 shut down.

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

1. ELA Proficiency
2. Math Proficiency
3. Science Proficiency
4. ESE Proficiency for ELA and Math
5. English Language Learners Proficiency for ELA and Math

English Language Learners are another subgroup that has shown a need for intervention. 5% of ELL students were proficient according to i-Ready fall 2019 data. The winter diagnostic only improved by 6%. In math, 0% of Turner's ELL students were proficient on the fall diagnostic and 11% improved to proficiency at the winter diagnostic window.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Teacher learning and growth are dependent upon frequent interaction, dialogue, and reflection between themselves, instructional coaches, and administration.
Measureable Outcome:	School wide ELA scores will increase as a result of teachers collaboratively planning and the implementation of standards aligned instruction in all classrooms for all students. In school year 18-19, 53% of students scored a learning gain and 45% of students in grades 3-6 were proficient on the ELA FSA. The goal for 20-21 school year is to increase students showing a learning gain to 55% and students meeting proficiency to 48% on the ELA FSA. Turner would also like to see the federal index for SWD improve to 45% (currently 43%) and ELL to improve to 52% (currently 49%).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ashley Toll (toll.ashley@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilization of collaborative planning with standards aligned quality resources. Teachers will use Standard Focus Boards as a resource in the classroom. Standard Focus Board and collaborative planning are critical for organizing instruction (effect size- 0.64), explaining content (effect size- 0.70), and assessment of student learning (effect size- 0.64). Teachers and students will have clear learning targets, a clear understanding of what students are expected to know and be able to do and are able to communicate this.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Evidence supports that teaching strategies increase when teachers are given time to collaborate with peers and build their skills utilizing quality materials. Standard Focus Boards are also used to increase the teacher's understanding of the standard and remain focused on the standard throughout the lesson. These strategies when paired with administration walkthroughs, immediate feedback, and data driven lessons, will increase student achievement in ELA.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will collaboratively plan with district and school based-coaches quarterly to map out ELA standards aligned curriculum including complex text, tasks, questions, exit ticket for understanding, including scaffolding and utilizing the enhanced focus documents. These planning sessions will be led by literacy coach, Chantel McKenzie, who is being supported by Debbie Wood. Turner will utilize lessons and assessment from Standards-Mastery to define the depth of the standards. Title I will fund substitutes. (T)
2. Teachers will collaboratively work with school literacy coach and district ELA support team to increase understanding and implementation of best practices in writing strategies for instruction.
3. Teachers will use frequent feedback from coaches and administrative observations to improve instruction.
4. Turner will utilize i-Ready programs for ELA and Math and the professional development that aligns with the program. Teachers will monitor student progress through i-Ready, QLA District assessments, Running Records, and other monitoring tools to guide and plan for standards based instruction. (T)
5. School based leadership team and teachers will collaboratively plan implementation of

school wide intervention based on frequent student data analysis.

6. Teachers will plan lessons with increased written response to text to increase student achievement in ELA.
7. Turner will continue to use the writing program, Write Score (T), to improve writing across content areas. Professional Development for Write Score will support the implementation of the program. (T)
8. Hire Instructional Assistants from Title I funds to support intervention for ELA. (T)
9. Title I teacher hired to pull intervention groups. All small groups will have white boards to help with student engagement. (T)
10. Hired Literacy Coach (.5 T) to support ELA. In the 2019-2020 school year we did not have this position.
11. Use Standards Mastery program from i-Ready to monitor standards based instruction. Teachers will monitor the data and utilize results to follow up with reteach.
12. CARES Act/ASP funding will be used to form small groups for before or after school intervention to fill ELA learning gaps.
13. Provide new web cameras (T) and training to eLearning teachers. Teachers will need PD in digital platforms and resources in order to continue to provide standards based lessons to their online learners.
14. Plan a Literacy Night to help parents understand how to help their child at home (T).
15. Purchase i-Ready ELA workbooks for teachers to support standards based instruction for small groups. (T)
16. i-Ready training and professional development will be provided to all Turner teachers to support the implementation of the program (T).
17. Three Title I Teachers will support tier 2 and tier 3 ELA intervention. (T)

Person Responsible Sara Keller (keller.sara@brevardschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale:

Teacher learning and growth are dependent upon frequent interaction, dialogue, and reflection between themselves, instructional coaches, and administrators.

Measureable Outcome:

School wide Math scores will increase as a result of teachers collaboratively planning and the implementation of standards based instruction in all classrooms for all students with the utilization of the Eureka math program. In the 18-19 school year, 57% of students scored a learning gain and 44% of students in grades 3-6 were proficient on the Math FSA. The goal for 20-21 school year is to increase students showing a learning gain to 61% and students meeting proficiency to 49% on the Math FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ashley Toll (toll.ashley@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Utilization of collaborative planning with standards aligned quality resources. Collaborative planning allows teachers to improve clarity in the Eureka lessons and organize their instruction in a way that keeps them on pace with one another and the district pacing guides.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Evidence supports that teaching strategies increase when teachers are given time to collaborate with peers and build their skills utilizing quality materials. This strategy when paired with administration walkthroughs, immediate feedback, and common assessments can yield great results for all learners.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Continue to implement Eureka math program in all classrooms K-5 to increase student depth of knowledge on math standards.
2. Teachers will collaboratively plan with district and school based administration utilizing the Eureka Math resources in order to increase the standards based instruction and move to the next level of deeper mathematical knowledge for all students.
3. Teachers will use feedback from administrative observations to improve instruction.
4. Teachers will plan and deliver lessons with increased student talk/discourse within lessons in all subject areas. They will also implement the use of exit tickets to inform reteaching needs.
5. Continue the use of the i-Ready instructional program for math. Use Title I funds for professional development for i-ready and substitutes.
6. Use the i-Ready Standards Mastery program to monitor standards based instruction. Teachers will utilize data and reteach standards when needed.
7. CARES Act/ASP funding will be used to form small groups for before or after school intervention to fill Math learning gaps.
8. Provide new web cameras (T) and training to eLearning teachers. Teachers will need PD in digital platforms and resources in order to continue to provide standards based lessons to their online learners.
9. Plan a Family Math night to help parents understand how to help their child at home. (T)

Person Responsible

Sara Keller (keller.sara@brevardschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Teacher learning and growth are dependent upon frequent interaction, dialogue, and reflection between themselves, instructional coaches, and administrators.

Measureable Outcome: Fifth Grade SSA scores will increase as a result of teachers collaboratively planning and the implementation of standards based instruction and standards based hands-on science labs in all classrooms. In 18-19 school year 43% of students in 5th grade were proficient on the State Science Assessment. The goal for the 20-21 school year is to increase students meeting proficiency to 48% on the SSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Ashley Toll (toll.ashley@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Collaborative planning with the utilization of the Five E model for hands on science instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Evidence supports that teaching strategies increase when teachers are given time to collaborate with peers and build their skills utilizing quality materials. This strategy when paired with administration walkthroughs, immediate feedback, and common assessments can increase student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will collaboratively plan with district and school based science coach, utilizing the standards aligned science resources created by Michelle Ferro, in order to increase standards based instruction.
2. Teachers will use frequent feedback from coaches and administrative observations to improve instruction.
3. Michelle Ferro will work closely with school Science Coach and the 5th grade team to model implementation of the Five E science instruction within all classrooms and the utilization of standards aligned science instruction for all grade levels.
4. Science Blitz will be planned and implemented prior to the SSA. Students will review 3rd and 4th grade standards during rotations.
5. Utilizing the Brevard SSA Review Part 1 and 2 to look for deficiencies in science from previous grade levels. Science Coach will use this data to pull text that aligns with the standard to use in small reading groups as well as create labs to fill the gaps.
6. Use Title I funds to bring the Orlando Science Center to Turner for a family science night. (T)
7. Purchase the Lagoon Quest virtual field trip program for our 4th graders. (T)
8. Utilize a school science coach to support teachers and monitor science data. (T)
9. Purchase the program Generation Genius to support science instruction and support student engagement. (T)
10. Science coach will teach hands on activities that align with standards in grades 3-5. (T)

Person Responsible Sara Keller (keller.sara@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Turner will work to improve the social emotional learning in all classrooms from PK-6. All teachers will be implementing a morning meeting to discuss needs students may have. Sanford Harmony lessons will be utilized each day by all teachers to ensure that students are mentally ready for the school day.

SWD and ELL students will be included in the CARES/ASP tutoring to fill instructional gaps caused by COVID-19.

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.

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which has been uploaded to this plan.

The BPS parent survey revealed that Turner's communication with parents was an area of strength. A weekly email from the principal and monthly school newsletter helped parents stay up to date with deadlines and upcoming activities. An area of improvement was planning activities on different days of the week or even morning meetings. During the 19-20 school year, we added monthly parent meetings in the mornings. We also added virtual meetings so that more parents could participate.

In alignment with the BPS strategic plan, Goal 1, Obj. 3 (Provide equitable supports in a safe learning environment for every student's social, emotional, and behavioral development.), Turner provides social and emotional small groups for students in need. Teachers also utilize morning meetings, Sanford Harmony curriculum, and the use of SWPBIS for classroom management and positive behavior support.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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