

Brevard Public Schools

Emma Jewel Charter Academy



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Emma Jewel Charter Academy

705 BLAKE AVE, Cocoa, FL 32922

<http://emmajewelcharter.com>

Demographics

Principal: Thomas Cole

Start Date for this Principal: 8/22/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-8
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students* Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (41%) 2020-21: (39%) 2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (45%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

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

School Board Approval

N/A

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.

The Mission of the Emma Jewel Charter Academy (EJCA) is to instill within each scholar a passion for learning, a strong desire to nurture their family members, friends and their community. We will empower each individual scholar to be lifelong learners, problem solvers and have a positive impact in their community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision: Our vision is that all scholars will demonstrate academic excellence once they are placed in a nurturing educational environment where they are valued and celebrated for their uniqueness.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Karnetsky, Mary	Assistant Principal	Inputs information into data bases for lunch programs, scholar academic programs, scheduling, and testing coordinator. Supports school budget and data meetings as needed. Manages the Professional Development. Performs evaluations on teachers.
Cole, Thomas	Principal	To provide a safe learning and working environment for all educators scholars, and parents. He will support scholars and educators in their pursuit of increasing academic success. He will set the tone for providing a culture that expect a high standard for all that enter the building.
Hansen-Lettsome, Jeselle	Reading Coach	Works with educators through the IPST and MTSS process. Reviews scholar data to help monitor progress during intervention. Observes classroom instruction and provides feedback to educators.
Turner, Greg	Other	Consultant
Jordan, Johnny	Dean	As dean of scholars, he oversee's behaviors of scholars in grades K-8. He is in charge of discipline implementation and tracking behavioral data. Works with parents when behavioral issues arise.
Roberts , Lloyd	Dean	Other

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/22/2022, Thomas Cole

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

Total number of students enrolled at the school

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

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

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	43	40	47	38	42	37	36	32	25	0	0	0	0	340
Attendance below 90 percent	10	14	8	8	10	7	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	61
One or more suspensions	3	0	1	0	4	9	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	19
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	0	4	1	4	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	17	16	13	13	11	0	0	0	0	77
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	6	19	26	18	15	8	0	0	0	0	92
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	1	0	1	2	9	10	5	9	4	0	0	0	0	41

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	17	23	17	15	6	9	13	6	0	0	0	0	109
Students retained two or more times	0	0	6	1	3	2	8	7	7	0	0	0	0	34

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/6/2022

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	39	49	28	44	37	41	52	30	26	0	0	0	0	346
Attendance below 90 percent	1	16	12	20	13	10	15	4	9	0	0	0	0	100
One or more suspensions	0	2	6	8	13	9	20	7	7	0	0	0	0	72
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	3	1	2	4	3	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	2	1	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	14	24	24	15	11	0	0	0	0	91
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	19	24	29	9	7	0	0	0	0	91
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	4	9	10	9	15	6	8	3	0	0	0	0	64

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	4	9	21	23	29	14	16	0	0	0	0	117

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	4	2	2	2	2	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	2	0	7	7	2	0	0	0	0	19

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	39	49	28	44	37	41	52	30	26	0	0	0	0	346
Attendance below 90 percent	1	16	12	20	13	10	15	4	9	0	0	0	0	100
One or more suspensions	0	2	6	8	13	9	20	7	7	0	0	0	0	72
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	3	1	2	4	3	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	2	1	5	0	1	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	14	24	24	15	11	0	0	0	0	91
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	3	19	24	29	9	7	0	0	0	0	91
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	4	9	10	9	15	6	8	3	0	0	0	0	64

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	4	9	21	23	29	14	16	0	0	0	0	117

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	4	2	2	2	2	2	4	1	0	0	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	2	0	7	7	2	0	0	0	0	19

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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

School Grade Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	27%	64%	57%	29%			30%	65%	61%
ELA Learning Gains	52%	56%	55%	40%			46%	58%	59%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	60%	49%	46%	39%			58%	54%	54%
Math Achievement	33%	66%	55%	29%			45%	67%	62%
Math Learning Gains	54%	62%	60%	42%			56%	62%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	57%	56%	41%			53%	59%	52%
Science Achievement	27%	63%	51%	28%			24%	62%	56%
Social Studies Achievement	66%	77%	72%	60%			77%	80%	78%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	29%	64%	-35%	58%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	23%	61%	-38%	58%	-35%
Cohort Comparison		-29%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	20%	60%	-40%	56%	-36%
Cohort Comparison		-23%				
06	2022					
	2019	17%	60%	-43%	54%	-37%
Cohort Comparison		-20%				
07	2022					
	2019	52%	58%	-6%	52%	0%
Cohort Comparison		-17%				
08	2022					
	2019	42%	63%	-21%	56%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	31%	61%	-30%	62%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	32%	64%	-32%	64%	-32%
Cohort Comparison		-31%				
05	2022					
	2019	40%	60%	-20%	60%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-32%				
06	2022					
	2019	47%	67%	-20%	55%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-40%				
07	2022					
	2019	59%	62%	-3%	54%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-47%				
08	2022					
	2019	68%	43%	25%	46%	22%
Cohort Comparison		-59%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	16%	56%	-40%	53%	-37%
Cohort Comparison						
06	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-16%				
07	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2022					
	2019	42%	53%	-11%	48%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019	77%	74%	3%	71%	6%
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2022					
2019					

Subgroup Data Review

2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	9	47	56	11	36	47	5	42			
ELL											
BLK	26	52	53	32	53	45	27	60			
HSP	26	59		37	67						
MUL	26	56		37	56						
WHT	42	36		42	36						
FRL	24	51	60	34	55	43	27	64			
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	17	26	26	15	28	29	25	31			
BLK	24	37	37	28	43	42	26	58			
HSP	32	43		32	50						
MUL	42	53		27	33						
WHT	41	46		41	31						
FRL	26	39	42	30	43	39	24	62			
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	22	50	53	28	49	50	27				
BLK	25	43	58	42	53	52	16	75			
HSP	40	40		60	60						
MUL	43	60		52	67						
WHT	41	56		45	61						
FRL	28	46	66	46	56	51	22	64			

ESSA Data Review

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	57
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	423
Total Components for the Federal Index	10
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	57
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	44
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	49
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	44
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	39
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	41
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis

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

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

Trends that emerge across grade levels, subgroups, and core content areas is that proficiency scores are not meeting our expectations. Reading proficiency for the school was 27% in 2022 which was a 2% decline. Math proficiency however was at 33% in 2022 which is a 4% increase. Grade levels of most concern are grades 4 and 5 for proficiency. Learning gains were good in 2022 compared to 2021. There were increases in learning gains in all grades combined with 10% in reading and 12% in math. The grade with the highest level of proficient scholars, at level 3 or above, with 78% in 2022 was grade 8. The lowest 25% in both ELA and Math had an increase from school year 2021 to 2022. Science continues to be a concern as we have not been over 28% in the past 3 years. Civics is relatively steady with a range from 66%-77%. SWD and White scholars were below the threshold on the Sesir report. We did improve in all categories from the 2021 school year to the 2022 school year.

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

The greatest need for improvement is raising proficiency scores. Maintain the high performance of our 8th grade scholars. Progress monitoring data shows that grades 2,3,5,6 demonstrate the most need in mathematics, as they are all below 30% proficiency rates. In ELA grade 4,5,6 demonstrate the most concern with proficiency rates below 30%. FSA data shows that grades 3-6 have the most concern with ELA proficiency scores from a low of 18% (4th) to 27% (6). Learning gains in both ELA and Math were better demonstrating that scholars are making more than a years growth (ELA 52%, Math 54%, L25 ELA 60%, L25 Math 47%).

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

Many factors such as COVID, excessive absences, mobility, and summer learning loss all contribute to why proficiency scores are low. A social worker was hired to help with scholars that have demonstrated excessive absences. Barton, a Tier 3 program was bought to help with our ESE and most struggling readers. Emma Jewel purchased Benchmark basal series for the Tier 1 core reading program for K-5. Interventionist, reading coach, and MTSS coordinator will help support and strengthen the intervention block.

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

Emma Jewel's spring i-Ready data showed the most gains in grades 1,2,3,7.and 8. Grade 1 had 60% of the scholars at grade level or above on the Spring 2022 reading assessment. Grades 2,3,7, and 8 were all approaching 50% proficient in reading on Spring assessments. Math is still lacking, but was lead by grades K,1, and 4 which were all approaching 40% proficient on the Spring assessment. On the 2022 FSA ELA, grade 8 had a 15% increase in proficiency from the 2021 to 2022 test (41%). Learning gains in both ELA and Math were up 12% in both over 50% making more than a years growth. The lowest 25% percent had the schools highest percentage of scholars making more than a years growth at 60%. Our 8th grade scholars were the 2nd highest proficiency scores in the district at 78%.

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

The success of our 8th graders was based on high quality instruction and a group of scholars that held each other accountable for learning. We monitored our intervention groups in both reading and math. Implemented small group instruction in math to help fill in vital gaps in scholar's understanding of the standard. Consultant had individual motivational data meetings with scholars in grades 6-8. Scholars were promoted and rewarded for high attendance during Saturday School.

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

We will continue to use i-Ready diagnostic tool to monitor scholar progress. Intervention times will be strictly enforced with monthly data chats to review intervention progress. Purchase of Barton for Tier 3 scholars to accelerate their learning in ELA. Data chats with our lowest performing scholars biweekly to monitor progress on specific goals. Scholars will not be able to opt out of participation during instruction. Math will also have a 30 minute intervention time 3 days a week.

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.

Teachers will attend professional development two Fridays a month. Topics may range from discussions around the new BEST Standards, behavioral strategies, center activities, and implementation of Benchmark Reading Series. All teachers that are in their 1st or 2nd year at Emma Jewel will work with consultant during their planning period once a week to ensure their understanding of standards and developing quality learning plans.

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

Additional interventions will be monitored by Reading Coach, MTSS Coordinator, and Consultant to ensure high quality instruction is happening in the classrooms. Professional development will provide teachers with highly effective instructional strategies to help increase engagement and learning. Checking for understanding will be a priority.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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

Over the past 4 years ELA proficiency has remained below 30% for the school. This past year our proficiency was 27%. On the Spring i-Ready diagnostic test grades 4-6 had a range of 22%-29%, which was consistent with the FSA results for proficiency in those grades. Grade 3 had a 15% drop from the 2021 to 2022 school year in proficiency. On the Spring i-Ready diagnostic 25% of our scholars were Tier 3 candidates and 32% that were Tier 2 candidates. Over 57% over our scholars in grades K-8 are receiving Interventions.

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

ELA 3+ proficiency will increase by 7% (from 27% to 35%) on the Spring FAST assessment.
EOY 2022 i-Ready the percent of scholars receiving interventions will decrease by 15% from (57% to 42%).

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

The area of focus will be monitored 3 times a year. MTSS data chats will take place monthly to check progress of Tier 2 and 3 interventions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jeselle Hansen-Lettsome (hansen-lettsome.jeselle@brevardschools.org)

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

Benchmark curriculum was purchased over the summer. Barton Tier 3 intervention was purchased to work with all of our Tier 3 scholars. Heggerty Phonemic Awareness materials were purchased for kindergarten, grade 1 and intervention to close the gap on basic literacy skills scholars were lacking. Monthly data meetings will be run by our new MTSS coordinator whose only responsibility is to monitor intervention. Educational consultant will conduct classroom visitations to monitor high quality small group instruction during the reading block. Vocabulary program was purchased across all K-6 grades.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

There was a need to have a more consistent curriculum in grades K-5, so the Benchmark Advanced series was purchased for this school year. MTSS coordinator was a need based on the amount of scholars receiving Tier 2 and 3 intervention. Differentiation, observational feedback, data monitor monthly, and communication with interventionist and classroom teacher will be key to success.

Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Ensure that Phonemic Awareness instruction is happening in K-1.
2. Ensure that Phonics instruction is happening in K-3.
3. Implement Barton for all Tier 3 scholars in reading.
4. MTSS coordinator to monitor intervention and data to demonstrate improvement.
5. Implement Benchmark curriculum in grades K-5
6. Small group instruction is mandatory during core curriculum.
7. Continue the use of i-Ready, Study Island, and myOn as differentiated computer assisted programs.

Person

Responsible

Jeselle Hansen-Lettsome (hansen-lettsome.jeselle@brevardschools.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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

There was a 4% increase in math proficiency scores from the 2021 to 2022 school year (33%). This is still below our highest proficiency in 2019 which was 45%. On the Spring 2022 i-Ready math diagnostic 12% of scholars scored in Tier 3 and are 3 years below grade level, and 10% are 2 years below grade level. Fifty percent of our scholars are 1 year below grade level.

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

Math 3+ proficiency will increase from 33% to 40%. Math learning gains will increase from 54% percent to 61%. EOY i-Ready data will demonstrate a decrease of Tier 3 scholars from 22% to 15%. i-Ready data will show a 10% decrease in Tier 2 scholars from 50% to 40% and hopefully meet the proficiency goal.

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

Math will be assessed using the i-Ready diagnostic three times a year. Teachers will also use cold assessments to monitor the scholars mastery of multiple standards every 6 weeks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kimberly Harrell-Cole (kharrell@emmajewelcharter.com)

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

Ensuring that teachers understand the depth of the standard using unpacking form with consultant. Intervention in math will be mandatory a minimum of two days a week. Classroom observations will focus on engagement and questioning techniques. Small group instruction will be a priority.

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

If a teacher does not understand the depth of the standard there is no way that the scholar will. As demonstrated by the data on i-Ready and the previous FSA 70% of our scholars are demonstrating one to three grade levels behind. Small group is a priority to help teach the standard and fill in gaps. With so many scholars needing small group, whole group instruction will be limited to 20 minutes. Observational feedback and analyzing data are very important to monitor the growth of our scholars. These two areas will be a priority.

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Math lead teacher will attend State summer institute on the BEST standards and FAST testing.
2. Math lead teacher will attend i-Ready training to understand how to use the tool box application to help with intervention aligned to the on level standard for groups of scholars that are below grade level.
3. All Tier 3 scholars will be monitored at minimum monthly to demonstrate progress towards their individual needs.
4. Monitor math data 3 times a year to monitor growth.
5. Informal observations and peer teacher visits to highly performing math instructors.
6. Consultant will meet with teachers to ensure understanding of new standards and to identify possible gaps due to certain changes for specific grade levels.
7. Ensure that math interventions are happening throughout the school and minimum of twice a week for those in Tier 2 or 3.

**Person
Responsible**

Greg Turner (gturner@emmajewelcharter.com)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus

Description and

Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Thirty-two percent of our scholars with disabilities achieved a level 3 or higher on the ELA FSA, which is the third year that we have been below the 41% threshold for ESSA reporting.

Measurable

Outcome:

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

Increase ELA achievement from 10% to 42% for our scholars with disabilities.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored by our reading coach and MTSS coordinator by tracking and holding data chats that are specifically monitoring the progress of scholars towards grade level mastery. Educational Consultant will observe small group instruction to provide feedback to instructors on their instructional practices.

Person

responsible for monitoring outcome:

Greg Turner (gturner@emmajewelcharter.com)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Differentiation, observing instruction, small group instruction during core and interventions, and the use of Barton or other related materials as a targeted intervention for our lowest performers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

Barton is one of the tools that have been proven to demonstrate success. We will continue to monitor student data and make decisions regarding effective materials to ensure student success. Ensure that our scholars with disabilities are receiving high quality instruction. Making sure that grade level teacher is working with ESE resource to align instruction for our scholars with disabilities. Review IEP's with grade level teachers to explain how the identified disability will effect the learning of the scholar with disabilities.

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Professional development on high quality strategies used for working with various disabilities of scholars.
2. Small group instruction during core and intervention for our scholars with disabilities.
3. Track data of progress towards their academic goals of our scholars with disabilities.
4. Make sure ESE teachers and regular education teachers are communicating regarding the success of their scholars with disabilities.
5. Observe small groups to make sure that instructional strategies are being implemented.

Person**Responsible**

Jeselle Hansen-Lettsome (hansen-lettsome.jeselle@brevardschools.org)

Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students and families of students, volunteers and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services and business partners.

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

Emma Jewel plans to build a positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders by continuing to communicate using multiple platforms, as well as being very transparent. Emma Jewel will host a variety of parent engagements events including a math night, reading night, and STEM night. Feedback from parents and community will help guide the content of these nights. Educators will volunteer to work with parents during these events. We will continue to host character breakfast to recognize the scholars that are demonstrating a positive character trait. Parents will be invited to attend the celebration. We will continue to have our step team perform at various events in the community. Scholars will be offered to participate in multiple extra curricular activities.

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

Educators and staff at Emma Jewel are given an opportunity to receive information as it pertains to scholar learning and are able to provide input on areas of need. All members of Emma Jewel are encouraged to build relationships with families and community members to support our scholars. Teachers volunteer their time participate in family engagement events, working with parents to provide knowledge and strategies to help their children at home. The Emma Jewel step team perform at various events in the community.

Emma Jewel has community partners such as The Real Church, Cocoa PD, and United Way to name a few who support the school in various ways. Emma Jewel hosts character breakfast every month as the school, community and parents come together to recognize scholars that are demonstrating good character habits. Employees from Harris volunteer their time to facilitate STEM activities with our middle school scholars.