

Brevard Public Schools

Christa Mcauliffe Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	26
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	27
VI. Title I Requirements	30
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Christa McAuliffe Elementary School

155 DEL MUNDO ST NW, Palm Bay, FL 32907

<http://www.mcauliffe.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), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) 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.

Empower students by challenging them to achieve their personal best each day.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To attain excellence by encouraging responsible, independent lifelong learners.

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
Finsted, Victoria	Principal	As Principal, I work with my team to collaboratively plan to ensure student and staff needs are consistently met. As part of the planning process, we meet weekly to review student achievement data and to plan for upcoming projects and or initiatives.
Mucha, Glenda	Reading Coach	As a member of the leadership team, I provide literacy support to the classroom teachers and students at Christa McAuliffe. I facilitate the MTSS process and work with the leadership team to analyze student achievement, behavioral, and attendance data and develop necessary interventions and strategies to improve reading and math achievement for all students, including SWD and ELL students. I provide literacy support for all teachers, provide professional development, facilitate collaborative planning, and provide coaching and modeling in the classrooms. In addition, I work collaboratively with the media specialist to create a literacy rich environment, plan community and school fundraisers to promote literacy, and collaborate with the leadership team to develop, implement, monitor, and adjust the School Improvement Plan, driven by data.
Redito, Mary	School Counselor	As a member of the leadership team, I work with all students to provide social and emotional supports. I provide character building lessons to primary students on a weekly basis. Additionally, I monitor students attendance for the school and support our English Language Learners.
Marshall, Josena	Teacher, K-12	As a member of the leadership team, I work closely with the team to monitor student achievement, to identify strengths and weaknesses; and to plan for ways to provide both teachers and students with instructional support. I provide direct instruction to students in grades K-6 during intervention blocks, and I create schedules for the Title I instructional assistants to provide needed support in the classroom to help student achievement.
Meyer, Cristina	Assistant Principal	As a member of the leadership team, I work with my team to collaboratively plan to ensure student and staff needs are consistently met. As part of the planning process, we meet weekly to review student achievement data, behavior data, attendance data and to plan for upcoming projects and or initiatives. Additionally, as the Assistant Principal I work closely with the staff to address curriculum needs and to provide support with lesson planning processes.

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.

We involve all stakeholders in the development of our SIP. Each month we host Principal Chat meetings to review available achievement data and school operational issues. During this time, parents are

encouraged to provide input and to participate in dialogue surrounding school improvement needs. Monthly we also meet with School Advisory Committee to provide opportunities for input and to review the progress towards our identified school improvement goals. At the closing of the school year, our Title I Coordinator hosts a Critical Needs Assessment meeting, where all parents, community, and staff are invited to attend. During these meetings we discuss our current progress towards our identified goals, and we brainstorm possible goals and strategies to implement for the upcoming school year. During each of these meetings we also take time to review the input from parents, staff and students via the various surveys completed throughout the year.

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))

Administration meets weekly with staff to review student achievement data. During these meetings we review the progress being made towards each of the identified goals in our school improvement plan. Additionally, when we host Principal Chat meetings and SAC meetings, we review our progress with both the implementation and the progress being made. Finally, our Literacy Leadership team meets monthly to discuss ELA student achievement and instruction and how it is supporting our SIP goals. We then discuss what adjustments can be made to ensure we are utilizing evidence based ELA strategies to support these goals, thus maximizing ELA achievement. We also analyze the data and adjust our SIP goals if needed, ensuring we are continuing to focus on the the priority needs of our school.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	54%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL)* Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B

	2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

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	17	14	2	8	7	10	9	0	0	67	
One or more suspensions	2	3	3	6	5	3	12	0	0	34	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	3	5	0	0	0	0	8	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	5	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	12	22	15	17	0	0	66	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	15	41	26	15	0	0	97	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	8	14	24	19	6	19	0	0	94	

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	2	6	3	9	12	8	12	0	0	52

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	7	9	1	6	2	1	0	0	0	26
Students retained two or more times	0	1	0	0	0	0	6	0	0	7

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	26	19	11	15	14	9	21	0	0	115	
One or more suspensions	2	0	2	1	3	5	5	0	0	18	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
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		

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	2	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	5

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	7	7	1	6	4	2	1	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	3

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	26	19	11	15	14	9	21	0	0	115	
One or more suspensions	2	0	2	1	3	5	5	0	0	18	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
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		

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	2	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	5

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	7	7	1	6	4	2	1	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	3

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*	55	58	53	60	61	56	55		
ELA Learning Gains				59			52		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				46			51		
Math Achievement*	48	58	59	59	49	50	57		
Math Learning Gains				56			45		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				46			50		
Science Achievement*	70	58	54	55	60	59	46		
Social Studies Achievement*					64	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					56	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		54	59				56		

* 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	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	233
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	54
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	381
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
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	30	Yes	2	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	41			
HSP	64			
MUL	48			
PAC				

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%
WHT	62			
FRL	55			

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	35	Yes	1	
ELL	40	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	45			
HSP	51			
MUL	52			
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	52			

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	55			48			70					
SWD	28			29			43				4	
ELL	10			50							2	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	42			23			75				4	
HSP	57			58			69				4	

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
MUL	52			33			60				3	
PAC												
WHT	60			55			71				4	
FRL	51			46			67				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	60	59	46	59	56	46	55					
SWD	39	41	28	42	42	30	24					
ELL	35	47	36	45	47	30						
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	55	53	28	33	52	48	43					
HSP	56	64	55	56	51	33	42					
MUL	61	61		49	48	40						
PAC												
WHT	64	60	45	73	62	57	66					
FRL	57	57	46	54	51	49	50					

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	55	52	51	57	45	50	46					56
SWD	29	43	43	38	55	61	17					
ELL	29	42		35	39		10					56
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	41	43	36	35	31		24					
HSP	53	43	62	54	47	46	18					60
MUL	53	41		39	29		70					
PAC												
WHT	62	60	56	71	53	67	71					

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
FRL	51	53	50	50	46	56	43					

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	62%	59%	3%	54%	8%
04	2023 - Spring	45%	61%	-16%	58%	-13%
06	2023 - Spring	56%	61%	-5%	47%	9%
03	2023 - Spring	60%	56%	4%	50%	10%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	59%	67%	-8%	54%	5%
03	2023 - Spring	67%	60%	7%	59%	8%
04	2023 - Spring	31%	61%	-30%	61%	-30%
05	2023 - Spring	41%	55%	-14%	55%	-14%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	67%	57%	10%	51%	16%

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.

Our fourth grade math data showed the lowest performance at 31% proficiency. We had two vacancies at the grade level and multiple substitutes during the first semester of school. After hiring one teacher, we collapsed the remaining vacant class which contributed to higher class sizes in the three remaining classes for the remainder of the year.

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

Our fourth grade math data showed the greatest decline of 29% from the 2021-2022 school year. During the first semester of school we had two fourth grade teachers resign leaving 2 classes with vacancies and multiple substitutes. After hiring one teacher, we collapsed the remaining classroom which contributed to higher class sizes in the three remaining classes for the remainder of the year.

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.

Our fourth grade math proficiency was 31% whereas the state had 61% proficiency. This data component had the greatest gap by 30%. During the first semester of school we had two teachers resign leaving 2 classes with vacancies and multiple substitutes. After hiring one teacher, we collapsed the remaining vacant classroom which contributed to higher class sizes in the three remaining classes for the remainder of the year.

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

For the 2023 school year, our science scores showed the most improvement with 12% gains and a 67% proficiency. This year, 5th grade departmentalized and only one teacher taught science. Penda was monitored by administration weekly to be sure students were having the opportunity to review third and fourth grade benchmarks and practice the fifth grade benchmarks.

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

1. Percentage of students scoring Level 1 in Math.
2. Number of students who are substantially deficient in Reading

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

1. SWD
2. ELL
3. Reading proficiency gains
4. Math proficiency gains
5. Learning gains

Area of Focus

(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a 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.

Our 2022 SWD data from FSA evidenced a decline in learning gains in both ELA and Math from the 2021 FSA. Our SWD students showed a decline in ELA gains from 43% to 28%, while in Math the SWD's declined from 61% to 30% from 2021 to 2022. Our SWD proficiency rate for the 22/23 school year was 29%, being identified for additional targeted support and improvement (ATSI).

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our students with disabilities will increase their overall proficiency in ELA from 29% to 42% and from 29% to 42% in Math. We will also increase our SWD learning gains from 28% to 50% in ELA and from 30% to 50% in math.

Monitoring:

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

Outcomes will be measured using the district Benchmark quarterly assessments, iReady diagnostics, FAST, and STAR assessments. General Ed and ESE teachers, along with the leadership team, will monitor student growth with both the grade level benchmarks and the identified IEP goals, and through progress monitoring of intervention instruction. Educators will meet with the leadership team bi-weekly to review the progress of our SWD students and to determine appropriate evidenced-based practices to support student achievement, guided by the Decision Tree. IEP services will also be monitored, ensuring the needs match the services throughout the year, making data driven revisions as needed. We will utilize a bottom quartile data wall, which will include many of our ESE students, ensuring a whole school view for all. This data will be a part of our ongoing MTSS/Data chat bi-weekly discussions, followed by evidence based next steps.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Victoria Finsted (finsted.victoria@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.)

ESE resource teachers will collaboratively plan with the general education teachers each marking period to create high quality plans that will support the needs of all students in the general education setting. All teachers, including self-contained ESE teachers, will use BEST benchmarks to provide on grade level differentiated instruction. Each teacher will ensure that students have opportunities to engage in text at or above their grade level accompanied by direct, explicit, multi-sensory instruction to support the learning needs. Small group differentiated instruction will be provided during Tier 1 instruction and T2/T3 small group supports will be provided based on individual needs. Metacognitive strategies and scaffolded supports will be utilized across all tiers, ensuring grouping is fluid based on student need and driven by the data. Kagan strategies will be utilized throughout the tiers to ensure all students are engaged.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students with disabilities need ongoing opportunities to engage in complex text and rigorous tasks accompanied by direct and explicit evidenced-based multi-sensory instructional practices to target all learners. Utilizing the MTSS process and data chats to ensure all gaps are being filled, both in the general education setting and in the resource and self-contained settings, will be of high importance. Providing these evidence-based strategies that are aligned with our BEST benchmarks and Science of Reading

(SOR), will ensure that every ESE student will have an equal opportunity to work toward grade level proficiency.

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.

- 1 ESE services and accommodations will be identified and provided for each SWD and will be monitored via the MTSS process.
2. Collaborative planning with all teachers and administrators supported by the literacy coach, who is ESE certified. (T)
3. Hold bi-weekly data meetings to review the progress of each subgroup and plan interventions, emphasizing individual needs driven by data.
4. Provide tutoring after school with ASP and ESSER funds.
5. Provide daily on grade level differentiated instruction that are SOR aligned along with small group interventions.
6. ESE students will be progress monitored bi-weekly using progress monitoring determined in MTSS and guided by the decision tree.
7. Ensure that IEP services match the needs of the students during MTSS.
8. Provide PD to ensure instruction is direct, explicit, and multi-sensory (T).
9. Provide small group Magnetic training for an additional 30 minutes per day in grades K-2.

Person Responsible: Victoria Finsted (finsted.victoria@brevardschools.org)

By When: Student achievement will be reviewed after each diagnostic and benchmark assessment, as well as bi-weekly. The expectation is that goals will be achieved by the end of the year.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

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.

Based on our ESSA data, we will focus on proficiency and learning gains of our ELL subgroup. Our ELL students had proficiency levels at 22% in 2023 in ELA, which was a decline from 35% in 2022 and below 41%, being identified for additional targeted support and improvement (ATSI). Our ELL subgroup's learning gains in ELA in 2022 was 47%, which was an increase from 42% in 2021. In math, our ELL subgroup's proficiency was 33% in 2023, which was a decline from 45% in 2022. The ELL math learning gains was 47% in 2022, which was an increase from 39% in 2021. Due to our proficiency being below 41% in both reading and math, we have been identified for additional targeted support and improvement (ATSI).

Measurable Outcome:

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

Our ELL subgroup will increase their ELA proficiency from 22% to 42%. In addition, they will increase their ELA learning gains from 47% in 2022 to 57% in 2024. In math, our ELL subgroup will increase their proficiency from 33% in 2023 to 42% in 2024. In addition, they will increase their math learning gains from 47% in 2022 to 57% in 2024.

Monitoring:

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

Outcomes will be measured using the following assessments during bi-weekly MTSS/data chats, ORF, PSI, PASI, STAR, and FAST progress monitoring measures, Iready diagnostics, and required Benchmark Advance/SAVVAS assessments. In addition, educators will use various formative assessments to continually monitor student achievement on an ongoing basis. Educators will consult with the leadership team bi-weekly to analyze data and determine evidence-based practices to drive instruction. Specific ELL strategies will be discussed and implemented, if necessary. Evidence based Tier 2/3 instruction will be implemented, using the decision tree to make informed instructional decisions via the MTSS process. Strategies on how to increase learning gains will be discussed on an ongoing basis throughout the year during PLC's and data chats on a bi-weekly basis, specific to ELL students. Regular walk throughs and classroom visits will be implemented to ensure there is follow through of discussed strategies and evidence based instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cristina Meyer (meyer.cristina@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.)

Teachers will collaboratively plan ELA instruction by utilizing BPS created unit plans, analysis sheets, BEST benchmark curriculum, and best practices in literacy instruction in all tiers guided by the district decision tree. Teachers will use BEST benchmarks, which are aligned with the Science of Reading. Sixth grade teachers will use district adopted curriculum specific to their grade level, SAVVAS My Perspectives. Teachers will ensure their students have opportunities to engage with text at or above grade level and respond to higher order questions and will use Science of Reading knowledge, Iready, and other evidence-based instructional practices guided by the decision tree and by the data to fill in gaps. Small group instruction will be utilized regularly to differentiate instruction across all tiers. Specific ELL strategies, including visuals and scaffolded instruction, will be evident during regular walk-through's. Kagan Strategies will be utilized to maximize classroom engagement and build community.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

ELL Students need ongoing opportunities to engage with complex text and rigorous tasks. They need a strong foundation in phonemic awareness and phonics in order to achieve more complex literacy tasks. Evidence-based instructional practices need to target all learners, utilizing the MTSS process and data chats to ensure all gaps are being filled both inside and outside the reading block. Benchmark Advance/SAVVAS curriculum, aligning with the Science of Reading, will be utilized to ensure that all learners have equal access to on grade level content for the entire reading block, guided by district unit plans. Utilizing higher order questions, Iready, SOR knowledge, and small and whole group equitable instruction will ensure we are working toward our targeted goals, ensuring we are incorporating scaffolds, visuals, and other ELL strategies decided upon during our bi-weekly data chats. This will ensure we can increase the achievement and learning gains of our ELL population.

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.

1. Teachers will collaboratively plan with administration and the literacy coach to ensure rigorous and differentiated reading instruction is implemented, appropriate evidence-based interventions are identified, and visuals and scaffolds are utilized with our ELL population. (T)
2. Teachers will document ELL accommodations on the ELL accommodations checklist and keep it in their planbook or data binder.
3. Small group differentiated instruction will be implemented in the core as well as through T2/T3 intervention, incorporating ELL strategies as discussed at data chats.
- 4 ELL student will be assigned a mentor from the school to goal set and monitor their individual progress toward learning goals.
5. Teachers will utilize Kagan Cooperative Structures with their instruction to support the positive learning environment.
6. Professional development focused on ELL strategies and instruction will be provided.
7. Students will utilize Imagine Learning and Literacy weekly to develop their language acquisition and to support their achievement.

Person Responsible: Cristina Meyer (meyer.cristina@brevardschools.org)

By When: 57% learning gains and 42% proficiency will be achieved by the end of the year.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**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.

In the 2022/23 school year there were 162 discipline referrals submitted. Our two highest discipline codes were physical aggression one sided (52) and willful disobedience/insubordination (35). Breaking down the data of the physical aggression one-sided, 14 students were SWD and 1 student is both SWD and ELL monitoring. Under willful disobedience, 8 students were SWD and 0 students were ELL.

Measurable Outcome:

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

McAuliffe will decrease physical aggression one-sided and willful disobedience/insubordination by 5% through implementing class culture building when opening the door and greeting students at 7:45, mentorship, Wellness Wednesdays, and Kagan cooperative learning strategies in the classrooms.

Monitoring:

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

Administration will review quarterly referral reports to identify students who are at risk. Those identified will be provided with a mentor within the school and their progress both behaviorally and academically will be reviewed during MTSS/data team meetings bi-weekly. Early warning indicators within Performance Matters will be analyzed each quarter to ensure that all students needing behavioral support and or interventions are identified and addressed in a timely manner. The administration will regularly walk through classrooms to ensure cooperative learning and culture building is being implemented.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

The administration will regularly walk through classrooms to ensure cooperative learning and culture building is being implemented using Kagan strategies, mentoring, and the MTSS/Data chat bi-weekly process.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

To create a positive culture in our school, it is critical to give the teachers and students tools needed to communicate effectively. In order to achieve this, our school will be providing monthly Kagan Cooperative Learning Strategy trainings for teachers to implement in the classrooms. Through mentorship, our students, especially those who are identified as SWD and/or ELL and with multiple at-risk indicators, will have a mentor who goal sets with them and monitors student achievement data bi-weekly.

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.

1. Certified School Counselor will work with grades PK- Grade 3 on life skills and character traits.
2. Classroom teachers implement culture building by utilizing Kagan strategies and doing a morning check in/greeting at the door at 7:45 to enhance a positive classroom culture and to be proactive in providing individualized support to those students evidencing a need.
3. Classroom teachers will be implementing Kagan Cooperative Learning strategies throughout their lessons, enhancing a positive classroom culture.

Person Responsible: Victoria Finsted (finsted.victoria@brevardschools.org)

By When: On-going throughout the school year, will decrease physical aggression one-sided and willful disobedience/insubordination by 5% by the end of the school year.

4. Professional development will be provided to teachers on specific Kagan Cooperative Learning strategies throughout the year. (T)
5. An Activity Teacher will provide morning announcements to include the McAuliffe Pledge. This goes along with our McAuliffe Way theme for the school: Be Kind, Be Safe, Be Respectful, and Be Responsible.
6. ELL students will have a mentor who goal sets with them bi-weekly. SWD students be monitored by the ESE teacher, in collaboration with the general education teacher and the reading coach.

Person Responsible: Victoria Finsted (finsted.victoria@brevardschools.org)

By When: On-going throughout the school year, will decrease physical aggression one-sided and willful disobedience/insubordination by 5% by the end of the school year.

#4. 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.

Based on our ESSA data, our priority will be to focus on the proficiency of both our SWD and ELL subgroups, as well as our overall ELA proficiency. Our SWD students had 29% proficient and ELL students had 22% proficient, both being identified for additional targeted support and improvement (ATSI).

All grade levels except for fourth grade scored above a 56% proficiency rate. Third grade increased their proficiency in ELA from the previous year by 2%, increasing from 58-60% proficiency. Our sixth grade went down one point, decreasing from a 57% proficiency to a 56% proficiency. Fourth grade decreased from a 65% to 45%, and fifth grade increased from 60 to 62%. Our area of focus will be increasing proficiency of our SWD and ELL population, additional opportunities in fourth grade to collaboratively plan with the literacy coach, as well as our overall proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on our analysis of achievement data and our needs assessment, we will work to increase our school grade by focusing on our student achievement. We will increase our percent of ELA proficiency from 56% to 65%. Our learning gains will increase from 59% to 65% and our lowest quartile gains will increase from 46% to 55%. Additionally, we will increase our proficiency of both our ELL and SWD population. We will increase our ELL proficiency from 22% to 42% and we will increase our SWD proficiency from 29% to 42%.

Monitoring:

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

Outcomes will be measured using ORF, PSI, PASI, STAR, and FAST progress monitoring measures, Iready diagnostics, and required Benchmark Advance/SAVVAS assessments. In addition, educators will use various formative assessments to continually monitor student achievement. Educators will consult with the leadership team bi-weekly to analyze data and determine evidence-based practices to drive instruction. Specifically, the data of the bottom quartile, SWD, and ELL data will be analyzed and monitored to ensure they are working toward proficiency. Specific evidence based Tier 2/3 instruction will be implemented, using the decision tree to make informed instructional decisions via the MTSS process. Strategies on how to increase proficiency and strengthen all tiers will be discussed during PLC's and data chats on a bi-weekly basis. Regular walk throughs and classroom visits will be implemented to ensure there is follow through of evidence based instruction across all tiers and all grade levels.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Victoria Finsted (finsted.victoria@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.)

Teachers will collaboratively plan ELA instruction by utilizing BPS created unit plans, analysis sheets, BEST benchmark curriculum, and best practices in literacy instruction in all tiers. Teachers will use BEST benchmarks, which are aligned with the Science of Reading. Sixth grade teachers will use district adopted curriculum specific to their grade level, SAVVAS My Perspectives. Teachers will ensure their students have opportunities to engage with text at or above grade level and respond to scaffolded higher order questions and will use Science of Reading research, Iready, and other evidence-based instructional

practices guided by the decision tree and by the data to fill in gaps and word toward proficiency. Small group instruction will be utilized regularly to differentiate instruction in Tiers 2 and 3 and to accelerate instruction in Tier 1, including an additional 30 minutes of Magnetic reading instruction which will ensure mastery of foundational skills for grades K-2.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students need ongoing opportunities to engage with complex text and rigorous tasks. They need a strong foundation in phonemic awareness and phonics in order to achieve more complex literacy tasks. Reading gaps in these area will need to be intervened as early as possible. Evidence-based instructional practices need to target all learners, utilizing the MTSS process and data chats to ensure all gaps are being filled both inside and outside the reading block. Benchmark Advance/SAVVAS, aligning with the Science of Reading, will be utilized to ensure that all learners have equal access to on grade level content for the entire reading block, guided by district unit plans. Utilizing higher order questions, Iready, SOR knowledge and PD, and small and whole group equitable instruction will ensure we are working toward our targeted goals.

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.

1. Use district created unit plans with the TRS and analysis sheets to drive instruction.
2. Provide small group Magnetic training for an additional 30 minutes per day in grades K-2.
3. Provide small group, data-driven reading support designed around i-Ready diagnostic, FAST assessments, and curriculum assessments and instruction. (T)
- 4.1-1 technology devices and hardware (T)
5. Promethean Board training
6. Provide ELA interventions (T)
7. Utilize literacy coach for support. (T)
8. Purchase Accelerated Reader for grades 2-4, STAR for grades 2-6, and Discovery Education DEX for grades K-6. (T)
9. Planning with Literacy Coach, Title I personnel (T)
10. Hold bi-weekly data meetings to review the progress of each subgroup and plan interventions, emphasizing the needs of our SWD and ELL students.
11. Provide tutoring after school with ASP and ESSER funds.
12. Provide tutoring to our bottom 15-25% first graders in ELA utilizing RAISE funds.

Person Responsible: Glenda Mucha (mucha.glenda@brevardschools.org)

By When: Our area of focus will be increasing proficiency of our SWD and ELL population, as well as our overall proficiency by the end of the year.

#5. 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.

Based on our ESSA data, our priority will be to focus on the proficiency of both our ESE and ELL subgroups, as well as our overall Math proficiency. Our overall proficiency in Math declined from 59% in 2022 to 50% in 2023. Our SWD students had 29% proficiency and ELL students had 33%, both being identified for additional targeted support and improvement (ATSI).

We saw a decline in grade level proficiency data as well. Students in fourth grade proficiency declined from 60% in 2022 to 31% in 2023. Fifth grade proficiency declined from 54% in 2022 to 41% in 2023 and in sixth grade proficiency was down from 60% to 59% in 2023. Our third grade was the only grade level to increase proficiency from 61% in 2021 to 67% in 2023. Our area of focus will be increasing proficiency of our SWD and ELL population, as well as our overall proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Based on the analysis of our math data, we will increase the proficiency levels from 50% to 60%. We will increase the increase the proficiency levels for our SWD subgroup from 29% to 42% and our proficiency for our ELL subgroup from 33% to 42%.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers will use the data from PM and FAST three times a year and the iReady Math diagnostic assessment two times a year to monitor the progress of students in Math. This data will be used to determine appropriate intervention groups needed to support outcomes for all students and to build a strong Tier 1. District assessments will be utilized at the conclusion of each unit to monitor attainment of the standards taught.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Victoria Finsted (finsted.victoria@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.)

Teachers will utilize the district adopted math curriculum in math instruction K-12 when designing lessons to implement in the classroom. Specifically encouraging discussion presenting and comparing multiple solutions and when assessing student understanding. Additionally they will provide intervention with in the math block to support the needs of students as evidenced by observation and district/state assessments.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Presenting and comparing multiple solutions in math is key to developing student understanding. Teacher encouragement for student discussion affords students the opportunity to explore their learning and to express their mathematical reasoning, Best Practices in math instruction and the IRIS Center for research outlines the benefits of presenting math in multiple ways. These Best Practices are shown to significantly increase a child's procedural flexibility conceptual knowledge and procedural knowledge.

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.

1. Provide teachers with substitutes to collaboratively plan instruction each nine week with administration and math resource support (T).
2. Utilize iReady resources to individualize supports in the classroom.
3. Daily exit slips will be used at the conclusion of each math lesson to determine next best steps to meet individual student needs.
4. Provide math interventions in a small group setting on a daily basis.
5. Provide individualized math practice utilizing the iReady math instructional path requirement at each grade level.
6. Promote cooperative learning and lesson engagement by incorporating Kagan Structures in the math lessons daily. (T)
7. Fund professional development in Kagan and other Math based trainings. (T)
8. Utilize ESSER and ASP funds to provide tutoring targeted to support the ELL and SWD subgroup.
9. Meet monthly with the ESE teachers to review the progress made for each student within the SWD subgroup.

Person Responsible: Victoria Finsted (finsted.victoria@brevardschools.org)

By When: Math achievement will be monitored bi-weekly during MTSS meetings and during monthly meetings with ESE teachers.

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)).

Every year, the leadership team comes together and analyzes the entire school's student achievement, each grade level's achievement, each subgroup's achievement and learning gains, and each specific student's achievement and learning gains. Additionally, we analyze behavior, attendance, and school culture data. Once we have identified our school's greatest deficit areas as compared to each other, we also compare them to prior year's historical data. If we see that a specific area has historically been low, we know that this is where our investments are most needed. As a leadership team, we have collaborative conversations about what factors could have contributed to any trends. We then rank our three areas of focus. Once we have collaboratively identified these three areas of focus, we discuss what purchases will make the greatest impact, taking into consideration the community and parent's input from SAC meetings, comprehensive needs assessment meetings, principal chats throughout the year, as well as the Youth Truth, the BPS parent survey, and Teacher Insight survey. Additionally, we look at the exit tickets from family and parent engagement nights. We also discuss any barriers that may have prevented any group from reaching their goals and what we have successfully done or can do about them. In addition, when looking at a particular group, we analyze even further to see if there were any particular students within that lowest need group who were reaching their goal and what they were getting that others may not have been, in hopes of replicating that success. Once we have collaboratively determined what our greatest needs are and where we want to allocate our funds, we then collaboratively decide how we can monitor fidelity so that the greatest impacts can be made. It is imperative that all funding decisions are driven by data, that all data is considered, and that all stakeholders have input. This will ensure that funding will go where the greatest need is and where the biggest impact on student achievement can be made.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

All K-2 grade levels had at least 50% or more proficient in the 2022/23 school year.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically related to Reading/ELA

In the 2022/23 school year, we had 54% of our students scoring below Level 3 in fourth grade. We had two fourth grade teachers leave mid year and were unable to find a fourth fourth-grade teacher for the remainder of the year, resulting in higher than desired numbers in the remaining three classes. It will be critical to support fourth grade teachers, ensuring they feel confident in their instruction and their ability and desire to increase student achievement in their grade level. For the 23/24 school year, fourth grade teachers will collaboratively plan ELA instruction with the reading coach, utilizing BPS created unit plans, analysis sheets, BEST benchmark curriculum, and best practices in literacy instruction in all tiers. Teachers will use BEST benchmarks, which are aligned with the Science of Reading. Teachers will ensure their students have opportunities to engage with text at or above grade level, respond to higher order scaffolded questions, and will use Science of Reading research, Iready, and other evidence-based instructional practices guided by the decision tree and by the data to fill in gaps, build topic knowledge, and work toward proficiency. Small group data-driven instruction will be utilized regularly to differentiate instruction in Tiers 2 and 3 and to accelerate instruction in Tier 1. Teachers will work to fill in decoding, word recognition, and fluency gaps in Tiers 2 and 3, while providing small and whole group instruction in knowledge building and small group instruction utilizing morphology lessons, aligning with the Science of Reading research, with guidance from the literacy coach and the Literacy Leadership Team. Teachers will utilize Kagan structures to build in culture building and to increase student engagement.

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

NA

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Based on our analysis of achievement data and our needs assessment ,we will work to increase our school grade by focusing on our fourth grade student achievement. We we will increase our percent of ELA proficiency in grade 4 from 46% proficiency to 56% proficiency. Additionally, we will increase our ELA proficiency of both our ELL and SWD population. We will increase our ELL proficiency from 22% to 42% and we will increase our SWD proficiency from 29% to 42%. Doing this will ultimately assist in increasing fourth grade's overall proficiency.

Monitoring

Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Outcomes will be measured using ORF, , PASI, STAR, FAST progress monitoring measures, Iready diagnostics, and required Benchmark Advance/SAVVAS assessments. In addition, educators will use various formative assessments to continually monitor student achievement. Educators will consult with the leadership team bi-weekly to analyze data and determine evidence-based practices to drive instruction. Specifically, the data of the fourth grade bottom quartile, SWD, and ELL data will be analyzed and monitored to ensure they are working toward proficiency. Specific evidence based Tier 2/3 instruction will be implemented, using the decision tree to make informed instructional decisions via the MTSS process. Strategies on how to increase proficiency and strengthen all tiers will be discussed during PLC's and data chats on a bi-weekly basis. Regular walk throughs and classroom visits will be implemented to ensure there is follow through of evidence based instruction and Kagan structures across all tiers and all grade levels.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Finsted, Victoria, finsted.victoria@brevardschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term “evidence-based” means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida’s definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida’s definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district’s K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Students need ongoing opportunities to engage with complex text and rigorous tasks. They need a strong foundation in phonemic awareness, phonics, and oral language in order to achieve more complex literacy tasks. Evidence-based instructional practices need to target all learners, utilizing the MTSS process and data chats to ensure all gaps are being filled both inside and outside the reading block. Benchmark Advance/SAVVAS curriculum, aligning with the Science of Reading, will be utilized to ensure that all learners have equal access to on grade level content for the entire reading block, guided by district unit plans and the district decision tree. Utilizing higher order scaffolded questions, Iready, SOR knowledge, and small and whole group equitable instruction will ensure we are working toward the full intent of every fourth grade BEST benchmark. We will incorporate scaffolds, visuals, and other ELL and ESE strategies decided upon during our bi-weekly data chats. In addition to providing evidence based intervention utilizing instruction such as the Iready Toolbox, 95% Group comprehension and decoding/ PA as needed, we will utilize other instructional materials listed on the Decision Tree for Tiers 2 and 3 to fill in gaps. This will ensure we can increase the achievement and learning gains of our ELL, ESE, and overall fourth grade reading proficiency. Additionally, we will encourage teachers to review the Read at Home Plan with parents to ensure parents feel confident in knowing how they can help their children, aligning with the K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan. We will also encourage parents to take advantage of the New World's Reading Program if their children meet the criteria, allowing them to have new books delivered to their doors monthly, as well as other district initiatives that support parents helping their students at home.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Benchmark Advance and the above intervention materials were selected utilizing the district decision tree, which have been proven to be evidence-based and align with our BEST Benchmarks and SOR. Utilizing these instructional materials, as well as providing extra support, PD, and continuing to make data informed decision utilizing the MTSS process, will ensure that fourth grade teachers have the tools to increase their ELA proficiency. Additionally, at home support will be put into place to ensure that parents have every opportunity to help their children succeed and have the needed resources to do so. This has proven to work in all other grade levels, including fourth grade in the past, evidenced by continuous ELA proficiency above 50% historically.

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
<p>1. Teachers will collaboratively plan twice during the 23/24 year with administration and the literacy coach to ensure rigorous and differentiated reading instruction aligned with SOR and BEST benchmarks is implemented, appropriate evidence-based interventions are identified, and visuals and scaffolds are utilized. (T)</p> <p>2. Small group differentiated instruction will be implemented in the core as well as through T2/T3 intervention, incorporating ELL and ESE strategies as discussed at data chats, driven by data. Outcomes will be measured using ORF, , PASI, STAR, FAST progress monitoring measures, Iready diagnostics, and required Benchmark Advance/SAVVAS assessments. In addition, educators will use various formative assessments to continually monitor student achievement.</p> <p>3. Teachers will receive training and will utilize Kagan Cooperative Structures with their instruction to support the positive learning environment and increase student engagement.</p> <p>4. Professional development focused on Science of Reading and how it aligns with ELA benchmarks and our Benchmark Advance curriculum will be implemented throughout the year.</p> <p>5. MTSS will be utilized bi-weekly to ensure data driven decisions are utilized to drive Tier 1 instruction and filling gaps as needed, guided by the district Decision Tree.</p> <p>6. Regular walk-throughs will be scheduled to ensure follow through of evidence based, differentiated instructional practices and support of the leadership team is evident by fourth grade teachers and students.</p> <p>7. Teachers will share the Read at Home Plan and other district initiatives that support parents in helping their children at home.</p> <p>8. The Literacy Leadership team will meet monthly (at a minimum) to collaborate on ELA best evidence-based practices and how we can continue to provide support to our fourth grade team, thus increasing ELA proficiency in this grade level.</p> <p>9. The Literacy Coach will provide support as needed on an ongoing basis, including PD, MTSS, coaching conversations, coaching cycles, modeling, and evidence-based recommendations.</p>	<p>Finsted, Victoria, finsted.victoria@brevardschools.org</p>

Title I Requirements**Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements**

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

McAuliffe's method for dissemination of our SIP include by are not limited to: school website, parent email, Blackboard messages, school classroom dojo, individual classroom dojo, parent involvement book (located in the school lobby), school facebook, SAC meetings, school marque, and Principal chats. The principal will hold monthly chat meetings for all stakeholders with an agenda sent out ahead of time identifying elements of the SIP to be reviewed. Our Title I coordinator will send our SIP link to the teachers to share on their individual classroom dojo. When SIP information is disseminated all parents have the opportunity to request the plan to be translated in their native language.

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

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Our school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission by holding monthly principal chats, sending weekly McAuliffe Monday memos, holding quarterly Success Celebrations, grade level family nights where we teach parents "home to school" connections and strategies to help increase student learning at home , thus increasing overall student achievement. We encourage student led conferences so that students are able own their progress and communicate their progress with their parents/guardians. Interims and report cards are sent home quarterly, PMP's are sent home for students who are working below grade level annually and are communicated monthly, IEP meetings are held at least annually, and IPST meetings are held as needed, Grades are updated weekly in Focus.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)

Our school plans to strengthen the academic program in our school by giving students ongoing opportunities to engage with complex text and rigorous tasks across all tiers of instruction. Students need a strong foundation in phonemic awareness and phonics in order to achieve more complex literacy tasks. Reading gaps in these area will need to be intervened as early as possible. Evidence-based instructional practices need to target all learners, utilizing the MTSS process and data chats to ensure all gaps are being filled both inside and outside the reading block. Benchmark Advance/SAVVAS, aligning with the Science of Reading, will be utilized to ensure that all learners have equal access to on grade level content for the entire reading block, guided by district unit plans. Utilizing higher order questions, Iready, SOR knowledge and PD, and small and whole group equitable instruction will ensure we are working toward our targeted goals. Teachers will collaboratively plan ELA instruction by utilizing BPS created unit plans, analysis sheets, BEST benchmark curriculum, and best practices in literacy instruction in all tiers. Sixth grade teachers will use district adopted curriculum specific to their grade level, SAVVAS My Perspectives. Teachers will use Science of Reading research, Iready, and other evidence-based instructional practices guided by the decision tree and by the data to fill in gaps and word toward proficiency. Small group instruction will be utilized regularly to differentiate instruction in Tiers 2 and 3 and to accelerate instruction in Tier 1, including an additional 30 minutes of Magnetic reading instruction which will ensure mastery of foundational skills for grades K-2. Outcomes will be measured using PSI, PASI, STAR, and FAST progress monitoring measures, Iready diagnostics, and required Benchmark Advance/SAVVAS assessments. In addition, educators will use various formative

assessments to continually monitor student achievement. Specifically, the data of the bottom quartile, SWD, and ELL data will be analyzed and monitored to ensure they are working toward proficiency. Specific evidence based Tier 2/3 instruction will be implemented, using the decision tree to make informed instructional decisions via the MTSS process. Strategies on how to increase proficiency and strengthen all tiers will be discussed during PLC's and data chats on a bi-weekly basis. Regular walk throughs and classroom visits will be implemented in both reading and math to ensure there is follow through of evidence based instruction across all tiers.

Teachers will utilize the district adopted math curriculum in math instruction K-12 when designing lessons to implement in the classroom, specifically encouraging discussion presenting and comparing multiple solutions and when assessing student understanding. Additionally, we will provide intervention within the math block to support the needs of students as evidenced by observation and district/state assessments. Teachers will use the data from PM and FAST three times a year and the iReady Math diagnostic assessment two times a year to monitor the progress of students in Math. This data will be used to determine appropriate intervention groups needed to support outcomes for all students and to build a strong Tier 1.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

When developing both the school improvement plan and our school based Title I plan, we take into account the specific needs of each individual stakeholder. As we determine what is most critical for student success, we utilize all resources to achieve our goals. Working with various outside programs and with local community partners, we are able to provide supports critical to meet success. Our strategic planning efforts and the utilization of available funding sources help our school to systematically attain our intended outcomes.