

Brevard Public Schools

# Delaura Middle 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>10</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>0</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>

## Delaura Middle School

300 JACKSON AVE, Satellite Beach, FL 32937

<http://www.delaura.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.**

To provide a positive school environment where students may develop their individual skills and talents and prepare for their future endeavors in high school and beyond. Our school culture will foster security, responsibility, respect, and achievement for all.

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

To provide a quality education in a friendly and supportive atmosphere.

### 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
Susin, Tina	Principal	Principal Susin oversees every aspect of the school and strategically utilizes her administrative team to support her extensive work. As a result, she is able to focus on specific and key areas to elevate DeLaura. These areas include developing department chairpersons into Achievement Team Leaders, ensuring each department administers common assessments, increasing student engagement by training staff in Kagan structures, and ensuring DeLaura is a school where ALL students grow and achieve. Principal Susin also manages the school budget and aligns all purchases with the school goals. She keeps families and the community informed of current school events, and collaborates with business partners and the Parent Teacher Organization. Principal Susin supervises and evaluates teachers in the ELA/ILA, Music, and Foreign Language departments.
Melendez, Josefina	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Melendez is the Assistant Principal of Curriculum and Instruction and she manages the school Master Schedule, Registration, the School Improvement Plan, Testing, Course Recovery, Summer School and the RTI/MTSS process. She oversees the Guidance Office, the Media Center, the Incoming 7th grade night, Open House, the Custodial Staff Recognition and Teacher of the Year process. Mrs. Melendez supervises and evaluates teachers in the Social Studies department, several instructors of the CTE program, and the guidance counselors.
Kohler, Eric	Assistant Principal	Mr. Kohler is the Assistant Principal/Dean and he manages all student discipline, attendance, and school safety matters. He oversees the maintenance of the school facilities and daily operations, Transportation, the Athletics department, cafeteria, and school technology. He also manages school field trips, the Employee of the Year process, Cafeteria Staff Recognition, and the 7th grade orientation. Mr. Kohler supervises and evaluates the teachers in the math and science departments.

**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.

Teachers and staff were instrumental in creating the School's Vision and Mission statements. In the next few months students in our gifted program (SALT) will be participating in a seminar course where they will provide their feedback on the teacher created vision and mission statements. The SAC committee will also review our plan and provide their feedback. The literacy coach also provided data and goals regarding our students in the Intensive Reading classes.

**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))

The school administrative and leadership teams will review the SIP plan after the administration of every FAST PM. The data team will lead the staff in data review and planning. All teachers will create common assessments to monitor and track the progress of all students, specifically the ESE sub-group of students. The Exceptional Student Education Team will track the learning gains of our students with disabilities after every marking period. Based on the data we collect at these times the administrative team will determine if additional steps need to be taken and recorded in the SIP plan in order for us to meet our goals.

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

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Middle School 7-8
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	No
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	22%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	21%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	No
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) English Language Learners (ELL) Asian Students (ASN) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35	23	58	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24	34	58	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	8	12	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	18	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34	44	78	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	15	18	
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	29	53	82	

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	26	45	

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	4	

**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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17	21	38	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5	12	17	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	8	10	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	18	19	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20	37	57	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18	16	34	
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	

**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	0	0	0	0	8	5	13	

**The number of students identified retained:**

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

**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									17	21	38
One or more suspensions									5	12	17
Course failure in ELA									2	8	10
Course failure in Math									1	18	19
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment									20	37	57
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment									18	16	34
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.									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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	5	13	

**The number of students identified retained:**

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

**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	51	49	72	50	50	70		
ELA Learning Gains				58			56		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				41			41		
Math Achievement*	81	55	56	80	33	36	73		
Math Learning Gains				64			49		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				58			42		
Science Achievement*	68	47	49	63	53	53	65		
Social Studies Achievement*	88	67	68	92	48	58	89		
Middle School Acceleration	85	69	73	85	36	49	83		
Graduation Rate					48	49			
College and Career Acceleration					71	70			
ELP Progress		47	40		72	76			

*\* 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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	78
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	392
Total Components for the Federal Index	5

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	613
Total Components for the Federal Index	9
Percent Tested	96
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	44			
ELL	74			
AMI				
ASN	95			
BLK	75			
HSP	78			
MUL	75			
PAC				
WHT	78			
FRL	70			

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	41			
ELL	71			
AMI				
ASN	77			
BLK	66			
HSP	68			
MUL	64			
PAC				
WHT	68			
FRL	57			

**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			81			68	88	85			
SWD	38			45			31	60	45		5	
ELL	57			78			64	73	100		5	
AMI												
ASN	91			96			94		100		4	
BLK	77			73			47	93	85		5	
HSP	68			84			66	94	79		5	
MUL	71			74			67	79	83		5	
PAC												
WHT	69			81			68	88	85		5	
FRL	63			74			51	83	77		5	

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	72	58	41	80	64	58	63	92	85			
SWD	30	46	40	35	43	39	23	69	43			
ELL	59	60		70	75		50	92	90			
AMI												
ASN	71	73	64	79	67		71	100	91			
BLK	48	56		62	76			86				
HSP	64	56	42	74	69	65	53	91	94			
MUL	71	39	43	78	56	38	70	93	84			
PAC												
WHT	75	59	39	81	63	57	65	92	85			
FRL	57	41	31	68	56	51	48	86	76			

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	70	56	41	73	49	42	65	89	83			
SWD	27	34	36	34	37	29	19	70	50			
ELL	43	69		68	47			85				
AMI												
ASN	77	71		93	69		80	75	100			
BLK	39	40		34	28		35	73	70			
HSP	66	62	45	65	46	52	50	83	80			
MUL	71	49		60	42	30	63	81	70			
PAC												
WHT	72	56	43	76	49	42	69	92	83			
FRL	49	47	35	55	42	39	44	70	76			

**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
07	2023 - Spring	68%	53%	15%	47%	21%
08	2023 - Spring	68%	52%	16%	47%	21%
06	2023 - Spring	*	61%	*	47%	*

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
07	2023 - Spring	80%	58%	22%	48%	32%
08	2023 - Spring	61%	38%	23%	55%	6%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	67%	48%	19%	44%	23%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	90%	51%	39%	50%	40%

GEOMETRY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	100%	50%	50%	48%	52%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	88%	69%	19%	66%	22%

### 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.**

The lowest data point is in the number of students who have scored a level 1 on the ELA F.A.S.T. PM 3. That number is 78, and last year it was 57. The 19-point difference may have occurred due to a lack of tutoring and support services available to students.

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

The data component that shows the greatest decline from last year is the number of reading deficient students. The current number is 84 students, and last year 0 students were reported. The steep decline may be a result of no one monitoring this group of students. Now that the students have been identified, we will put systems in place to monitor their progress and provide timely interventions and supports.

**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.**

None of the SWD scored a 4 or 5 on the science test. The State data shows that 5.7% of SWD earned a 4 and 3% earned a 5. The gap exists due to the SWD not having the academic understanding needed to fully comprehend what is being asked on the science test.

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

The component showing the most improvement is in our math data. Last winter we identified 30 students failing first semester, and only 20 students had a C or better. After students participated in the pull-out math program only 7 students were still failing by 3rd quarter and 43 had a C or better.

In PM 2 we had 42 students at level 1 or 2. We had only 5 students at level 3, 4, or 5.  
At PM 3 we had 27 students at level 1 or 2. We had 22 students at level 3, 4, or 5.

This improvement reflected in our ESSA data. In 2022 80% of our students were at or above grade level. This is an increase from last year, when we were at 73%.

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

84 students are identified as being deficient in reading. There is no data to show what the number was in previous years, but 84 is almost 10% of our enrollment. We need to identify those students and provide them with reading strategies to get them to improve.

Another area of concern is the number of students with 2 or more early warning indicators. That number last year was at 13 and now it is at 45. The administrative and school leaderships teams will disaggregate the data to identify the students and create a plan to support them.

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

These are not in a particular order:

- 1) Increase the academic achievement of our SWD.
- 2) Reduce the number of students who have 2 or more early warning indicators by at least 10.
- 3) Increase the academic achievement of our SWD on the Science test.
- 4) Reduce the number of students who are deficient in reading from 84 to at least 70.



**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 Student Engagement

### 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 Youth Truth survey January 2023 shows that Engagement is the lowest ranking category at 27%. This is 3% lower than the district average and 22% below a typical Youth Truth school.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

In January of 2024, we will increase our score by 3% in the category of Engagement. DeLaura will score a 30% in Engagement on the Youth Truth survey.

### Monitoring:

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

The school administrative and teacher leadership teams will conduct classroom walkthroughs focused on the fidelity of implementation of the Kagan structures. Students will be interacting and engaging with each other to learn the content and master standards.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tina Susin (susin.tina@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.)

The Kagan Structures are effective teaching and learning tools for cooperative learning, multiple intelligences, language learning, and emotional intelligence. Teachers will implement Kagan Structures in their classrooms.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Kagan structures are proven to raise academic scores and reduce the achievement gap. Using Kagan structures also improves students' self-esteem, social skills, leadership skills. and communication skills. Students will see learning as a positive and engaging experience in our classrooms. This will be reported on the Youth Truth survey in January 2024.

### 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. Kagan Professional Development Day 1, August

**Person Responsible:** Josefina Melendez (melendez.josefina@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** August 2023

2. Creation and distribution of Scottie Table Mats for cooperative learning

**Person Responsible:** Tina Susin (susin.tina@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** August 2023

3. Create and implement walkthrough feedback form and process

**Person Responsible:** Josefina Melendez (melendez.josefina@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** September 2023

4. Provide specific feedback on Kagan in the classrooms

**Person Responsible:** Josefina Melendez (melendez.josefina@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** Between September 2023 and February 2024

5. Plan for continued monitoring and professional development

**Person Responsible:** Josefina Melendez (melendez.josefina@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** February 2024 into SY 2025

*No description entered*

**Person Responsible:** [no one identified]

**By When:**

## #2. 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.

According to the 2022 EWS data, only 41% of our SWD are at or above grade level. According to the ESSA data, the SWD group scored the lowest in the Science Achievement category at 23%. ELA Achievement is the next lowest scoring category for this group, at 30% at or above grade level. The SWD is the lowest performing sub-group at DeLaura. A school with a positive culture will ensure all of its students are thriving, and at DeLaura we expect all students to succeed academically, including the SWD.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

By June 2024, 43% of SWD will score at or above grade level on all of their standardized tests according to the F.A.S.T. Progress Monitoring PM 3 data.

### Monitoring:

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

Data will be collected after PM 1 and 2. The ESE team will analyze and disaggregate the data to identify learning gaps for each student. General education teachers will collaborate with ESE teachers to target closing the achievement gaps.

General education teachers will collaborate with ESE teachers to analyze the results of common assessments that are administered every quarter to also target standards the student still needs to master.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Josefina Melendez (melendez.josefina@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.)

The MTSS team will assemble monthly to identify and monitor each student.

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Through the MTSS process, team members come together to analyze multiple points of data for each student. Based on the data points, the team will produce a plan that is shared with all team members, the student's teachers, and the parents/guardians. The MTSS process has proven successful for DeLaura in past years, and we will continue this work to make sure all of our students are successful.

### 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.

Meet with ESE team to analyze and disaggregate PM data after each test session.

**Person Responsible:** Josefina Melendez (melendez.josefina@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** After every PM test session. This will continue through May 2024.

The students' Individualized Education Plans will be reviewed by case managers to make sure all services are being provided to enable the student to demonstrate learning growth.

**Person Responsible:** Josefina Melendez (melendez.josefina@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** October 1, 2023

Meet with MTSS Team to establish process and procedures to identify students who need to be monitored.

**Person Responsible:** Josefina Melendez (melendez.josefina@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** October 1, 2023

ESE teachers will teach identified SWD in small groups to reinforce missing concepts. The small group instruction occurs after Tier I instruction in the general education classroom. Within the general education classroom the ESE teacher will pull a small group as a Tier II intervention.

**Person Responsible:** Josefina Melendez (melendez.josefina@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** May 2024

**#3. 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.

According to the 2022 ESSA data, only 41% of our 25% lowest achieving students in ELA demonstrated learning gains. This is our lowest scoring data category that includes all students. That percentage indicates there is still 59% of students who are not making learning gains. It is that population we want to target.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

By June 2024, the ESSA data will show that 43% of our 25% lowest performing students in ELA will be at or above grade level.

**Monitoring:**

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

The data used to monitor this focus will be the FAST PM 1, 2, and 3 data and walkthrough data from classroom observations.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Josefina Melendez (melendez.josefina@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.)

The RACE Strategy provides a simple and structured framework for students to follow when responding to questions or prompts. It helps them develop their writing skills by encouraging them to restate the question, provide a clear answer, support their answer with evidence, explain their reasoning, and summarize their response.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By practicing using their own ideas and citing specific examples from literature or other informational texts to support them, students will gain confidence in their ability to use text-based evidence in their writing. When asked to support their answers with evidence from the text, it becomes immediately apparent whether or not learners have grasped the big ideas. This is valuable information for teachers, who can then use that data to inform further instruction.

**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. Presentation and review of ELA data with faculty

**Person Responsible:** Tina Susin (susin.tina@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** August 2023 - Preplanning

2. Introduction of RACE Strategy as an evidence-based strategy

**Person Responsible:** Tina Susin (susin.tina@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** August 2023 - Preplanning

3. Development of walkthrough tool targeting implementation

**Person Responsible:** Tina Susin (susin.tina@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** September, 2023

4. Conduct walkthroughs and provide feedback to teachers

**Person Responsible:** Josefina Melendez (melendez.josefina@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** September 2023 - February 2024

5. Monitor FAST data from PM 1 to PM 3

**Person Responsible:** Josefina Melendez (melendez.josefina@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** September 2023 - May 2023