

Brevard Public Schools

Fieldston Preparatory School



2019-20 School Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	7
Planning for Improvement	13
Title I Requirements	15
Budget to Support Goals	17

Fieldston Preparatory School

2940 COLUMBIA BLVD, Titusville, FL 32780

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: David O'brien M

Start Date for this Principal: 8/10/2018

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Special 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 Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grade	2018-19:
School Grades History	2017-18:
	2016-17:
	2015-16:
	2014-15:
	2013-14:
ESSA Status	CS&I

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

The mission of Fieldston Preparatory School is to develop, implement and manage individual and therapeutic educational programs for all students in our care.

Provide the school's vision statement

Fieldston Preparatory School inspires accountability without excuses. We strive to provide an atmosphere of love, respect and acceptance, along with maintaining the feeling of a public school. Students at Fieldston receive individualized education and counseling in a highly structured environment, while developing an appreciation for learning and consistency. Students learn and apply coping skills to solve every day, real world problems. We offer strategic interventions to help each student achieve their "personal vest" academically, socially and behaviorally. Our focus is to foster a positive relationship between parent, school and student with emphasis on family values in the spirit of altruism. At Fieldston we believe in goals and the ownership of achieving them. Setting attainable goals requires high expectation. At Fieldston, the high expectations of children apply to our staff as well. In order to serve them best, we must expect of ourselves what we expect of our students.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Colletti, Cindy	Principal	To provide resources, assess teaching methods, monitor student achievement, encourage parent involvement, revise policies and procedures, administer the budget, hire and evaluate staff and oversee facilities
	Instructional Coach	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	1	4	5	3	7	11	18	9	8	7	7	13	93
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	3	0	0	1	5	10	3	5	3	6	7	43
One or more suspensions	0	0	4	0	0	3	6	10	5	7	2	2	5	44
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	1	3	6	10	13	8	2	2	6	0	51
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	3	0	0	0	3	7	11	5	7	2	6	2	46

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	0	0	0	1	0	0	3	1	0	0	0	0	0	5
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	4	3	0	0	0	0	10

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/26/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	0%	65%	61%	0%	68%	60%
ELA Learning Gains	0%	58%	59%	0%	59%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	54%	54%	0%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	0%	67%	62%	0%	67%	61%
Math Learning Gains	0%	62%	59%	0%	61%	58%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	0%	59%	52%	0%	56%	52%
Science Achievement	0%	62%	56%	0%	63%	57%
Social Studies Achievement	0%	80%	78%	0%	81%	77%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey														
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	1 (0)	4 (0)	5 (0)	3 (0)	7 (0)	11 (0)	18 (0)	9 (0)	8 (0)	7 (0)	7 (0)	13 (0)	93 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	0 ()	3 ()	0 ()	0 ()	1 ()	5 ()	10 ()	3 ()	5 ()	3 ()	6 ()	7 ()	43 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	4 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	6 (0)	10 (0)	5 (0)	7 (0)	2 (0)	2 (0)	5 (0)	44 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	3 (0)	6 (0)	10 (0)	13 (0)	8 (0)	2 (0)	2 (0)	6 (0)	0 (0)	51 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	3 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)

Grade Level Data

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

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	0%	64%	-64%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	63%	-63%	57%	-57%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	61%	-61%	58%	-58%
	2018	0%	57%	-57%	56%	-56%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	60%	-60%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	54%	-54%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	60%	-60%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	63%	-63%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	9%	58%	-49%	52%	-43%
	2018	0%	56%	-56%	51%	-51%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
08	2019	0%	63%	-63%	56%	-56%
	2018	0%	65%	-65%	58%	-58%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019	0%	62%	-62%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	60%	-60%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019	0%	59%	-59%	53%	-53%
	2018	0%	61%	-61%	53%	-53%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	0%	61%	-61%	62%	-62%
	2018	0%	62%	-62%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	0%	64%	-64%	64%	-64%
	2018	0%	59%	-59%	62%	-62%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	0%	60%	-60%	60%	-60%
	2018	0%	58%	-58%	61%	-61%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
06	2019	0%	67%	-67%	55%	-55%
	2018	0%	68%	-68%	52%	-52%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
07	2019	0%	62%	-62%	54%	-54%
	2018	0%	62%	-62%	54%	-54%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
08	2019	0%	43%	-43%	46%	-46%
	2018	0%	41%	-41%	45%	-45%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	10%	56%	-46%	53%	-43%
	2018	0%	57%	-57%	55%	-55%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
08	2019	0%	53%	-53%	48%	-48%
	2018	0%	55%	-55%	50%	-50%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	66%	-66%	67%	-67%
2018	0%	67%	-67%	65%	-65%
Compare		0%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	7%	74%	-67%	71%	-64%
2018	0%	73%	-73%	71%	-71%
Compare		7%			
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	8%	71%	-63%	70%	-62%
2018	0%	70%	-70%	68%	-68%
Compare		8%			
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	61%	-61%	61%	-61%
2018	0%	62%	-62%	62%	-62%
Compare		0%			
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	0%	60%	-60%	57%	-57%
2018					

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	CS&I
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	11
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	

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	86
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	95%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	11
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	13
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	

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	7
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	11
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	2

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year’s low performance and discuss any trends

Math learning gains went from 25 to 11 for students with disabilities. (100% ESE center)

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

English Language Arts learning gains declined from 31 to 26 for students with disabilities. (100% ESE Center)

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

n/a

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

Science gains from 8 to 16 showed improved outcomes.

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

Fieldston showed a decline in math learning gains and ELA learning gains. These are both areas of concern and may be directly correlated with an increase in aggressive student behaviors. As behaviors increase the amount of academic effort and time decrease. Fieldston will be implementing more school-wide behavior strategies, trainings and mentoring. Through the consistent implementation of Universal Design of Learning strategies in conjunction with Behavioral strategies we have high expectations for an increase in our students academic learning gains.

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

1. ELA Learning Gains
2. Math Learning Gains
3. Social Emotional - Attendance, Suspensions, Restraints
- 3.
- 4.
- 5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	SWD (whole school) Attendance, Suspensions, Restraints
Rationale	EWS data for the past 2 years reveal an increase in restraint reporting, student disciplinary actions and improvement in attendance. However, a continued on focus on attendance is needed to sustain the improvement.
State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve	Discipline restraints will decrease 10%. ISS &OSS will also decrease 10%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Cindy Colletti (cindy.colletti@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Zones of Regulation Mental Health Awareness Counseling Student mentors
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	The Zones of Regulation is a conceptual framework used to teach students self regulation and self control. When implemented this framework will help regulate strategies for student success, teach them how to independently utilize strategies, problem-solving techniques, perspectives to include how their behavior impacts not only their own life and success, but how it impacts others and increased awareness of emotions and regulation.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Professional development for staff on Zones of Regulation cohesive implementation to include the book, support through modeling and training by experienced staff and purchase of needed resources. 2. ESE Counselors will provide classroom and individualized support for mental health awareness and crisis interventions. 3. Student assigned mentors for attendance 4. Classroom modeled coping skills infused throughout the school day 5.
Person Responsible	Cindy Colletti (cindy.colletti@brevardschools.org)

#2

Title SWD (whole school) ELA and Math Learning Gains
Rationale English Language Arts learning gains showed a decline from 31 -26 and Math learning gains showed a decline of 25 to 11 for students with disabilities.

State the measureable outcome the school plans to achieve To show an improved outcome of one school year of learning gains in the core content areas of ELA and Math for students with disabilities.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome Cindy Colletti (cindy.colletti@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy Universal Design of Learning (UDL)
 Differentiated instructional practices for SWD
 Check and Connect

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy Universal Design of Learning (UDL) uses a variety of teaching methods to remove any barriers to learning and give all students equal opportunities to succeed. It's about building in flexibility that can be adjusted for every student's strengths and needs. The consistent implementation of intensive curriculum in conjunction with Zones of Regulation and UDL will help to improve academic learning and understanding, along with decrease aggressive and verbal outbursts ensuring student academic time increase.

Action Step

Description 1. Professional development for evidence based practices to improve learning gains
 2. Teacher mentors to model effective implementaion of UDL strategies on a consistent basis in the classroom
 3. Collaborative teaching methods to incorporate all needed indidvudalized instruction to promote engagement
 4. Teacher PLCs to ensure validity of baselines for differentiated instructional approaches
 5.

Person Responsible Cindy Colletti (cindy.colletti@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information)

Fieldston will provide training, resources and mentors in order to promote student active engagement in their educational process, behavior, academic outcomes and accountability.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students

See Parent Family Engagement Plan

PFEP Link

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services

100% of our students are assigned to an ESE mental health counselor. Counselors are available to see students throughout the school day. Each student has a social history and a mental health assessment questionnaire done with the assistance of their counselor. Instructional in social personal skills is available for SWD.

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

Fieldston has individualized plans for targeted behavior to students transitioning back to their public home school. Fieldston also has base line assessments, updated social history and mental health ESE counselor intakes for new placements.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact

Through a review of data and current expenditures for the school year the leadership team works with the School Improvement Committee and determines what worked and what didn't. Data is used to determine school needs, input is sought from parents and teachers and the resources are allocated accordingly. Data is then reviewed periodically through the school leadership team and school improvement committee to make sure the resources are helping. Continual review of data and needs based assessments are facilitated by the principal, managed by administrators, but monitored by SAC and SIC.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations

Fieldston students have employment, college and career related goals in their IEP's. Parental participation with partnerships to include BLAST, LEAP, Project Search, Brevard Achievement Center and STAR program is encouraged. Fieldston team invites colleges and also includes Career readiness and development courses as part of the curriculum.

Part V: Budget

1	III.A	Areas of Focus: SWD (whole school) Attendance, Suspensions, Restraints	\$0.00
2	III.A	Areas of Focus: SWD (whole school) ELA and Math Learning Gains	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00