Meadowlane Primary Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Meadowlane Primary Elementary School

2800 WINGATE BLVD, West Melbourne, FL 32904

http://www.meadowlane.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.

Meadowlane Primary students will achieve life-long learning skills that will enable them to be productive and successful citizens in the future.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Meadowlane Primary provides a successful, cooperative learning environment where students, parents, staff, and the community maximize achievement through mutual respect, open communication, and self-discipline.

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
Smith, Deanna	Principal	Monitor student achievement data; initiate collaborative meetings with school-based leadership team and faculty; plan professional learning opportunities for staff; observe instructional practices and provide feedback to teachers; oversee school operations to ensure alignment with school improvement processes.
Mowery, Jessica	Assistant Principal	Monitor student achievement data; initiate collaborative meetings with faculty and grade level teams; plan professional learning opportunities for staff; observe instructional practices and provide feedback to teachers; ensure alignment of curriculum and instruction with state adopted benchmarks; manage the implementation of the School Improvement Plan.
Weber, Jael	Reading Coach	Monitor school-wide ELA data; support teachers with the implementation of ELA benchmarks and the analysis of student data; provide feedback to instructional staff that will positively impact instructional routines in the classroom; deliver professional learning opportunities based on the needs of our instructional staff and school; support the administration in the implementation of the School Improvement Plan.
Bailly, Carrie	School Counselor	Assist students with physical, social, and psychological needs; provide professional development to staff related to social and emotional needs at our school; facilitate Individual Problem Solving Team meetings; monitor Early Warning Systems.
Gacioch, Ashley	SAC Member	Build staff, family, and community partnerships through SAC and PIE; participate in the development of the School Improvement Plan; assist in the preparation of the school's annual budget and plan; build consensus with SAC members regarding school-based initiatives, instructional resources, and other school needs; support the school needs through partnerships with business partners and community members.

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.

The school leadership team met prior to the start of the school year to analyze schoolwide 2022-2023 data. During preplanning, teachers met in grade level collaborative teams to analyze their grade level 2022-2023 ELA and Math academic data. Based on a triangulation of multiple data measures from i-Ready, STAR, and district assessments, teachers and staff members determined which data components showed the highest performance and which showed the lowest. Collaborative discourse occurred among grade level teams and actions and strategies for improvement were developed. Parents, business, and community leaders will be provided opportunities for input at our School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings. During SAC meetings our School Improvement Plan (SIP) will be reviewed

initially and feedback will be considered from members. Each meeting thereafter, throughout the remainder of the school year, will allow for review of data related to the SIP and input from SAC members will be elicited to support our improvement efforts and goals.

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 leadership team will meet with teachers and staff following each i-Ready Diagnostic, STAR PM, and district assessment period. Progress toward our school improvement goals will be analyzed based on the data these assessments reveal and our SIP will be revised to ensure continuous improvement. In addition, teachers will meet with school leadership every six weeks to analyze student progress monitoring data from Tier 2 intervention groups. This data will determine next steps for intervention instruction based on student needs and will provide more intensive supports for students with the greatest achievement gaps. During this time Tier 2 groups will be revised based on the quarterly benchmarks set within the district Decision Trees. Students not demonstrating adequate progress will be referred to our IPST team for additional interventions and support measures. Furthermore, school leadership will complete frequent classroom walkthroughs to assess Tier 1 instructional practices and provide actionable feedback to instructional staff in support of our school improvement goals. Information gathered from classroom walkthroughs and observations will help support our schoolwide professional development efforts for instructional staff. Schoolwide professional development will provide instructional staff members with relevant research and instructional strategies that support increases in student achievement.

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 KG-2
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	43%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	47%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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)	English Language Learners (ELL) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
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	11	33	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	65
One or more suspensions	3	8	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Course failure in English Language Arts (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	

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	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5

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	24	31	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Students retained two or more times	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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
Absent 10% or more school days		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)		
Course failure in Math		
Level 1 on statewide FSA ELA assessment		
Level 1 on statewide FSA Math assessment		
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Retained Students: Current Year		
Students retained two or more times		

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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Absent 10% or more school days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide FSA 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	

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

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

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	0	0	
Students retained two or more times	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*		58	53		61	56			
ELA Learning Gains									
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*		58	59		49	50			
Math Learning Gains									
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*		58	54		60	59			
Social Studies Achievement*					64	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					56	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	68	54	59	68			53		

* 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	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	68
Total Components for the Federal Index	1
Percent Tested	
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				
ELL	68			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	67			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	59			

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				
ELL	68			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT				
FRL	58			

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students												68
SWD												
ELL											1	68
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP											1	67
MUL												

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
2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL											1	59

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
2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
All Students												68
SWD												
ELL												68
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												
FRL												58

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
2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
All Students												53
SWD												
ELL												53
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												73
MUL												
PAC												
WHT												60
FRL												55

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.

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.

According to the 2022-2023 schoolwide assessment data, STAR Early Literacy and Reading PM 3 showed the lowest performance. Only 56% of students in Grades K-2 who took STAR Early Literacy PM 3 demonstrated proficiency at the 50th percentile or higher. Only 55% of students in grades K-2 who took STAR Reading PM 3 demonstrated proficiency at the 50th percentile or higher. However, in analyzing i-Ready Reading D3, data indicates that 77% of students in Grades K-2 were proficient. Strands showing the lowest performance include high frequency words, phonics, vocabulary, and comprehension. Instructional staff feel that contributing factors to this performance include a lack of quality phonics instruction due to limited instructional materials available for use and low performance on state benchmarks that include author's purpose & perspective, theme, structure, central idea, and comparative reading.

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

According to three year trend data from i-Ready Reading D3, students in grade 1 make the least amount of growth from D1-D3 each year and the least amount of growth between assessment years. Trends show consistent low performance in the areas of phonics, vocabulary, and comprehension. Factors contributing to this low performance include lack of training in the area of phonics instruction, insufficient decoding activities that explore word meaning and focus on vocabulary acquisition, and the need for quality standards-based questioning that scaffold student thinking toward mastery of the benchmarks.

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.

There was no state data available for STAR Early Literacy, STAR Reading, or STAR Math assessments.

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

According to the 2022-2023 schoolwide assessment data, students performed the highest on STAR Math PM 3 with 63% of students demonstrating proficiency. This was equally comparable to i-Ready Math D3 which showed 62% proficiency schoolwide. All domains - numbers and operations, algebra and algebraic thinking, measurement and data, and geometry - reflected similar proficiency scores ranging from 64% proficient to 67% proficient. Last school year we implemented a new curriculum, Reveal, and teachers were provided district supports such as pacing documents, resources, enhanced professional development, and a district provided math coach that was at the school monthly to help teachers plan, model lessons, and provide feedback.

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

From the EWS data in Part 1, two areas of concern are students absent 10% or more days and the amount of students currently serving a retention.

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

1. Phonics instruction
2. Attendance
3. Vocabulary acquisition
4. Comprehension strategies

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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

According to our 2022-2023 final i-Ready diagnostic data, 17% of students in grades K-2 were not proficient in phonological awareness skills by the end of the school year. When analyzing further, this included 16% of students in grade K, 28% of students in grade 1, and 6% of students in grade 2 showing deficiencies in phonological awareness at the end of last school year. Additionally, 27% of students in grades K-2 were not proficient in phonics skills by the end of the school year. When breaking the data down further this included 20% of students in grade K, 31% of students in grade 1, and 31% of students in grade 2 not meeting end of year phonics benchmarks.

Data trends show that in 2020-2021, 16% of students were not proficient in phonological awareness and 31% of students were not proficient in phonics by the end of the school year. In 2021-2022, 14% of students were not proficient in phonological awareness and 28% of students were not proficient in phonics by the end of the school year. These trends show some progress being made in the area of phonics but students our phonological awareness deficiencies have remained consistent over the past three years.

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

Students in grades K-2 demonstrating phonological awareness and phonics deficiencies will decrease to 15% or below by the final 2023-2024 i-Ready diagnostic.

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

Teachers will meet every six weeks with administration and their grade level team to discuss Tier 2 intervention phonological awareness and phonics groups and determine next steps for instruction based on the on-going progress monitoring data. In addition, teachers will meet quarterly with administration and their grade level team to discuss Tier 1 phonological awareness and phonics data for all students based on the benchmarks set on the district decision trees. The Leadership Team will gather observational data via classroom walkthroughs and will determine teachers who need additional coaching support with delivering phonological awareness and phonics instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Deanna Smith (smith.deanna@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.)

In order to identify the precise area where instruction is most helpful to students and plan to scaffold, support, or accelerate learners, teachers must utilize features of effective teaching. Systematic instruction will ensure that whenever students are asked to learn a new skill or concept, they already possess the appropriate prerequisite knowledge and understanding to learn it efficiently. Explicit instruction teaches skills or concepts that allow for teachers to shift the responsibility of learning from teacher to student. In regard to phonological awareness and phonics, students need developmentally appropriate, explicit instruction that includes modelling, practice, specific feedback, and application to text. Scaffolded instruction will occur for students needing additional support to become more independent learners. Finally, differentiating instruction will allow teachers to be responsive to students' specific needs based on assessment and observational data.

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

If teachers provide more explicit phonological awareness and phonics instruction based on a multi-linguistic approach, students will build phonological processing skills that will help them better decode unfamiliar words and in turn enhance their vocabulary acquisition, reading fluency and comprehension.

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. School-based Literacy Coach will provide resources for professional development on standards-aligned reading instruction and the science of reading with a focus on the features of effective teaching.
2. Teachers will use the Benchmark Advance curriculum, district-created Overview Documents, i-Ready Toolbox, and supplemental resources to support phonological awareness and phonics instruction when planning collaboratively.
3. Teachers will enhance student learning needs by providing additional Tier 1 supports during small group instruction within the ELA block based on the benchmarks being addressed within the pacing.
4. Teachers will provide Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions outside of the ELA block based on student academic needs daily. Teachers will be provided time to discuss intervention progress monitoring data during Professional Learning Community meetings with the leadership team and will adjust instructional groups based on data.

Person Responsible: Jael Weber (weber.jael@brevardschools.org)

By When: The actions listed above will be ongoing throughout the school year and will be adjusted based on data analysis.

5. Teachers will utilize curriculum-based and district required assessments to support student mastery toward B.E.S.T. standards. They will be provided time to analyze ELA data and discuss ways to scaffold lessons and accelerate learning to support all students access to grade-level standards.
6. Teachers will monitor student progress in i-Ready Reading to ensure students are moving forward within their instructional paths and will make instructional decisions based on this data.
7. Instructional monitoring, feedback, and coaching will occur based on student data trends and observational/walk-through data.
8. School-based leadership team will collaborate to analyze data and tier teachers for targeted coaching support.

Person Responsible: Jessica Mowery (mowery.jessica@brevardschools.org)

By When: The actions listed above will be ongoing throughout the school year and will be adjusted based on academic data analysis and observational data.

#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.

Our 2022-2023 Early Warning Systems data shows that 65 students were absent 10% or more days for the school year last year. Further, there is no record of truancy referrals being submitted last school year, documentation of attempts to conference with parents regarding barriers to attendance, or interventions put in place for students demonstrating significant attendance concerns.

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

Our students absent 10% or more days for the school year will decrease by at least half. Systems will be implemented to closely monitor attendance and procedures will be put into place to support students and families with attendance concerns.

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

Attendance reports will be run monthly from Focus and monitored by our School Counselor. Data from these reports will be analyzed and action steps will be created as needed. Students demonstrating attendance concerns will be referred to IPST for additional supports.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Deanna Smith (smith.deanna@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.)

This school year we will prioritize providing strategies for chronic absences as outlined by Attendance Works. We will utilize three tiers of intervention where we will will focus on providing foundational strategies by promoting a safe and positive learning environment school wide, offering supports for students and families before absences begin affecting achievement, and implementing interventions that are designed to remove barriers for students who are at risk for chronic absenteeism.

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

We believe that if we have systems in place to improve attendance through supports for staff, students, and families, we will see a decrease in student absenteeism. Research shows that every day a student is absent is a lost opportunity for learning. Student attendance correlates directly with student achievement and the effects of lost school days build over time. In addition, student absenteeism may not only affect the student who is absent, but can also disrupt the learning environment in the classroom and provide added stress on the teacher who must provide remedial support to students who have missed instructional time. If we provide support for students and families to ensure students are at school on time, every day, student absenteeism will decrease and student outcomes will rise.

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 and staff will engage students and families in a safe and respectful school environment each day. When students are absent from school, teachers and/or staff will welcome them back in a caring manner. Teachers will ensure that families know and understand what their student is learning in school through class newsletters and information sent home.
2. Attendance data will be monitored monthly through Focus reports. Practices will be developed and staff will be trained on procedures for students absent several days from school.
3. IPST Meetings will be scheduled for students who have 5 unexcused absences within a 30 day period. Parents will be invited and supports put into place or resources provided to help improve attendance.
4. If needed, attendance referrals will be submitted to our District Attendance Specialist and services through outside agencies will be sought for students with chronic absenteeism.

Person Responsible: Carrie Bailly (bailly.carrie@brevardschools.org)

By When: This will be ongoing throughout the school year.