

Brevard Public Schools

W. Melbourne Elementary School For



2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	12
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	14

W. Melbourne Elementary School For Science

2255 MEADOWLANE AVE, West Melbourne, FL 32904

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

Demographics

Principal: Theresa Benson

Start Date for this Principal: 6/3/2020

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)	17%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19: A
School Grades History	2017-18: A 2016-17: A 2015-16: A 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

To educate today's students utilizing scientific discovery and implementation of technology to meet the challenges of tomorrow's world.

Provide the school's vision statement

Our vision is to help each child develop their full potential while becoming creative producers and self-directed, life-long learners. We will accomplish this through a commitment to excellence and collaboration between parents, staff, students, and community.

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
Benson, Theresa	Principal	*Instructional Leader *Manages Curriculum *Monitors Lesson Plans *Allocates Resources *Evaluates Teachers *Monitors Quality Instruction *Promotes Student Learning & Growth *Oversees Cafeteria, Custodial & SACC Staffs
Batman, Amanda	Assistant Principal	*Assists Principal with all above mentioned duties and responsibilities *FSA Testing Coordinator *Maintains Discipline Records *Maintains Investigation Records

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	72	72	71	72	87	88	87	0	0	0	0	0	0	549
Attendance below 90 percent	4	2	1	1	2	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
One or more suspensions	2	3	2	0	1	3	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA or Math	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	7	8	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
	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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	1	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

37

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/15/2019

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	0	6	6	3	6	5	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
One or more suspensions	4	2	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	6	6	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	88%	62%	57%	88%	60%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	73%	60%	58%	71%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	57%	53%	67%	46%	48%
Math Achievement	84%	63%	63%	84%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains	73%	65%	62%	71%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	69%	53%	51%	60%	49%	47%
Science Achievement	92%	57%	53%	95%	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	72 (0)	72 (0)	71 (0)	72 (0)	87 (0)	88 (0)	87 (0)	549 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	4 ()	2 ()	1 ()	1 ()	2 ()	3 ()	3 ()	16 (0)
One or more suspensions	2 ()	3 (0)	2 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	3 (0)	8 (0)	19 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	1 ()	3 (0)	1 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	5 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	7 (0)	8 (0)	1 (0)	16 (0)
	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (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.

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	90%	64%	26%	58%	32%
	2018	81%	63%	18%	57%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	80%	61%	19%	58%	22%
	2018	90%	57%	33%	56%	34%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		-1%				
05	2019	90%	60%	30%	56%	34%
	2018	89%	54%	35%	55%	34%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	90%	60%	30%	54%	36%
	2018	91%	63%	28%	52%	39%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	82%	61%	21%	62%	20%
	2018	81%	62%	19%	62%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	79%	64%	15%	64%	15%
	2018	80%	59%	21%	62%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				
05	2019	90%	60%	30%	60%	30%
	2018	86%	58%	28%	61%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
06	2019	87%	67%	20%	55%	32%
	2018	87%	68%	19%	52%	35%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	92%	56%	36%	53%	39%
	2018	95%	57%	38%	55%	40%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
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	56	37	42	54	63	67					
ELL	82	78		90	75		83				
ASN	88	83		90	72	80	73				
BLK	78	60		61	67						
HSP	91	71	64	87	76		100				
MUL	94	73		83	73						
WHT	87	71	63	85	73	68	94				
FRL	89	76		82	68	69	100				

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	53	55		50	50						
ELL	80			80							
ASN	95	81		91	77		94				
BLK	82	64		71	79	73					
HSP	91	86		87	67		100				
MUL	85			77							
WHT	86	65	63	82	70	58	98				
FRL	82	72	68	74	68	48	84				

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	78
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	544
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	53
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Students With Disabilities	
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	82
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	81
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	67
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	82
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	81
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	77
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	81
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

In looking at our data, our Students with Disabilities showed the lowest performance. One possible factor that contributed to this low performance, was a change in ESE teachers at the mid-point of the year. Building relationships and understanding the needs of each child was an adjustment and strategies needed to be more targeted. During the summer of 2019, the ESE schedule was considered first before the master schedule was finalized to guarantee the needs of SWD is a priority. Based upon the 18-19 FSA data, we have identified 18 ESE students that need targeted instruction and place with teachers that will work closely our ESE teachers, Administration and ESE Specialist.

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

The subgroup showing the greatest decline was the 4th grade Math cohort. Based on our FSA & IReady data, 4th grade math decreased by 3%. There were 71 out of 87 students or 82% the previous year and 69/87 students or 79% this year. This is a steady decrease. 2019-2020 5th grade Teachers have put many interventions in place to close the gap and increase student achievement for this rising 5th grade cohort. Factors contributing to this decline was the rigor in the classroom was not consistently attained. We hired a brand new teacher mid-year with a learning curve of being a new teacher with a new curriculum (i.e Eureka Math). To help this teacher be successful, we provided access to a mentor teacher and an Instructional Coach. We have provided the opportunity to attend staff development management training and many informal observations with feedback has been given. Having the support of grade level and planning with vertical peers has been beneficial this year.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends

Our data is higher in comparison to the state average in all areas. The contributing factor to this trend is ALL stakeholders are held accountable. Parent Involvement, Community

Support, triangular communication between parent, teacher and student are what makes this school excel. Administration is committed to making certain that excellence is our standard and that we make every moment count in presenting thoughtful instruction and differentiation for all students.

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

The component that showed the most improvement was the lowest 25% learners in math. In 2018, 60% of these students made a learning gain, and in 2019, 69% made a learning gain. This is an increase of 8 %. The actions our school took was that our ESE teacher and Instructional Coach were instrumental in modeling strategies to teachers to meet the needs of these learners.

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

Due to our belief that attendance matters at our school, we noticed that there were 16 students that were below 90% in attendance. Our goal is to decrease this number by 50%. We can achieve this by being proactive in reaching out to families that are absent at the early stages, have parents work with our guidance counselor and remind parents the success rate of students present at school.

Another area we noticed from our data, was that we had 19 students with one or more suspensions. Our goal is to decrease this number by 50%, as well. We will achieve this by kicking off our year presenting our school-wide rules and expectations to all teachers and students. We will implement restorative practices, creative discipline that includes reflective assignments and and conflict resolutions prior to suspending students.

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

1. Meeting the needs of our ESE population by providing collaborative planning time between ESE teacher and Gen Ed teachers, utilizing our data wall through data discussions and creating an intervention block in our master schedule.
2. Ensuring a learning gain for EVERY student in Reading and Math. We have constructed a data wall that continues data chats among Administrators, Instructional Coach and Teachers about where students are, their needs and the tools we will use to get them on or above grade level. We have purchased the iReady instructional piece in Reading and Math to have more progress monitoring data.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Meet the needs of our ESE population.
Rationale	<p>In 2019, our students with disabilities demonstrated that they are our highest-priority. This equates to a total of 19 students identified as SWD. In ELA, 56% of our ESE students achieved proficiency or higher, which equates to 11 students. 37% made a learning gain, which equals 7 students. Out of the lowest 25%, 42% made a learning gain, which equates to 8 students.</p> <p>In Math, 54% of our ESE students achieved proficiency or higher with equates to 10 students. 63% made a learning gain which equates to 12 students. Out of the lowest 25%, 67% made a learning gain, which equates to 13 students.</p>
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>In 2020, we will be able to measure whether students with disabilities made larger gains through the use of inclusive practices, individual student data chats and benchmark data from iReady in Reading and Math.</p> <p>In ELA, 100% will make a learning gain. Out of the lowest 25%, 100% will make a learning gain.</p> <p>In Math, 100% will make a learning gain. Out of the lowest 25%, 100% will make a learning gain. We realize that these are big goals to aspire to, however, we feel that every student should make a learning gain every year while bridging the gap on student achievement.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Theresa Benson (benson.theresa@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	IReady Instruction will be utilized for our student population. IReady implementation will establish clear benchmarks for students and teachers. Analyzing this data immediately after diagnostic testing and throughout online instruction will allow teachers to make decisions to immediately differentiate their instruction and support each and every student.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The IReady System has been vetted and endorsed by Brevard County. This system allows us to analyze our data to understand our students better, plan instructional support, gauge progress toward goals, and improve instruction to meet students' diverse needs.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Instruction and Remediation from ESE teachers, Instructional Assistant and General Ed Teacher is inclusive. 2. Collaboratively analyze ESE students scores with Administration, gen ed teacher, ESE teacher & instructional coach. 3. Appropriately assign IReady instruction to meet the needs of learners for 45 minutes weekly in addition to small group instruction by support personnel and Gen. Ed Teacher 4. Assess program and learning periodically throughout the year. 5. Standardize testing (FSA) results in the Spring, 2020 will prove whether our plan was successful in meeting the needs of not only SWD, but all students.

Person Responsible Theresa Benson (benson.theresa@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)

Part V: Budget

1	III.A	Areas of Focus: Meet the needs of our ESE population.	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00