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Rachel M. Roberts
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### School Grade History

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2016-17:</th>
<th>2015-16:</th>
<th>2014-15:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Connections to District Strategic Plan

- Obj.L1. Protect instructional time
- Obj.L2. Support educator effectiveness and build capacity of teachers to improve student outcomes and close achievement gaps
- Obj.L4: Provide equitable support for every student’s social-emotional development
- Obj.L6. Build principal capacity to develop and spread highly effective instructional practices
- Obj.R3 Increase system-wide proactive communications

### Mission Statement:
To teach students to think, problem solve and be productive members of society.

### Vision Statement:
Columbia’s vision is to provide a safe and stable environment that will enable all students to thrive intellectually, physically, and emotionally. We strive to provide an atmosphere that will help mold students to become well rounded citizens who encompass pride and respect for themselves and for their community.
Stakeholder Involvement in School Improvement Planning:
Briefly explain how stakeholders are involved in the development, review, and communication of the SIP.

In the summer of 2017, administration and a team of teacher leaders met to review the school’s performance data. The team looked at a variety of indicators, including behavior data, attendance data, student achievement on state and local tests as well as student, staff and parent survey data.

Then, during preplanning, the teaching staff took a deep dive into the data and analyzed the root causes/barriers and possible solutions to the identified trouble areas for Columbia.

Columbia’s School Advisory Council committee provided their insights during a meeting in late summer. These three activities led to the initial draft and subsequent improvement plan.

Columbia’s faculty, staff and community provided input on this school improvement plan during our Title I Open House and at our Fall Curriculum night.

Brevard Public Schools
School Improvement Plan
2017-2018

Part 1: Planning for Student Achievement

RATIONALE – Continuous Improvement Cycle Process

Data Analysis from multiple data sources: Please consider the priority indicators selected from your school BPIE and EDI Insight Survey results within the rationale of your SIP.

What are the areas of successful professional practices and what data shows evidence of improvements?

Over the past few years, Columbia Elementary has had various school improvement foci, including an emphasis on mathematical learning and the use of learning scales. For the 2016-17 school year, the goal was for teachers to deliver rigorous, standards-based instruction while using data to target the learning needs of students.

As part of the school improvement process, Columbia’s faculty worked to implement data meetings in 2016-17. The purpose of the meetings was to review student progress using a variety of data points. These data meetings utilized a common spreadsheet to record district assessment data. During the meetings, administration and faculty worked collaboratively to analyze student data. This practice may have contributed to the following learning gains:
As the graph depicts, Columbia Elementary’s learning gains for the lowest quartile (lowest 25%) students were just slightly above the state average. The combination of ELA learning gains and the school’s overall ELA proficiency was equal to 90 points, which was just a few points higher than the threshold for Lowest 300 designation.

In addition to the increase in student learning gains, Columbia also saw an increase in two dimensions of school climate. According to the yearly INSIGHT survey (given by BPS to gauge the school’s climate) results from the instructional staff determined the following areas of strength for Columbia:

1. Teacher Workload
2. Fair Evaluations

However, the overall index percentile rank was 20% (meaning that 80% of BPS Schools Rank Higher than Columbia).

**What are the concerns with professional practices and what data shows evidence of opportunities for growth?**

Based on the INSIGHT survey data, along with direct feedback from open-ended prompts on the survey, along with a site analysis conducted by the elementary director, teachers at Columbia viewed Learning Environment, Leadership and Peer Culture as some of the weakest areas of school operations and the school climate. The list below is ranked from the weakest to the least weak in terms of teacher impressions of school operations and climate:
The impression of school operations and climate may have an impact on instruction and student achievement. The INSIGHT survey reported that teachers did not feel that the school ran smoothly and that there were not consistent consequences for student behaviors.

Additionally, while the previous school improvement plans included goals for standards-based instruction and a focus on learning scales, student achievement data has not been increasing in a strategic and consistent manner. The school grade has remained a “C” since 2013 and proficiency in ELA, Math and Science has not improved significantly.

### 2016-17 FSA Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ELA</th>
<th>Math</th>
<th>Science</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Proficiency</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Gains</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Gains for Lowest 25%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COLUMBIA SCHOOL GRADE HISTORY 2007-2017**

- 2007: A
- 2008: A
- 2009: A
- 2010: A
- 2011: A
- 2012: B
- 2013: C
- 2014: C
- 2015: C
- 2016: C
- 2017: C
What does the student achievement data indicate?

As described above, the school’s achievement rate has been stagnated. While the school grade has remained a “C”, the school has fluctuated in its learning gains for both reading and mathematics. This does not show a positive trend in either areas of mathematics or reading gains.

Our school’s math performance has remained the same for both overall proficiency as well as in learning gains for the lowest quartile students. As depicted above, there was a decrease in overall learning gains from 2015-16 to 2016-17. This may be attributed to a change in focus on the school improvement plan, as the 2015-16 school year focused on the use of mathematical scales in learning.
### Strand Breakdown Average Out of Points Possible

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Operations, Alg. Thinking/NBT</th>
<th>Number/Operations Fractions</th>
<th>Measurement Geometry and Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>18/26</td>
<td>5/9</td>
<td>11/20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5/11</td>
<td>6/11</td>
<td>9/14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>10/23</td>
<td>5/15</td>
<td>7/20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>Expressions</th>
<th>Geometry</th>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Number System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5/8</td>
<td>8/18</td>
<td>2/8</td>
<td>6/10</td>
<td>5/12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, Columbia’s students struggle with *Measurement/Geometry and Data, Number and Operations and the Number System*. This shows that overall mathematical understanding of the number system/base ten and spatial reasoning across all grade levels is well below the expected proficiency levels.

As the team analyzed Columbia’s performance on the FSA ELA assessment, it was clear that learning gains for the lowest quartile and overall learning gains increased between 2015-16 and 2016-17.
As the graph shows, overall proficiency remained relatively the same, however, Columbia did see an increase in learning gains. This is most likely the determining factor for the school maintaining its school grade and not falling into the lowest 300 performing schools category.

The team looked closely at the performance of specific subgroups, including special education (ESE), minority and English Language Learners (ELL). The data shows that performance for these subgroups is below that of non-minority students. The table below shows the performance levels on FSA ELA and FSA Mathematics by subgroup category.

**FSA PASSING RATE by SUBGROUP**  
**2016-17 SY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroup</th>
<th>FSA Reading</th>
<th>Math</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Is.</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi Racial</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exceptional Student Ed.</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ELL</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Beyond the achievement rate gaps (as noted above) the team analyzed the school’s performance on the specific strands of standards to better understand instructional trends. A breakdown by strand is included below:

**FSA ELA 2016-17 Strand Breakdown**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>Key Ideas and Details</th>
<th>Craft and Structure</th>
<th>Integration of Knowledge</th>
<th>Language and Editing</th>
<th>Writing</th>
<th>Overall</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analysis of the individual strands and grade level breakdown from the FSA ELA assessment shows that the weakest area schoolwide was in Integration of Knowledge and Ideas and Key Ideas/Details. This is a highly skilled strand which requires student to use their inferential skills along with their appropriate use of textual evidence. The strongest performance across all grade levels was in Language and Editing. This is a lower level skill, including the understanding of grammar as well as decoding. Furthermore, when the schoolwide I-Station End of Year data was analyzed, text fluency was the weakest skill area. On the chart below, the percentage of students for rising grade levels in terms of RTI placement in Tier III is depicted.
This graph shows that our Rising grades all struggle with text fluency, however, our rising fourth grade students show the most difficulty with 54% of students meeting criteria for INTENSIVE instruction in text fluency.

Finally, the science achievement rate has stagnated over the last two years, with Columbia’s students demonstrating around 30 percent proficiency on the state assessment. This may imply that students struggle with mastering the Bodies of Knowledge (BOKs) for Next Generation Sunshine State Standards, as well as overall reading skills as explored above.

Write a 2-3 sentence summary explaining how the data above provides the rationale for your goals, barriers and action steps.

As the data above demonstrates, the students at Columbia Elementary have struggled to achieve school-wide proficiency in all areas assessed by the state. This may be contributed to core instruction focused on surface level teaching of the standards and an over-reliance on curricular resources rather than a standards mastery approach. The data also shows that ESE and ELL students are not performing anywhere close to their peers. In BPIE, under the Domain of Communication and Collaboration indicator 28 addresses collaborative planning. The subgroup data for ESE and ELL displays the need for this to be addressed.

Describe how your school ensures standards-aligned instruction is occurring in ELA, math and content areas. Describe the processes in place to progress monitor instruction to ensure it is systematic, explicit and based on data. (Please limit to 250 words.)

Starting in 2017-18, standards-aligned core instruction will be closely monitored by administration. This will occur in several ways, starting with the Professional Learning Community process of shared planning, as well as by implementing common formative assessments to determine standards mastery and areas for re-teach.
School-Based Goal: What can be done to improve instructional effectiveness?

If Columbia elementary teachers focus on high-quality, standards-aligned core instruction for both reading and mathematics, with an emphasis on student mastery, then overall student proficiency will increase.

Strategies: Small number of action oriented staff performance objectives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barrier</th>
<th>Action Steps to Overcome Barrier</th>
<th>Person Responsible</th>
<th>Timetable</th>
<th>In-Process Measure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Common Understanding of the Depth of Standards | 1. Create a dedicated PLC schedule through master scheduling that will allow uninterrupted teacher PLCs for 90 minutes each week (grades 3-6)  
2. Work with PLC consultant to put into place a highly effective collaborative planning process that includes unpacking of the standards and development of standards-aligned instruction | Administration and PLC Consultant           | August 2017 to May 2018           | Sign-in Sheets from PLC, Lesson Plan Review, Unpacking Standard Form |
<p>| Lack of Knowledge in Utilization of Test Design and Item Specs to map out focus standards | During preplanning, teachers will utilize test item specs/design blueprint along with District Focus Maps to create a year-long standards map | Administration, Literacy Coach, PLC Consultant | August 2017                        | Finalized Standards Maps                    |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Responsible Parties</th>
<th>Timeframe</th>
<th>Evidence of usage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consistency in Communication of Standards to Student with Fidelity</td>
<td>As a means to help students understand the learning goal and objective, teachers will utilize a common board configuration for core subjects</td>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>August 2017-May 2018</td>
<td>Evidence of usage of Common Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent Common Planning for Teachers to Formulate Standards-Aligned Instruction</td>
<td>Teachers will develop clear, concise and logical lessons utilizing the gradual release model</td>
<td>Teachers, Literacy Coach</td>
<td>August 2017-May 2018</td>
<td>Walk thru feedback, Lesson Plans, Student Performance on Progress Monitoring Assessments (Common Formative) and on District Assessments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent Progress Monitoring of Standards Mastery</td>
<td>Utilizing common formative assessments in paced intervals during the school year (given every 5-7 weeks) to assess student mastery of standards</td>
<td>Title I Teacher, Literacy Coach, Teachers</td>
<td>September 2017-April 2018</td>
<td>Results from Common Formative Assessments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Lacking Knowledge of Data Analysis Relating to Student Mastery        | 1. Use of a “data dashboard” by admin to closely monitor student progress  
2. Teachers will use a data spreadsheet to monitor student mastery of standards  
3. Teachers will analyze student test items to determine strengths and weaknesses | Administration, Teachers, Title I Teachers, Literacy Coach and PLC Consultant | September 2017-April 2018 | Teacher Spreadsheets, Reteach Plans, MTSS Groupings    |
EVALUATION – Outcome Measures and Reflection—begin with the end in mind.

Qualitative and Quantitative Professional Practice Outcomes: Measures the level of implementation of professional practices throughout your school.

The 2016-17 EDI Survey, the overall index percentile rank was 20%. With the actions steps listed above being implemented, the overall percentile rank of the EDI INSIGHT survey will increase by 10%. As a result of standards-aligned mastery focus, the teachers at Columbia will see an increase in Dimensions II of the IPPAS. In 2016-17, 86% of teachers performed as proficient or higher. This will increase to 90%.

With the implementation of the Standards Focus Maps and PLC’s, teachers will be implementing standards based instruction with more rigor. This will be observed through classroom walk-throughs.

Qualitative and Quantitative Student Achievement Outcomes:

As a result of standards-aligned mastery focus for core subjects, Columbia expects the following results on the Florida State Assessment results:

- English Language Arts proficiency will increase by 5%, from 37% to 42%.
- Mathematics proficiency will increase by 5% from 36% to 41%.

Through the implementation of the common boards, students will be able to identify and communicate what they are expected to learn in the classroom. This will be observed through conversations with students during classroom walk-throughs.
Part 2: Support Systems for Student Achievement

(Federal, State, and District Mandates)

For the following areas, please write a brief narrative that includes the data from the year 2016-17 and a description of changes you intend to incorporate to improve the data for the year 2017-18.
MTSS & EARLY WARNING SYSTEMS  Please complete 1 – 4.

1. Describe your school’s data-based problem-solving process and school-based structures in place to address MTSS implementation.

In 2016-17, Columbia implemented a data team approach to MTSS. Columbia will continue to build on this practice by holding monthly MTSS meetings for individual problem solving. Additionally, the school will utilize the PLC process to review student standards mastery based on common formative assessments.

Tier I, and Tier II supports will be provided by the classroom teachers. Tier III interventions will be provided by our Title I teachers as well as a certified tutor who is funded with ASP monies. Research-based programs such as Barton, Sunday Reading and Fountas and Pinnell’s Leveled Literacy Intervention (LLI) will be used for our Tier III students. Tier II students will use i-Ready independently and in small groups with their teacher, focused on targeted skills.

Faculty will be supported by the MTSS coordinator, school guidance counselor, ESE support specialist, administration and the PLC consultant. Multiple data points will be utilized and include; i-Ready performance, classroom performance, and student mastery levels from common formative and district assessments.

Teachers will continue to be responsible for the classroom level spreadsheet where they will house data from all areas of achievement, including the common formative assessments, district assessments and school based measures such as DORF, Running Records, and Math Inventories. In 2017-18, Columbia will use i-Ready including the i-Ready Diagnostic and instructional grouping profile.

In quarterly cycles, the academic leadership team (ALT) will compile progress monitoring data for a “state of the schools” report. This report will be used to closely monitor the growth and progress of all students at Columbia Elementary. There will be a close monitoring process for our students in defined subgroups such as African American students, gifted students and our Lowest 25% performing students.

2. List below who monitors the Early Warning System and how often.

In 2017-18, Columbia’s administration and EWS team (consisting of the guidance counselor, administration and teacher leaders) will meet weekly to review EWS for the school, particularly daily attendance rates and behavioral data.

3. This section captures a snapshot of the total number of students exhibiting a respective indicator or set of indicators during the 2016-17 school year. These data should be used as part of the needs assessment to identify potential problem areas and inform the school’s planning and problem solving for 2017-18:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade Level</th>
<th>K</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attendance &lt;90</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 or more ISS or OSS</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level 1 in ELA or Math</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantial Reading Deficiency</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Describe all intervention strategies employed by the school to improve the academic performance of students identified by the Early Warning System (i.e., those exhibiting two or more early warning indicators).

As the snapshot above describes, nearly half of the students enrolled in Columbia struggled with daily school attendance. This is a major concern for academic performance, as many students missed nearly 19 days in 2016-17.

In 2017-18, the school will focus on improving daily attendance rates. This will include a focus on attendance celebrations, classroom competitions, and an attendance committee. Administration will work to educate parents on the importance of school attendance and create a process to support families who struggle with attendance.

One in-process measure of improvement will be to increase the school’s daily attendance rate to 94%, and to decrease the number of students at <90 attendance from 254 to less than 50.

Tier 3 Interventions will include LLI groups in grades K-6. Title I teachers, Resource teachers, Instructional IA’s and the ASP teacher will attend trainings in order to implement LLI effectively. Small group intervention will take place daily for 30 minutes for students that are identified in the MTSS process as needing a Tier 3 intervention.
PARENT AND FAMILY INVOLVEMENT: (Parent Survey Data must be referenced) Title I Schools may use the Parent and Family Engagement Plan to meet the requirements of this section.

Consider the level of family and community involvement at your school and parent survey data collected. Respond to the following questions. What are best practices that are strengths and how will they be sustained? What are areas of weaknesses and how are they being addressed?

See the Parent Family Engagement Plan (PFEP).

STUDENT TRANSITION AND READINESS

**PreK-12 TRANSITION**  This section used to meet requirements of 20 U.S.C 6314(b)(1)(g).

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

During Second Semester a team is formed to start working on kindergarten recruitment. The team consists of at least one Pre-K Teacher, one parent volunteer and on Kindergarten teacher. The team meets and makes decisions on Kindergarten recruitment and then assigns roles and responsibilities to the whole Pre-K and Kindergarten Team as well as any other parent volunteers. Information goes out to families and area pre-schools to inform parents of the Kindergarten Information Night and pre-registration occurs. Families have the opportunity to meet the Kindergarten teachers and tour the school campus.

The sixth grade teachers work with the Middle schools to set up assemblies so that students are given the information on registration and different activities that will be available to them in the middle school. The sixth grade teachers also facilitate information going to students have the programs they can apply for, deadlines and try-outs.