

Brevard Public Schools

# Quest Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>                                   | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>I. School Information</b>                                       | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>                            | <b>11</b> |
| <b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>                               | <b>15</b> |
| <b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>                       | <b>25</b> |
| <b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b> | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>                                    | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>                       | <b>0</b>  |

# Quest Elementary School

8751 TRAFFORD DR, Melbourne, FL 32940

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

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

### Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

### Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

### Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

| SIP Sections   | Title I Schoolwide Program                                      | Charter Schools        |
|--|---|------------------------|
| I-A: School Mission/Vision   |   | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)   |
| I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)   |                        |
| I-E: Early Warning System  | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)                                    | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)   |
| II-A-C: Data Review  |   | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)   |
| II-F: Progress Monitoring  | ESSA 1114(b)(3)   |                        |
| III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection                                    | ESSA 1114(b)(6)   | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)   |
| III-B: Area(s) of Focus  | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)                                       |                        |
| III-C: Other SI Priorities   |   | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9) |
| VI: Title I Requirements   | ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5),<br>(7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B)<br>ESSA 1116(b-g) |                        |

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

## 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 Department 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.

## I. School Information

### School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement.**

Our mission, at Quest, is for educational excellence in a nurturing 21st century environment that promotes exemplary character, independent thinking, and a desire for lifelong learning. (Rev. 2019-20)

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

A collaborative learning community on a journey to reach its highest potential. (Rev. 2019-20)

### School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

**School Leadership Team**

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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

| Name            | Position Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|-----------------|---------------------|--|
| Castillo, Karry | Principal           | As principal, Mrs. Castillo, works with the leadership team to set clear goals for the school based on collaborative analysis of data. She organizes the team to shape a vision of quality instruction and academic success for all students through a clear focus on data-driven strategic goals, instructional priorities, and collaborative planning and professional learning. She supports shared decision making regarding curriculum, resource allocation, instruction, staffing, and community engagement.   |
| Phillips, Tauna | Assistant Principal | As assistant principal, Mrs. Phillips, leads the implementation of new curriculum/initiatives, collaborative planning efforts, and professional development. She is focused on a vision of shared instructional leadership and academic success for all. She defines and promotes high expectations among the school-based learning community in support of quality instruction and improved student achievement. She identifies the instructional talents and interests of teachers, organizing them to apply those talents as teacher leaders to lead collaborative planning, professional development, and peer coaching efforts. Mrs. Phillips leads monthly MTSS data chat meetings, assisting teachers with the MTSS process through data analysis, identification of needs and skills deficits, intervention planning, and data collection. She also communicates timely information to parents and community members regarding school and community-based events through Facebook and FOCUS. |
| Kostka, Julie   | Instructional Coach | As the literacy/instructional coach, Ms. Kostka plays a critical role in gathering data, both instructional and performance, from a variety of sources for analysis by the administrative leadership team as well as the literacy leadership team. She mentors and coaches teachers, modeling lessons and providing resources to support school-wide best instructional practice. She leads collaborative planning with a focus on strong Tier 1 instruction and standards-aligned learning tasks. Ms. Kostka also facilitates school-wide and grade level professional development.   |
| Jean, Aimee     | School Counselor    | As school social worker, Ms. Jean supports the leadership team by providing critical data SEL needs as well as available community supports. Ms. Jean guides the threat/ mental health assessment process and conducts suicide risk inquiries as needed. The information collected from these assessments is utilized to enhance school supports or investigate the need for additional supports. She supports students through small group counseling sessions based on needs noted by classroom teachers. She also works with families to find available community supports such as housing, food banks, and outside counseling to name a few. The work Ms. Jean does as a member of the leadership team has a positive impact on the ability of students to arrive to school engaged and ready to learn.  |

**Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development**

Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Stakeholders have provided input through a variety of measures. Information collected from these measures has been used to inform various components of Quest's School Improvement Plan. These measures include student input through the 22-23 Youth Truth Survey, faculty and staff input through the 22-23 TNTP Insight Survey, and family input through the 22-23 Parent Survey.

**SIP Monitoring**

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Quest's School Improvement Plan will be monitored by the administrative leadership team on a monthly basis to note implementation progress and impact as revealed through standards-aligned performance data. Student performance data will be consistently analyzed through school-based PLC and data chat meetings to determine if the action steps outlined in the plan are yielding positive results. If not, then the action steps will be revised and updated in order to more effectively meet the needs of students and the school learning community.

**Demographic Data**

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2023-24 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-6   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>   | No  |
| <b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>   | 27%   |
| <b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>   | 20%   |
| <b>Charter School</b>  | No  |
| <b>RAISE School</b>  | No  |
| <b>ESSA Identification</b><br>*updated as of 3/11/2024   | ATSI  |
| <b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>  | No  |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)*<br>English Language Learners (ELL)<br>Asian Students (ASN)<br>Black/African American Students (BLK)<br>Hispanic Students (HSP)<br>Multiracial Students (MUL)<br>White Students (WHT)<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |



|   |            |
|---|------------|
| <p align="center"><b>School Grades History</b></p> <p>*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.</p> | 2021-22: A |
|   | 2019-20: A |
|   | 2018-19: A |
|   | 2017-18: A |
| <b>School Improvement Rating History</b>  |            |
| <b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>  |            |

**Early Warning Systems**

Using 2022-23 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  |
| Absent 10% or more days   | 6           | 8 | 10 | 5 | 6  | 4 | 5  | 0 | 0     | 44 |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 1 | 1  | 0 | 3  | 2 | 2  | 0 | 0     | 9  |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)   | 0           | 0 | 0  | 1 | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0     | 1  |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 0 | 0  | 2 | 4  | 0 | 1  | 0 | 0     | 7  |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0 | 0  | 5 | 13 | 3 | 6  | 0 | 0     | 27 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0  | 4 | 13 | 7 | 13 | 0 | 0     | 37 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0           | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0     |    |
|   | 0           | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0     |    |
|   | 0           | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0     |    |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Total |    |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|----|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |       | 8  |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 1 | 0 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0     | 13 |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Total |   |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|---|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |       | 8 |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 1 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0     | 5 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0     | 1 |

**Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)**

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

| Indicator   | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |    |   |   | Total |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|-------|
|   | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7 | 8 |       |
| Absent 10% or more days   | 2           | 5 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 18    |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 0 | 0 | 5     |
| Course failure in ELA   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0 |       |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1  | 0 | 0 | 2     |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 7  | 0 | 0 | 21    |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 36    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0           | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 7  | 0 | 0 | 23    |

**The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3     |

**The number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 1           | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2     |

**Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)**

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

| Indicator   | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |    |   |   | Total |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|----|---|---|-------|
|   | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6  | 7 | 8 |       |
| Absent 10% or more days   | 2           | 5 | 3 | 4 | 0 | 4 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 18    |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 1  | 0 | 0 | 5     |
| Course failure in ELA   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0 |       |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1  | 0 | 0 | 2     |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 7  | 0 | 0 | 21    |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0 | 0 | 4 | 6 | 7 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 36    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0           | 0 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 8 | 7  | 0 | 0 | 23    |

**The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 3     |

**The number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 1           | 1 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9     |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2     |

**II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**

**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

**On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.**

| Accountability Component        | 2023   |          |       | 2022   |          |       | 2021   |          |       |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                                 | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement*                | 70     | 58       | 53    | 75     | 61       | 56    | 79     |          |       |
| ELA Learning Gains              |        |          |       | 67     |          |       | 75     |          |       |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile      |        |          |       | 50     |          |       | 57     |          |       |
| Math Achievement*               | 72     | 58       | 59    | 77     | 49       | 50    | 81     |          |       |
| Math Learning Gains             |        |          |       | 74     |          |       | 69     |          |       |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile     |        |          |       | 55     |          |       | 55     |          |       |
| Science Achievement*            | 75     | 58       | 54    | 65     | 60       | 59    | 70     |          |       |
| Social Studies Achievement*     |        |          |       |        | 64       | 64    |        |          |       |
| Middle School Acceleration      |        |          |       |        | 51       | 52    |        |          |       |
| Graduation Rate                 |        |          |       |        | 56       | 50    |        |          |       |
| College and Career Acceleration |        |          |       |        |          | 80    |        |          |       |
| ELP Progress                    | 44     | 54       | 59    | 69     |          |       | 71     |          |       |

\* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

**ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)**

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index                     |      |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)               | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students           | 65   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 1    |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 327  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 5    |
| Percent Tested                                 | 100  |
| Graduation Rate                                |      |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index                     |      |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)               | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students           | 67   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 1    |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 532  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 8    |
| Percent Tested                                 | 100  |
| Graduation Rate                                |      |

**ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**

| 2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY |                                 |                    |   |   |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup                      | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD                                | 33                              | Yes                | 2   |   |
| ELL                                | 51                              |                    |   |   |
| AMI                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| ASN                                | 85                              |                    |   |   |
| BLK                                | 50                              |                    |   |   |
| HSP                                | 76                              |                    |   |   |
| MUL                                | 48                              |                    |   |   |
| PAC                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| WHT                                | 72                              |                    |   |   |

| 2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY |                                 |                    |   |   |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup                      | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| FRL                                | 60                              |                    |   |   |

| 2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY |                                 |                    |   |   |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------|---|---|
| ESSA Subgroup                      | Federal Percent of Points Index | Subgroup Below 41% | Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41% | Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32% |
| SWD                                | 37                              | Yes                | 1   |   |
| ELL                                | 65                              |                    |   |   |
| AMI                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| ASN                                | 65                              |                    |   |   |
| BLK                                | 58                              |                    |   |   |
| HSP                                | 54                              |                    |   |   |
| MUL                                | 76                              |                    |   |   |
| PAC                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| WHT                                | 69                              |                    |   |   |
| FRL                                | 58                              |                    |   |   |

**Accountability Components by Subgroup**

Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

| 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
| All Students                                   | 70       |        |             | 72        |         |              | 75       |         |           |                   |                     | 44           |
| SWD  | 28       |        |             | 41        |         |              | 30       |         |           |                   | 4                   |              |
| ELL  | 52       |        |             | 62        |         |              |          |         |           |                   | 4                   | 44           |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  | 75       |        |             | 95        |         |              |          |         |           |                   | 2                   |              |
| BLK  | 45       |        |             | 55        |         |              |          |         |           |                   | 2                   |              |
| HSP  | 73       |        |             | 78        |         |              |          |         |           |                   | 2                   |              |
| MUL  | 57       |        |             | 59        |         |              |          |         |           |                   | 3                   |              |

| 2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22 | C & C Accel 2021-22 | ELP Progress |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 72       |        |             | 72        |         |              | 73       |         |           |                   | 4                   |              |
| FRL  | 54       |        |             | 63        |         |              | 73       |         |           |                   | 4                   |              |

| 2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
| All Students                                   | 75       | 67     | 50          | 77        | 74      | 55           | 65       |         |           |                   |                     | 69           |
| SWD  | 29       | 48     | 41          | 36        | 46      | 42           | 17       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ELL  | 64       | 65     | 58          | 63        | 68      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     | 69           |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  | 71       | 38     |             | 80        | 69      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  | 56       | 56     |             | 56        | 63      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| HSP  | 62       | 67     | 54          | 63        | 63      | 20           | 50       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| MUL  | 72       | 89     |             | 76        | 68      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 80       | 67     | 49          | 81        | 78      | 65           | 68       |         |           |                   |                     | 64           |
| FRL  | 63       | 63     | 48          | 61        | 72      | 56           | 43       |         |           |                   |                     |              |

| 2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 | ELP Progress |
| All Students                                   | 79       | 75     | 57          | 81        | 69      | 55           | 70       |         |           |                   |                     | 71           |
| SWD  | 45       | 61     | 42          | 46        | 49      | 36           | 35       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ELL  | 72       | 100    |             | 85        | 92      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     | 71           |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  | 95       |        |             | 90        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  | 57       | 58     |             | 73        | 62      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| HSP  | 67       | 70     |             | 74        | 63      |              | 40       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| MUL  | 75       | 65     |             | 78        | 65      |              | 58       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 81       | 77     | 68          | 83        | 69      | 53           | 76       |         |           |                   |                     | 82           |
| FRL  | 67       | 68     | 59          | 73        | 61      | 63           | 57       |         |           |                   |                     |              |

**Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)**

The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

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 |
| 05    | 2023 - Spring | 80%    | 59%      | 21%                        | 54%   | 26%                     |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 83%    | 61%      | 22%                        | 58%   | 25%                     |
| 06    | 2023 - Spring | 72%    | 61%      | 11%                        | 47%   | 25%                     |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 66%    | 56%      | 10%                        | 50%   | 16%                     |

| MATH  |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06    | 2023 - Spring | 78%    | 67%      | 11%                        | 54%   | 24%                     |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 67%    | 60%      | 7%                         | 59%   | 8%                      |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 86%    | 61%      | 25%                        | 61%   | 25%                     |
| 05    | 2023 - Spring | 79%    | 55%      | 24%                        | 55%   | 24%                     |

| SCIENCE |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade   | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05      | 2023 - Spring | 82%    | 57%      | 25%                        | 51%   | 31%                     |

**III. Planning for Improvement**

**Data Analysis/Reflection**

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

While the 22-23 FAST ELA proficiency levels for Grades 3-6 showed a decrease in the percent of Quest students scoring at Level 3 or higher, the data component showing the lowest performance was Grade 3 FAST ELA proficiency. Only 67% of students in third grade performed at a proficiency Level 3 or higher. This performance follows what is now a three year trend of declining performance in Grade 3 ELA performance at Quest Elementary (2021 - 78% proficiency, 2022 - 71% proficiency, and 2023 - 66% proficiency). This decline in proficiency is accompanied by an increase in the percentage of students

scoring at Level 1 (8% in 2022 to 16% in 2023). A similar trend of declining Grade 3 ELA proficiency is noted in Brevard County Public Schools data, with proficiency levels falling by 2% each year from 2021 to 2023 along with an increasing percentage of students scoring at Level 1, increasing from 20% in 2022 to 22% in 2023.

Contributing factors to the decline in ELA proficiency levels at Quest include inconsistencies in Grade 3 Tier 1 instruction, particularly related to the rigor of the state benchmarks and the implementation of aligned curriculum, inconsistencies in the implementation of effective intervention and daily small group instruction, inconsistent data analysis accompanied by an absence of a targeted collaborative planning structure for whole and small group instruction as well as intervention, and the absence of a consistent walkthrough schedule for improved monitoring, feedback, and coaching practices. Additionally, progress monitoring data have revealed a decline in proficiency levels as indicated in grade level iReady ELA performance from first to second grade for Quest's rostered 22-23 third grade students. End-of-year proficiency levels dropped from 70% on-grade level proficiency in first grade to 65% on-grade level proficiency in second grade, pointing to a need for improved Tier 1 ELA instruction in Grade 2 as well as Grade 3.

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

Per Quest's 22-23 assessment data, the component showing the greatest decline from the prior year was FAST Mathematics proficiency in Grade 3, dropping from 78% proficiency in 2022 to 67% proficiency in 2023. Here again as with ELA, this performance follows a three year decline in proficiency levels (2021-79%, 2022 - 78%, and 2023 - 67% proficiency). This contrasts with district data which shows an increase in Grade 3 Mathematics proficiency levels over the last three years (2021-51%, 2022-58%, 2023-59%).

Contributing factors to the decline in Mathematics proficiency levels at Quest include inconsistencies in Mathematics Tier 1 instruction, particularly with the implementation of the newly adopted Reveal Mathematics curriculum in Grade 3 and the accompanying district pacing guides, inconsistent collaborative planning practices and walkthroughs for monitoring, coaching, and feedback practices, and inconsistent small group instruction and intervention supports. Furthermore, progress monitoring data have also revealed a decline in proficiency levels as indicated in iReady Mathematics performance from first to second grade for Quest's rostered 22-23 third grade students. End-of-year Mathematics proficiency levels dropped from 60% on-grade level proficiency in first grade to 29% on-grade level proficiency in second grade, pointing a need for improved Tier 1 Mathematics instruction in Grade 2 as well as Grade 3.

**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.**

Data analysis has revealed the greatest gap in performance to be the gap in FAST Mathematics proficiency between the school-wide proficiency percentage for Grades 3-6 and SWD proficiency percentage. The school-wide mathematics percent proficient for Grades 3-6 is 77% while the percent proficient for SWD Grades 3-6 (not including GSP or speech) is 38%, a 39% gap. In 21-22, the school-wide percent proficient for Grades 3-6 was 85% and the percent proficient for SWD Grades 3-6 was 48%, a 37% gap. The state-wide gap in 21-22 between the overall percent proficient (55%) compared to SWD statewide (25%), comparatively, was a 30% difference. So while the percent proficiency at Quest for both groups is higher than the state, the trend shows an ever widening gap. This performance gap has increased each year since 2018 (2018- 23%, 2021-33%, 2022-37%, and 2023-39%).

Contributing factors include inconsistent implementation of rigorous, benchmark aligned Tier 1 Mathematics instruction and curriculum, variations in SWD access to grade level content, scheduling anomalies among grade levels for ESE supports and interventions, as well as an inconsistent service model for ESE students.



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

FAST Mathematics proficiency (Level 3 and above) improved in Grade 4 and Grade 5 by 2% and 3% respectively (Grade 4 - 86% and Grade 5 - 79%). While this improvement is celebrated, it is only an incremental increase, not the type of increase associated with any significant changes in practice.

**Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.**

When considering related causes that contribute to student performance, analysis of the 22-23 EWS data related to attendance, behavior, and retention does not reveal strong connection or correlation with lower proficiency levels. An increase in the number of students performing at Level 1 on both the FAST ELA and FAST Mathematics is an area of concern, especially when considering how many SWD are scoring at Level 1 in each grade level. On FAST ELA Reading, 68% of third graders scoring at Level 1 are in the SWD subgroup, 67% of fourth graders scoring at Level 1 are in the SWD subgroup, 86% of fifth graders scoring at Level 1 are in the SWD subgroup, and 45% of sixth grades scoring at Level 1 are in the SWD subgroup. On FAST Mathematics, 71% of third graders scoring Level 1 are in the SWD subgroup, 33% of fourth graders scoring Level 1 are in the SWD subgroup, 82% of fifth graders scoring Level 1 are in the SWD subgroup, and 22% of sixth graders scoring at Level 1 are in the SWD subgroup.

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

Quest's priorities for school improvement for the 23-24 school year are as follows:

1. Improved ELA Proficiency Grades 3-6
2. Improved Mathematics Proficiency Grades 3-6
3. Improved Grade Level Proficiency for SWD subgroup - Reading and Mathematics

Based upon analysis of student performance data and informal meetings with school leadership, inconsistencies

in the implementation of effective intervention and daily small group instruction have been revealed which may have contributed to the decline in Reading and Math proficiency levels among certain grade levels and our SWD subgroup. As a result, several actions need to be taken to address the need for improvement in Reading

and Mathematics. These new actions include a revised master schedule to include defined times for small group instruction and intervention in both reading and mathematics that will also lend to consistency in how SWD are served, a consistent classroom walkthrough model for monitoring instruction and follow-up plan for feedback, quality implementation of our benchmark aligned ELA curriculum, quality implementation of our benchmark-aligned math curriculum along with quality coaching and feedback provided by a district mathematics coach, structured short and long term collaborative planning sessions in ELA with each grade level guided by our literacy coach, regular grade level meetings with the literacy coach to help structure the literacy and/or mathematics block so there are improved, daily small group practices, and early identification of intervention needs in both reading and mathematics, and improved practices in selecting and implementing effective intervention through Quest's MTSS meeting and data chat structure.

**Area of Focus**

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority 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 crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The area of focus for grades K-2 is planning and implementing benchmark aligned Tier 1 ELA instruction and daily small group instruction that meets the needs and closes the gaps in student learning, specifically in the domains of phonics and comprehension. Informal discussion with the school leadership team, analysis of the 22-23 progress monitoring data in relation to historical data trends, a review of the 22-23 master schedule plan, and informal walkthroughs have revealed that daily small group instruction is not being implemented with fidelity throughout the grade levels. This may have impacted student performance in ELA, due to student learning gaps not being filled using explicit, benchmark aligned, research-based ELA instruction and intervention.

The area of focus for grades 3-6 is planning and implementing standards-aligned Tier 1 ELA instruction and daily small group instruction that closes the gaps in student learning by meeting and supporting student needs, specifically in the domains of vocabulary and comprehension. Informal discussion with the school leadership team, analysis of the 22-23 progress monitoring data, and informal walkthroughs have revealed that daily small group instruction is not being implemented with fidelity throughout the grade levels. Informal discussion with the school leadership team, analysis of the 22-23 progress monitoring data in relation to historical data trends, a review of the 22-23 master schedule plan, and informal walkthroughs have revealed that daily small group instruction is not being implemented with fidelity throughout the grade levels. This may have impacted student performance in ELA, due to student learning gaps not being filled using explicit, standards-aligned, research-based ELA instruction and intervention.

The ELA achievement of our lowest performing subgroup, SWD, has been impacted as a result of inconsistent access to strong, benchmark aligned Tier 1 instruction along with inconsistent access to grade level content through small group instruction, intervention, and ESE services.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

As a result of implementation of evidence-based strategies and action steps, student proficiency levels in Grades 3-6 will improve from the 21-22 FSA proficiency level of 84% to at least 88% or higher as evidenced by the 2024 FAST ELA PM 3 assessment. ELA proficiency for Grade 3 students, specifically, will improve from the 22-23 FAST proficiency level of 66% to at least 75% or higher as evidenced on the 2024 FAST ELA PM 3. The proficiency percentage for SWD in Grades 3-6 will improve from 38% (21-22) to 45% or higher.

### Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring efforts will inform progress toward desired outcomes. Weekly data analysis of My Path performance iReady reports will indicate the degree of progress students are making toward identified ELA goals and learning gains. Additionally, analysis and review of iReady diagnostic assessment and FAST progress monitoring assessment data, along with quarterly ELA Benchmark/SAVVAS assessments, will inform improvement in grade level proficiency across grade levels and among subgroups while also revealing areas for continued focus and support. The school leadership team will guide and formalize data analysis efforts through grade level PLC and MTSS meetings and facilitate targeted efforts for improvement as revealed by the data. The school leadership team will also monitor student achievement and classroom instruction through observations and walkthroughs, providing feedback to PLC

groups and with individuals to support instructional needs in reading, especially focusing on how the needs of our SWD subgroup are being met through Tier 1 instruction, classroom supports, and ESE services.

#### **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Karry Castillo (castillo.karry@brevardschools.org)

#### **Evidence-based Intervention:**

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Implementation of quality ELA curriculum: Explicit, systematic instruction in phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension is provided through the implementation of the rigorous Tier 1 curriculum provided by BPS, Benchmark Advance(K-5) and SAVVAS(Gr. 6).

Scheduled MTSS Intervention: School-wide Intervention (WIN - What I Need Time) has been established through the master schedule. Students will receive tiered intervention support during WIN time for identified needs. Following the BPS CERP plan, BPS Decision Trees will be used to guide the selection of strategies and resources.

Collaborative Planning Practices for Tier 1 and daily Small Group Instruction: Following the BPS CERP plan, grade level collaborative planning with the literacy coach will support teacher understanding of instructional needs, selection of appropriate materials, and organization and differentiation of instruction to maximize learning while meeting individual needs. Long-range grade level collaborative planning sessions are scheduled prior to each quarter with our literacy coach.

#### **Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Based on a comprehensive review of student performance data and historical achievement trends, a review of the master schedule, and a review of the ESE model through which services are provided to SWD, it is clear that improved Tier 1 ELA instruction that is clearly aligned with state benchmarks and accessible to SWD through the appropriate scaffolds and supports is a priority for improvement for grades K-6. Focus on the quality and appropriateness of interventions, collaborative planning practices for Tier 1 instruction, daily small group instruction that is structured to meet specific student needs, and implementation of a quality, benchmark aligned ELA curriculum will allow us to accelerate learning through rigorous instruction and grade level learning opportunities while also addressing gaps in student performance.

#### **Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

#### **Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

#### **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.

Revise master schedule to reflect specific instructional periods for ELA small group instruction and ELA intervention (WIN time) for Grades K-6 to assure all students receive interventions according their needs as identified through data analysis.

**Person Responsible:** Karry Castillo (castillo.karry@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** Summer 2023 before pre-planning

Leadership team (Administration, Literacy Coach) will conduct regular learning walks to monitor alignment and progress with the district developed ELA Benchmark/SAVVAS lesson plans. Learning walks will inform professional development opportunities, weekly PLC meetings, collaborative planning efforts, and/or coaching cycles. Feedback and coaching will be provided to grade level teams and/or individual teachers based on specific needs as evidenced by walkthroughs.

**Person Responsible:** Julie Kostka (kostka.julie@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** Learning walks will occur on a monthly basis as scheduled and more often as needed.

Collaborative planning with the school literacy coach for Tier 1 ELA instruction and small group instruction provides an opportunity to delve into the meaning of the standards and will assure both instruction and learning tasks identified in the district developed Benchmark/SAVVAS plans are implemented with fidelity and consistency throughout the school year.

**Person Responsible:** Julie Kostka (kostka.julie@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** Quarterly through the 23-24 school year

Closely monitor the performance of students K-6, with particular attention on our SWD ESSA subgroup, through monthly MTSS meetings in order to assure students are receiving and making progress with appropriate targeted ELA interventions and/or Tier 1 enrichment opportunities to support improved academic performance. Data will be analyzed from the group to the individual student level to examine the effectiveness of scaffolds for Tier 3 students. If scaffolds are found not to be effective, decisions will be made with respect to new strategies or resources that are better suited to serve the needs of individual students.

**Person Responsible:** Tauna Phillips (phillips.tauna@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** Monthly through the 23-24 school year.

Student iReady performance data will be monitored weekly by the leadership team with a focus on overall school performance and subgroup performance. The Literacy Coach will analyze data to determine coaching needs and align professional development.

**Person Responsible:** Julie Kostka (kostka.julie@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** Weekly through the 23-24 school year.

Meet with BPS support facilitator for ESE and the BPS assigned staffing specialist to review Quest's ESE service model and available resources to determine if additional schedule or service changes need to be made in order to meet the needs of Quest's SWD population.

**Person Responsible:** Karry Castillo (castillo.karry@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** September 2023

Use goal-setting in Reading as an action step for improvement. iReady Diagnostic 1 data will be used school-wide as a baseline for setting performance goals, at the class and individual level, with identified "Stretch Growth" as the target goal for each student in order to close gaps in ELA proficiency.

**Person Responsible:** Julie Kostka (kostka.julie@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** Ongoing through the 23-24 school year.

## #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

The area of focus for grades K-6 is planning and implementing benchmark aligned Tier 1 Mathematics instruction and daily small group instruction that meets the needs and closes gaps in student learning. Informal discussion with the school leadership team, analysis of the 22-23 progress monitoring data in relation to historical data trends, a review of the 22-23 master schedule plan, and informal walkthroughs have revealed that strong Tier 1 Mathematics whole group instruction and daily small group instruction are not being implemented with fidelity throughout the grade levels. This may have impacted student performance in Mathematics due to student learning gaps not being filled using explicit, benchmark-aligned, and research-based instruction and intervention.

The Mathematics achievement of our lowest performing subgroup, SWD, has been impacted as a result of inconsistent access to strong, benchmark aligned Tier 1 instruction along with inconsistent access to grade level content through small group instruction, intervention, and ESE services.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

As a result of implementation of evidence-based strategies and action steps, student proficiency levels in Grades 3-6 will improve from the 21-22 FSA proficiency level of 85% to at least 88% or higher as evidenced by the 2024 FAST Mathematics PM 3 assessment. Mathematics proficiency for Grade 3 students, specifically, will improve from the 22-23 FAST proficiency level of 67% to at least 75% or higher as evidenced on the 2024 FAST Mathematics PM 3. The proficiency percentage for SWD in Grades 3-6 will improve from 48% (21-22) to 50% or higher.

### Monitoring:

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

Progress monitoring efforts will inform progress toward desired outcomes. Weekly data analysis of My Path performance iReady reports will indicate the degree of progress students are making toward identified Mathematics goals and learning gains. Additionally, analysis and review of iReady diagnostic assessment and FAST progress monitoring assessment data will inform improvement in grade level proficiency across grade levels and among subgroups while also revealing areas for continued focus and support. The school leadership team will guide and formalize data analysis efforts through grade level PLC and MTSS meetings and facilitate targeted efforts for improvement as revealed by the data. The school leadership team along with the district mathematics coach will also monitor student achievement and classroom instruction through observations and walkthroughs, providing feedback to PLC groups and with individuals to support instructional needs in mathematics, especially focusing on how the needs of our SWD subgroup are being met through Tier 1 instruction, classroom supports, and ESE services.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Karry Castillo (castillo.karry@brevardschools.org)

### Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Implementation of quality Mathematics curriculum: Explicit, systematic mathematics instruction is provided through the implementation of the rigorous Tier 1 curriculum provided by BPS, Reveal (K-5) and EdGems (Gr. 6).

Scheduled MTSS Intervention: School-wide Intervention (WIN - What I Need Time) has been established

through the master schedule. Students will receive tiered intervention support during WIN time for identified needs in Mathematics.

#### **Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Based on a comprehensive review of student performance data and historical achievement trends, a review of the master schedule, and a review of the ESE model through which services are provided to SWD, it is clear that improved Tier 1 Mathematics instruction that is clearly aligned with state benchmarks and accessible to SWD through the appropriate scaffolds and supports is a priority for improvement for grades K-6. Focus on the quality and appropriateness of interventions, collaborative planning practices for Tier 1 instruction, daily small group instruction that is structured to meet specific student needs, and implementation of a quality, benchmark aligned Mathematics curriculum will allow us to accelerate learning through rigorous instruction and grade level learning opportunities while also addressing gaps in student performance.

#### **Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

#### **Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

#### **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.

Revise master schedule to reflect specific instructional periods for Mathematics small group instruction and intervention (WIN time) for Grades K-6 to assure all students receive interventions according their needs as identified through data analysis. This will also assure SWD receive scheduled intervention support and ESE services through small group.

**Person Responsible:** Karry Castillo (castillo.karry@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** Summer 2023 prior to pre-planning.

Leadership team (Administration, Mathematics Coach) will conduct regular learning walks to monitor alignment and progress with the district developed Reveal and EdGems lesson plans. Learning walks will inform professional development opportunities, weekly PLC meetings, collaborative planning efforts, and/or coaching cycles. Feedback and coaching will be provided to grade level teams and/or individual teachers based on specific needs as evidenced by walkthroughs.

**Person Responsible:** Karry Castillo (castillo.karry@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** Monthly through the 23-24 school year.

Closely monitor the performance of students K-6, with particular attention on our SWD ESSA subgroup, through monthly MTSS meetings in order to assure students are receiving and making progress with appropriate targeted Mathematics interventions and/or Tier 1 enrichment opportunities to support improved academic performance. Data will be analyzed from the group to the individual student level to examine the effectiveness of scaffolds for Tier 3 students. If scaffolds are found not to be effective, decisions will be made with respect to new strategies or resources that are better suited to serve the mathematics needs of individual students.

**Person Responsible:** Tauna Phillips (phillips.tauna@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** Monthly through the 23-24 school year.

Meet with BPS support facilitator for ESE and the BPS assigned staffing specialist to review Quest's ESE service model and available resources to determine if additional schedule or service changes need to be made in order to meet the needs of Quest's SWD population.

**Person Responsible:** Karry Castillo (castillo.karry@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** September 2023

Increase use of mathematics manipulatives in Grades K-6 to improve accessibility and understanding of mathematics to support Mathematics conceptual development from concrete to representational to abstract.

**Person Responsible:** Tauna Phillips (phillips.tauna@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** Ongoing through the 23-24 school year.

### #3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

#### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

When reviewing the 22-23 Youth Truth Survey that was administered to Quest students in Grades 3-6, areas of concern were noted in the domains of Engagement, Relationships, and Culture. When responding to the question in the Engagement domain, "Do you like going to school?", only 28% of surveyed students replied, "Yes, very often." When responding to the question in the Relationships domain, "Does your teacher ask you about your life outside of school?", only 8% replied, "Yes, very often." When responding to the question in the Culture domain, "Do students behave in class?", only 24% replied, "Yes, very often." This data indicates a need to examine school-wide expectations for behavior and learning as well as processes for building connection through relationships and classroom community to foster students' senses of value and belonging.

#### Measurable Outcome:

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

As a result of the action steps outlined in the Positive Culture Area of Focus plan, we expect to see measured improvement in the percent of students in Grades 3-6 responding positively to targeted questions in 23-24 Youth Truth survey. When responding to the Engagement domain question, "Do you like going to school?", the student response percent positive will improve from 28% to 50%. When responding to the Relationships domain question, "Does your teacher ask you about your life outside of school?", the student response percent positive will improve from 8% to 50%. When responding to the Culture domain question, "Do students behave in class?", the student response percent positive will improve from 24% to 50%.

#### Monitoring:

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

Walkthrough data, anecdotal evidence from observation, along with behavior and positive referral data will be used to monitor implementation of revised school-wide expectations for behavior and learning and practices for morning greeting and morning meeting.

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tauna Phillips (phillips.tauna@brevardschools.org)

#### Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Consistent school-wide expectations grounded in positive behavior supports and proactive classroom management techniques.

#### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Per Education Resource Strategies Building Block Profile on Responsive Learning Communities, "Students and teachers are motivated to uphold school-wide values, systems and routines when they explicitly reinforce a school culture that fosters a positive learning environment and strong relationships..." which "helps students feel safe, cared for, and respected."

#### Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence



**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**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.

Establish a committee to examine current school-wide expectations for behavior and learning and make revisions needed to better address student relationships and belonging as reflected in the Youth Truth Survey data.

**Person Responsible:** Tauna Phillips (phillips.tauna@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** Ongoing through the 23-24 school year.

Establish morning greetings and morning meetings as non-negotiable best practices school-wide for building classroom community, connection, and positive relationships.

**Person Responsible:** Tauna Phillips (phillips.tauna@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** Ongoing through the 23-24 school year.

**CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review**

Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

Quest Elementary reviews schedules, personnel, instructional materials, and technology resources to ensure they are aligned with needs of all learners, including SWD in our ESE programs. The schedules of both ESE and General Education teachers are aligned and maximized to ensure students get the highest quality support and access to Tier 1 core instruction as well as small group instruction and intervention per their unique needs and goals. This includes scheduling for collaborative planning, core instruction, intervention, and time on technology with support programs. Additionally, the following programming components at Quest are aligned to support all learners:

**PERSONNEL**

District Mathematics Coach: Quest has been allocated support services through a district mathematics coach who provides feedback and support through the coaching cycle as well as scheduled professional learning for all teachers.

**INSTRUCTIONAL**

Small Group Instruction: Training is being provided to schools with an emphasis on small group instruction utilizing on-grade level text and instructional scaffolds that support access to benchmark aligned, on-grade level content. Quest has also been allocated a school-based Literacy Coach through Title II funds who provides instructional support through coaching and modeling as well as professional development that is focused on benchmark-aligned instruction, student engagement, and instructional strategies grounded in the Science of Reading. Additionally, Quest will be utilizing district purchased software, IMAGINE, to support improved ELL achievement.

**ACADEMIC SUPPORT PROGRAM (ASP)**

ASP allocations and ESSR funds are provided to all elementary schools to provide instructional support, with priority given to students in Grade 3 who are demonstrating below grade level performance.

**SUMMER READING CAMP**

Summer Reading Camp will be offered to all third grade students scoring at Level 1 achievement on the FAST ELA Progress Monitoring Assessment (PM 3).