

Brevard Public Schools

University Park Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	19
Positive Culture & Environment	27
Budget to Support Goals	0

University Park Elementary School

500 W UNIVERSITY BLVD, Melbourne, FL 32901

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

Demographics

Principal: Ana Diaz

Start Date for this Principal: 6/15/2017

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)	<i>[Data Not Available]</i>
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 (43%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: D (38%) 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	[not available]
* 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 empower students with a love for learning in a safe and caring learning environment.

* Reviewed with staff during preplanning of August 2021

Provide the school's vision statement.

All students making a year's worth of learning gains in a year's worth of time.

* Reviewed with staff during preplanning of August 2021

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
Diaz, Ana	Principal	Design systems and structures that support our vision for excellent instruction for ALL students. Ensure that all stakeholders are involved in the decision making process and align resources to support the action plan. Lead evaluation of School Improvement Plan.
Shah, Sejal	Assistant Principal	<p>Assist the principal in developing and maintaining an effective educational program consistent with State and Federal guidelines and the philosophy, policies and goals of the School Board; meeting and conferring with students, parents, faculty and staff; maintaining records and files; preparing reports.</p> <p>Assist the principal in the overall administration of the school; interpret and enforce school and school division policies and regulations.</p> <p>Assist the principal in the transformation of the school culture into a results-oriented collaborative learning community.</p> <p>Support the principal in the collaborative development, implementation, and ongoing refinement of the school's Plan for Continuous Improvement.</p>
Enright, Amber	Reading Coach	<p>(0.5 Title 1) Guide teachers to collect and analyze data and develop action plans in response to determined student needs.</p> <p>Provide individualized, classroom-based support to implement comprehensive program. This will include modeling of best teaching practices.</p> <p>Oversee the school's assessment procedure, training, data collection and collaborate with the principal to complete reports due.</p> <p>Coordinates and facilitates various professional development opportunities for teachers at school and district level.</p>
Beard, Jessika	Instructional Coach	<p>(1.0 Title 1)</p> <p>Support implementation of School Improvement Plan with math coaching and math interventions.</p> <p>Support teachers with collaborative planning and implementation of Florida Standards with fidelity.</p> <p>Provides teachers support that will improve teaching and learning including teaching strategies, assessment of math skills, interpretation, and use of assessment results, etc.</p> <p>Provides information and guidance regarding a range of effective and innovative math practices through various activities such as: individual discussions (informal and formal), coaching sessions, demonstration lessons with pre- and post-discussion, study groups, staff meetings, and</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Shorts, Kristi	Teacher, K-12	<p>professional development. Models lessons to ensure that all teachers have been trained to an advanced level of delivery and are using the instructional materials as designed. Provides PD development to ensure that teachers are knowledgeable about program components and understand the instructional design of how the program meets the standard alignment. Assist in identifying appropriate instructional strategies and interventions to improve student achievement for all students.</p>
		<p>(.5 Title 1 and .5 GSP) Work with assigned classroom teachers and curriculum coaches to plan and deliver instruction to students identified as gifted and/or talented. Instruct all third through sixth grade students in the STEM Lab bi-weekly. Work with assigned classroom teachers and curriculum coaches to plan and deliver instruction to students identified as gifted. Work with classroom teachers to plan and deliver science instruction. Assess needs of individual students and use the data and information to determine a plan to best meet each child's individual needs.</p>
Small, Jackie	Guidance Counselor	<p>Social Emotional Learning Coach, helps and provides support for students' concerns about academic, emotional or social problems, helps students process their problems and plan goals and action, mediate conflict between students, improve parent/teacher relationships and organize peer counseling programs, refer students to psychologists and other mental health resources.</p>
Miller, Annie	Staffing Specialist	<p>(0.5 Title 1 and 0.5 ESE support specialist) Provide support to ESE students and teachers. Serve a liaison on ESE compliance. Gather data on students new to our school, organize and lead meetings to discuss students' placement, possible changes to IEP, academic and behavioral concerns. Collaborate on the design of an action plan for specific students in the MTSS process.</p>
Lavelle, Danielle	Other	Teacher on Assignment
		<p>Positive Behavior Support Coach, respond to discipline concerns and provide support to classroom teachers with classroom management. Initiate communication related to discipline concerns among staff. Collaborate on the design of an action plan for specific students in the MTSS process.</p>

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 6/15/2017, Ana Diaz

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

46

Total number of students enrolled at the school

467

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

6

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

9

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	65	60	57	43	42	48	59	0	0	0	0	0	0	374
Attendance below 90 percent	8	16	16	15	7	11	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	89
One or more suspensions	2	2	0	3	5	3	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA ELA	0	0	0	2	13	19	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	52
LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA MATH	0	0	0	2	19	25	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	74

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	5	15	23	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	68

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	3	7	4	2	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	1	1	1	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/31/2021

2020-21 - 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	62	53	48	44	47	57	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	359
Attendance below 90 percent	4	7	10	7	6	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
One or more suspensions	1	3	1	1	3	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	6	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	19	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

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	1	0	1	3	8	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

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	12	3	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

2020-21 - 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	62	53	48	44	47	57	48	0	0	0	0	0	0	359
Attendance below 90 percent	4	7	10	7	6	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
One or more suspensions	1	3	1	1	3	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	3	6	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	19	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	41

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	1	0	1	3	8	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

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	12	3	3	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	37%			41%	62%	57%	47%	60%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	44%			45%	60%	58%	57%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	25%			59%	57%	53%	32%	46%	48%
Math Achievement	26%			35%	63%	63%	44%	62%	62%
Math Learning Gains	35%			49%	65%	62%	50%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	20%			38%	53%	51%	38%	49%	47%
Science Achievement	35%			35%	57%	53%	32%	57%	55%

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
03	2021					
	2019	40%	64%	-24%	58%	-18%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	38%	61%	-23%	58%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				
05	2021					
	2019	36%	60%	-24%	56%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				
06	2021					
	2019	31%	60%	-29%	54%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	20%	61%	-41%	62%	-42%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	39%	64%	-25%	64%	-25%
Cohort Comparison		-20%				
05	2021					
	2019	37%	60%	-23%	60%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				
06	2021					
	2019	33%	67%	-34%	55%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	35%	56%	-21%	53%	-18%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

i-Ready for ELA and Math for Grades 1-6
 Science district assessment data for Grade 5

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	16	33	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	6	29	43
	Students With Disabilities	9	45	36
	English Language Learners	0	11	20
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13	17	35
	Economically Disadvantaged	9	20	35
	Students With Disabilities	18	27	27
	English Language Learners	0	0	20
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	17	36	35
	Economically Disadvantaged	17	30	30
	Students With Disabilities	0	7	7
	English Language Learners	50	50	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	5	11	18
	Economically Disadvantaged	6	10	21
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	7
	English Language Learners	50	50	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	21	29	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	19	28	40
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	0	22
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	5	12	35
	Economically Disadvantaged	3	10	35
	Students With Disabilities	9	18	8
	English Language Learners	0	0	11
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	20	27	35
	Economically Disadvantaged	22	24	37
	Students With Disabilities	13	13	25
	English Language Learners	0	33	17
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	5	28	33
	Economically Disadvantaged	6	28	39
	Students With Disabilities	13	13	25
	English Language Learners	0	33	33

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	30	28	35
	Economically Disadvantaged	27	27	35
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	20	10
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13	33	35
	Economically Disadvantaged	10	35	33
	Students With Disabilities	0	11	22
	English Language Learners	0	10	10
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	0	N/A	35
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	N/A	28
	Students With Disabilities	0	N/A	8
	English Language Learners	0	N/A	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	33	25	27
	Economically Disadvantaged	32	24	29
	Students With Disabilities	7	13	14
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	11	23	23
	Economically Disadvantaged	10	21	26
	Students With Disabilities	7	7	7
	English Language Learners	0	17	17
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Subgroup Data Review

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	18	30	21	6	18	18	17				
ELL	34	57		38	31						
BLK	19	27	25	19	24	10	7				
HSP	37			21							
MUL	45			36							
WHT	48	56		31	36		48				
FRL	34	37	24	23	31	18	33				
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	12	27	37	21	37	33	14				
ELL	32	48		32	57						
BLK	25	45	69	21	42	37	19				
HSP	29	38		25	38						
MUL	44	54		25	46						
WHT	52	42	50	48	56	20	58				
FRL	38	44	60	33	49	39	30				
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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	12	20	14	17	24	15					
ELL	30	54	43	40	46	30					
BLK	30	40	28	29	47	43	20				
HSP	29	47		24	40						
MUL	47	76		50	56						
WHT	62	67	27	56	53	31	42				
FRL	43	54	33	40	48	37	31				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	[not available]
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	34
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	48
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	270

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	18
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	42
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	19
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	29
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	41
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

Native American Students	
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	47
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	29
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

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?

In looking at data from the 2021 FSA, the greatest concern for University Park Elementary is the increased number of students below grade level. The percentage of students who scored Level 1 on ELA FSA is 52% and an alarming 74% of students scored Level 1 in Math FSA. When we compare the iReady Diagnostic 1 to Diagnostic 3 for the 2020-2021 school year, the overall Tier I increased by 15% in ELA and by 21% in math. The progress monitoring data serves as evidence of the improvement made within the school year. Students who were identified as in need of intervention increased from 25% to 43% in 2019-2020 school year and from 43% to 63% in the 2020-2021 school year. The greatest gap in student achievement between district and school i-Ready scores is evident in the overall ELA scores. Results for i-Ready ELA Diagnostic 1 show the district at 40% proficient, whereas University Park is at 22% proficient. This shows a gap of 18% points, where the math gap is 14%. Only 25% of the bottom quartile made gains in the area of ELA in the 2020-2021 FSA, that is down from 59% the previous year. FSA Science remained the same for the 2021 school year at 35%. Students with disabilities demonstrate less success than their peers in every grade level and in every content area. African American students are the second lowest subgroup with 25% ELA proficiency and the lowest in Math, with 21% proficiency.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Schoolwide, the overall i-Ready math scores for on-grade-level students declined from 16% proficiency on Diagnostic 2 of the 2019-2020 school year to 9% proficiency on Diagnostic 1 at the

start of the 2020/21 school year. Students who were considered at risk for Tier-3 increased from 25% to 43%. The data show that students in 6th and 1st grade in math have the greatest percentage decline in math proficiency. In 6th grade, there was a decrease in Tier 1 students from 33% proficiency on Diagnostic 2 of the 2019-2020 school year to 13% proficiency on Diagnostic 1 of this school year, as well as an increase in at-risk for Tier 3 from 22% to 66%. In 1st grade, there was a decrease in Tier 1 students from 30% proficiency on Diagnostic 2 of the 2019-2020 school year to 11% proficiency on Diagnostic 1 of this school year, as well as an increase in at-risk for Tier 3 from 0% to 18%. Students with disabilities demonstrated less success than their peers in every grade level and in every content area.

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

The loss of face-to-face instruction in the last nine weeks of the 2019/20 school year, coupled with a decrease in consistent Tier 1 face to face instruction due to COVID-19, has had a negative effect on student proficiency for students. Many factors impacted quality learning the past year and a half and the supports offered were not accessed by the students who needed these supports the most. Virtual support, eLearning, Saturday school, after school and summer school were all offered, but not consistently accessed. This school year has a more traditional on campus learning environment, as well as an extended school day that will help to address the needs of our students and recover the learning loss. With students returning to campus, it will allow the staff the opportunity to address the learning needs of students while utilizing remediation and acceleration strategies during whole group and small group instruction. Professional development, coaching cycle, collaborative planning, progress monitoring, tutoring, observation and feedback are all strategies that we will continue to strengthen and target with precision. Two additional interventionists will be working with our Tier 3 and 2 students in a Response to Intervention model for ELA. An additional ESE teacher will allow us to more effectively provide an inclusion model of instruction for our students with disability. Additionally, many of our students' attendance decreased and this had a negative impact on learning. A strategy for stronger monitoring of attendance and encouragement for students to show up every day is required.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

While overall, University Park did not improve in a specific content area, when analyzing FSA data for ELA, Math, and Science there were some grade levels and classes within a grade level that did show growth. In math, 3rd grade improved from 20% in 18-19 to 21% in 20-21. In ELA, 5th grade improved from 36% to 39% and 6th grade improved from 31% to 35% proficiency. In science, proficiency remained the steady at 35% proficiency. In a time when most of our scores dropped, Science maintained.

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

In Science we focused on using pre-assessments to determine group review and reteach. We provided Saturday School for Science and monitored progress. It is very evident that teachers who engaged in the coaching cycle and responded well to feedback in both Math and ELA, had the highest percentage of achievement within their grade levels. In addition, in classrooms where small group instruction was more consistent, there was greater improvement in both ELA and math. Data monitoring and adjusting support based on data also helped students improve.

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

1. An additional hour of instruction to ensure all have access to Response to Intervention and acceleration

2. Carefully planned scaffolding strategies during small group instruction
3. Implementation of new ELA Curriculum and collaborative planning to support its implementation fidelity
4. Observations with feedback frequent and often
5. Analysis of student work samples-horizontal and vertical
6. Goal setting with teachers and students in grades 3-6
7. Response to Intervention with two additional interventionists
8. Data monitoring to include subgroups

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.

During the month of July, most teachers participated in training on the new ELA curriculum and standards. Teachers also participated in a two day training on conscious discipline. During preplanning, teachers received information on the status of our school's achievement data, as well and survey data from parents, students and teachers. They were provided an opportunity to plan alongside coaches and were trained on Positive Behavior Support System. Teachers also had an opportunity to become more aware of the history of the county so that they could better understand the community they serve by visiting the Moore Center and learning about local Black history. This year, training has been planned on how to use iReady diagnostic results to plan small group instruction, acceleration, student voice, and small group instruction. In addition, professional development will be embedded into the weekly Strategy Action Meetings (SAMs) and weekly and quarterly planning sessions. Teachers will also receive professional development on providing accommodations for students with disabilities during assessments. Student work samples will be analyzed by teams every five (5) weeks in order to build teacher capacity on monitoring and pushing for proficiency. Individualized support will be provided through the coaching cycle model for new teachers and teachers who are identified as needing additional support in lesson delivery or classroom management. Teachers will identify subgroups early and will monitor progress closely. The Bottom Quartile, Students With Disabilities and Black students are our subgroups of focus.

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

The plan in place for this school year will be in place for two consecutive years. Title I and ASP funds will be utilized to supplement the strategies that must still continue to be employed. The goal is to provide acceleration and intervention at higher levels and lower the number of students. Procedures and process will be in place so that they become part of the school culture and follow through would occur in the absence of the current support. Support for all classroom teachers is provided not just through PD, but also through observation and feedback, coaching cycle, facilitators for each grade level planning structure and district resource support request when needed. Schedules support instruction that has time embedded for Rtl, and small group acceleration during both ELA and math. Students' ability to set goals and create a plan for self-improvement continues to grow. Teachers and students work in a culture where a growth mindset is encouraged and modeled.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Facing the reality that all areas of FSA achievement are below 50% and below the district and state, our area of focus at University Park is to improve standards aligned instructional practices in math, ELA and science. In order for us to realize our vision to see every student make at least a year's worth of learning in a year's worth of time, we will need to see 100% of our students making learning gains and 80% of our students meeting grade level proficiency.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

In ELA, grades K-6 are implementing a new curriculum as well as teaching new B.E.S.T standards this year. Teacher training and classroom monitoring are essential to ensure instruction is meeting new standard requirements. In order for us to realize our vision, we will work together to implement accelerated learning strategies with our students which align with current standards. To ensure that the learning loss experienced during distance learning is eliminated, we have also added an additional hour of instruction to the school day, which will focus on response to intervention. Additionally, this year's i-Ready Diagnostic 1 data shows that 16% of students are proficient in ELA.

Math proficiency has continued to be a struggle for the past several years. 2021 FSA math data show that we continue to be below state (52%) and district (56%) proficiency with a school average of 26%. Additionally, this year's i-Ready Diagnostic 1 data show that 9% of students are proficient in math.

In 2021, science proficiency was at 35%. This was the same as our proficiency in 2019. However it was below the district (52%) and the state (47%).

Measureable Outcome:

By focusing on standards aligned instruction, student FSA achievement levels will increase to at least 42% in all subject areas for grades 3-6. Math from 26% to 42%, ELA from 33% to 42% and science from 35% to 42% proficiency. In math, student achievement on the i-Ready End of Year diagnostic assessment will increase 9% proficiency to 42% proficiency. In ELA, student achievement on the i-Ready EOY diagnostic assessment will increase 16% to 42% .

Monitoring:

The area of focus will be monitored through i-Ready diagnostics (BOY, MOY, EOY) and Standards Mastery. Classroom walk throughs and student work sample analysis will also be used to monitor ELA and Math progress. PENDA and district's pre-post assessments for Science will be utilized to monitor science progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sejal Shah (shah.sejal@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Teachers will incorporate student discourse and discussion in all subject areas. Targeted small group instruction to reteach foundational skills needed to master grade level content. Assessment driven instruction using summative and formative data to plan instruction and hands-on learning across multiple subject areas. Data chats / goal setting: Before and after major assessments teachers will complete data chats and goal setting with students for grades 4 to 6. Teachers will incorporate standard-based accelerated learning strategies into whole and small-group instruction. Frequent walk-throughs by Admin and coaches will be followed by debrief sessions to

determine trends, future PD and identify coaching cycle focus.
 Admin, coaches and teachers will engage in analyzing student work samples. This process will ensure a collective vision of what mastery of the standard looks like.
 Sub-group data will be monitored for bottom quartile, ESE and African American in ELA and Math.
 A parent liaison will be hired to focus on improving student attendance which in turn will improve ELA and Math achievement.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Increasing effectiveness of standards-aligned instruction will help improve student proficiency. Teachers need to use student assessment data to drive instruction in all subject areas. Teachers need to provide rigorous instruction and culminating tasks to reach the full intent of the standard. When teachers use student data to purposefully plan for targeted small group instruction, it will allow more students to master grade level content. Standard-based accelerated learning strategies taught during whole and small group instruction will decrease learning gaps and allow students to be successful with grade level content. Giving students voice through data chats and goal setting in all subject areas will enhance understanding of grade level expectations. Providing students the opportunity to participate in discourse and discussion is necessary to ensure students are reaching the full intent of grade level standards.

Action Steps to Implement

Academic Family Engagement events to communicate grade level standards and expectations will be provided. (T)
 School Calendar (T) will provide a list of school wide events.

Person Responsible Kristi Shorts (shorts.kristin@brevardschools.org)

Students in grades 3-5 will engage in pre and post district science assessments. Teachers will use data from these assessments to reteach necessary skills in the lab and through Super Science Saturday. (T)

Person Responsible Kristi Shorts (shorts.kristin@brevardschools.org)

Students in grades 3-6 will attend a STEM Lab course bi-weekly. Students will engage in critical thinking and hands on learning. (T)

Person Responsible Kristi Shorts (shorts.kristin@brevardschools.org)

Teachers will ensure that students in grades 3-6 will engage in the use of an online science program, PENDA, while students in grades K-2 will supplement with Mystery Science to build student background. Student usage data and passing rate will be monitored weekly with an opportunity to earn incentives.

Person Responsible Kristi Shorts (shorts.kristin@brevardschools.org)

Teachers will collaboratively plan with grade levels weekly and quarterly with Subs provided (T) led by instructional coaches and with the support of facilitators. Collaborative planning will ensure that opportunities for student discourse, scaffolding, and acceleration strategies are incorporated into lesson plans and include checks for understanding. Brevard County Benchmark Advance/Savvas Units and Eureka Pacing Guides will be used to guide planning. (T)

Person Responsible Amber Enright (enright.amber@brevardschools.org)

Teachers will collaborate with grade levels to plan small group instruction based on student data analysis and teacher observations. I-Ready Standards Mastery assessments and teacher-assigned lessons (LAFS and MAFS) will be used and analyzed to determine skills for reteaching and/or determining acceleration strategies. (T)

Person Responsible Amber Enright (enright.amber@brevardschools.org)

Teachers will analyze student tasks and provide feedback to ensure rigorous standards-aligned instruction twice per semester led by instructional coaches and administration. (T)

Person Responsible Jessika Beard (beard.jessika@brevardschools.org)

Instructional coaches will model for and coach teachers to continuously improve the delivery of standards-aligned instruction during whole group and small group through use of the coaching cycle. (T)

Person Responsible Jessika Beard (beard.jessika@brevardschools.org)

Teachers will engage in professional development on standards-aligned instruction and how to utilize student data to make instructional decisions. (T)

Person Responsible Amber Enright (enright.amber@brevardschools.org)

Teachers will receive and reflect on feedback provided by administration and instructional coaches. Observation and feedback will focus on rigorous standards-aligned instruction, scaffolding and acceleration strategies, and student engagement to support student success. (T)

Person Responsible Sejal Shah (shah.sejal@brevardschools.org)

Teachers will monitor i-Ready usage and passage rate (75% and higher) every week to ensure that all students have 30 minutes of i-Ready usage minutes in ELA and math. Recognition for both teachers and students who show increase consistency in both participation and increased improvement will be in place. (T)

Computers will be purchased for Grades 1 and Grade 2 using Title I to increase student achievement (T)

Person Responsible Amber Enright (enright.amber@brevardschools.org)

Build teacher capacity on student discourse and student engagement. Provide professional development using the book Making Thinking Visible, building upon a book study selected teachers completed last summer. (T)

Person Responsible Jessika Beard (beard.jessika@brevardschools.org)

Grade 6 will utilize Eureka Math. Math books will be purchased (T) along with student engagement materials such as Post Its, White boards, etc. (T)

Person Responsible Jessika Beard (beard.jessika@brevardschools.org)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Enhance and maintain Social Emotional supports for all students. The 2020-2021 school year showed a decrease in discipline referrals. This is attributed to the Trauma Informed Care training all teachers participated in as well as Conscious Discipline and other Social Emotional Supports.

Measureable Outcome: During the 2020-2021 school year, the goal was that the percentage of referrals in the areas of disruptive behavior, willful disobedience and physical aggression would be 10% lower than previous year, dropping from 86% to 76%. The percentage of referrals in these areas was 57%.

During the 2021-2022 school year, the percentage of these behaviors will decrease by 5%, going from 57% to 52%.

Monitoring: Student discipline referral information is put into Rtl: B. The PBIS team reviews this data on a monthly basis. During Social Emotional Learning Strategy Action Meetings, the data are shared with teachers. After analyzing the data, the Leadership Team meets to determining what actions need to be taken to reach the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Danielle Lavelle (lavelle.danielle@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Several evidence-based strategies are being implemented this year. Tier 1 consists of PBIS, Conscious Discipline, Sanford Harmony and Zones of Regulation, SNAP(Stop now and plan) in Kindergarten for 13 weeks and Mindfulness lessons. Tier 2 consists of Restorative Practices, Coping Skills and self-regulation groups and the Check in-Check out intervention. Tier 3 includes Behavior Intervention Plans and Check and Connect. Other supports include Eckerd Connects, St. Francis Grief Group and Pretty Brown Girls.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports drives the behavior and social emotional school wide program. Due to our students' social emotional needs and personal traumas, other systems and programs are implemented to build a stronger foundation for the students.

Action Steps to Implement

Continuing processes that will provide a trusting and safe environment for all students through a trauma informed approach:

- a). Check-in/Check-out processes for students
- b). Mindfulness Strategies
- c). Safe Space in every classroom
- d). Counselor, Social Worker, Teacher on Assignment and Eckerd Preventions will facilitate small groups targeting social emotional concerns

Person Responsible Jackie Small (small.jacqueline@brevardschools.org)

Support 4th year implementation of Sanford Harmony:

- a). Teachers will receive training support
- b). Morning meeting will be facilitated by a leadership team member during the first 2 weeks each semester
- c). Exemplar groups will be videotaped for training use to support teachers reluctant to implement and new teachers.

Person Responsible Danielle Lavelle (lavelle.danielle@brevardschools.org)

Provide new professional development:

- a). Zones of Regulation training for all school employees:
 - 1). Trainers presented during Pre-Planning to the whole staff
 - 2). Resources provided and available at teacher request
 - 3). Select staff participated in 2 day training
- b). Conscious Discipline training available for all teachers during extra pre-planning.

Person Responsible Jackie Small (small.jacqueline@brevardschools.org)

Provide training to new staff and refresher to those who need it:

- a). CPI Training to focus on de-escalation strategies
- b). First Aid Mental Health training

Person Responsible Sejal Shah (shah.sejal@brevardschools.org)

Provide a Title I/Eckerd Parent Night for Social/Emotional Development with a focus on: (T)

- a). Bully Identification and Prevention
- b). Substance Abuse
- c). Mental Health
- d). Self Regulating Strategies

Person Responsible Julie Grace (grace.julie@brevardschools.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: SY 20-21 FSA ELA data show 33% of students performing at proficiency (3+) compared to the state average 53% and district average 59%. 67% of students are below proficiency level.
 SY 20-21 EOY i-Ready Diagnostic show 83% of the students are below proficiency level for Grade K - 3.

Measureable Outcome: ELA proficiency will increase as measured by FSA ELA assessments from 33% to 42% for grades 3-6 and 17% to 42% for grades K-2.

Monitoring: Ongoing monitoring through the following measures will be in place:
 i-Ready Diagnostic Growth - 3X per year in Reading
 i-Ready Standards Mastery Assessment in Reading grades 3rd - 6th (2 assessments per 9 weeks)
 Benchmark Advance/Savvas Unit assessment data

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Amber Enright (enright.amber@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy: Overall Tier I ELA performance will improve through implementation of the following strategies:
 Small group instruction.
 Acceleration strategies.
 Intervention provided during an hour RTI block for all grades K-6

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Research shows that in order to accelerate struggling readers, providing guided reading through small groups, will allow for students to successfully learn to read. This model will drive:
 1. The need to differentiate instruction; 2. The need to provide equitable access to high-quality instruction for all students and reduce the stigma of being a struggling reader; 3. The desire to shift teacher focus from student progress to student proficiency; 4. The need for acceleration of below-level readers; and 5. The desire to follow a gradual release model of instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

i-Ready progress monitoring training for all teachers will be provided in October and January.

Person Responsible Amber Enright (enright.amber@brevardschools.org)

i-Ready Diagnostic 3 times per year with follow up data review. An on-going progress monitoring plan for interventions will be created to document growth.

Person Responsible Amber Enright (enright.amber@brevardschools.org)

i-Ready Standards Mastery assessments in grades 3rd-6th (2 assessments per 9 weeks).

Person Responsible Amber Enright (enright.amber@brevardschools.org)

Small group instruction based on data to provide acceleration.

Person Responsible Amber Enright (enright.amber@brevardschools.org)

Daily additional intervention for students not on grade level.

Person Responsible Amber Enright (enright.amber@brevardschools.org)

District required Benchmark Unit assessment will be used for data analysis.

Person Responsible Amber Enright (enright.amber@brevardschools.org)

Student trained to do productive struggle and do the thinking using Brevard's Vision for Excellent Instruction where teachers will provide lessons that are consistently focused on complex content that appropriately challenges students to meet the subject and/or grade level standards. Students are supported to engage fully in the work of the lesson and to be responsible for doing the thinking that the lesson demands.

Person Responsible Amber Enright (enright.amber@brevardschools.org)

Please refer back to the ELA action items within the "Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction Area of Focus" to include collaborative planning, small group instruction, Standards Mastery, acceleration strategies, student task analysis, instructional coaching, PD focusing on standards alignment and using data to make instructional decisions, observations and feedback, i-Ready usage and monitoring, and student discourse and engagement

Person Responsible Sejal Shah (shah.sejal@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

In 2019-2020 University Park Elementary reported 3.3 incidents per 100 students. This rate is greater than the Statewide elementary school rate of 1.0 incidents per 100 students. Within the Violent Incident category, our primary area of concern is bullying and our secondary area of concern is harassment. School culture and environment is part of our focus goal on the SIP, under social-emotional learning. To monitor progress of our implementation plan the Observed Student Behavior form will be utilized and analyzed. Strategy Action Meetings will provide opportunities for data analysis and action steps. The SEL strategies detailed in this plan clearly define action steps already in place.

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.

University Park Elementary is the recipient of the 2020-2021 Model School Resiliency Award. This award honors and celebrates schools who have effectively implemented PBIS and are making progress in improving student outcomes. In addition, we have developed processes to support student learning and build teacher capacity that have created a safe place for learning.

Students at University Park Elementary were surveyed in January 2021 about their perceptions of their school in terms of Engagement, Academic Challenge, Relationships, Culture, and Instructional Methods. In addition, students provided feedback about School Safety and Distance Learning. In order to put student feedback into context, the Youth Survey report compares University Park Elementary students' ratings to the ratings from students at 624 other elementary schools across the country. Compared to other participating elementary schools, University Park Elementary's highest rated themes were: Culture and Engagement. While the lowest rated themes were: Academic Challenge and Belonging. Compared to other participating elementary schools, University Park Elementary's highest rated question within the key themes was school culture. Students feel the other students behave well and that their teachers care about them. Under the lowest rated theme, we noticed that they believe that teachers do not let them explain their ideas. The teachers agree with the students, as the results of the Insight Survey indicate that 67% (7% less than in the past year) believe that at our school there are not many opportunities for students to have academic discussions.

The overall cultural index on Insight survey was 8.4, although a healthy cultural index, it is down from 9.7 the previous year.

These responses correlate with the feedback provided by administrators and coaches during instructional walk throughs. There is a need for teachers to carefully craft their questions to ensure scaffolding and concept development through student discourse.

The parent survey was very positive with 95.39% of families indicating that they feel welcome at the school. However, about 78% of families responded that they want more information and encouragement from the school how to be more engaged with their student's education.

These survey confirm our focus on building stronger relationships with families and working on engaging our families on how they can support and encourage their students.

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

University Park Elementary has built a network of support that has helped create and maintain a positive school environment that is focused on learning. Our Partners In Education provide support for or school improvement focus. This year, the school will have a STEM lab opened to all students and providing

lessons to 3rd to 6th graders through the activity wheel every other week. This is possible in large part to our partnership with Northen Grumman and Eckerd. Eckerd is also supporting staff development in the areas of Social Emotional Learning, lessons and support for students in SEL through programs and a Prevention Specialist who provides instruction and supports to our students in grades 3-6. Several churches have partnered with our school and provide support by mentoring families, students and staff. The school is also very engaged with the South Brevard NAACP. The members serve on our School Advisory Council, as mentors to students, Science Fair judges, classroom volunteers and share critical information with families on how to be more engaged with the schools.