

Brevard Public Schools

Roy Allen 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	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	21
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	22
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Roy Allen Elementary School

2601 FOUNTAINHEAD BLVD, Melbourne, FL 32935

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Brevard County School Board on 10/24/2023.

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 serve every student with excellence as the standard.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Roy Allen will serve our community and enhance students' lives by delivering the highest quality education in a culture of dedication, collaboration and learning, while building leaders one child at a time.

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
Grugan, Kelly	Principal	Mrs. Grugan provides the school vision and direction using a shared leadership model. She oversees and monitors schoolwide data and curriculum. She communicates school-wide expectations and works with instructional staff to ensure that lessons are consistently focused on complete content that appropriately challenges students to meet grade level benchmarks. She ensures the learning environment is same and encourages students to take risks necessary to master content. She facilitates PLC's to ensure instructional planning is aligned and uses district approved curriculum.
Batman, Amanda	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Batman supports the principal in providing direction and vision by collaborating with all stakeholders. coordinates all aspects of elementary curriculum. She identifies and leads professional development that supports the goals of the school and provides feedback from classroom observations. She communicates school-based discipline to families and is visible on campus.
Franklin, Lorelee	Instructional Coach	The coach assists in the development and implementation of instructional plans focused on ELA that align to district curriculum goals. She will provide feedback from classroom observations and walk-throughs. She will develop professional development focused on school identified goals and model lessons. She will facilitate the MTSS process and monitor intervention data. She will mentor new teachers and support teachers that are working to improve student engagement.
Gelfond, Kami	Teacher, ESE	As the ESE contact, she will send monthly reports to monitor IEP compliance. She will work with the ESE team to monitor that IEP goals are being reached or modified. She will meet with the ESE team to review data and provide professional development to support school-wide goals.

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 will meet weekly to review data and keep focus on the school-wide goals. Grade level PLC's will be used to monitor classroom instruction and disaggregate performance data. The School Advisory Council will review state progress monitoring three times a year. The SAC committee will review survey data from the yearly parent survey, youth truth and insight survey. The data will be used to set goals for each school 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))

Evidence of implementation will include classroom walkthrough feedback, data team meetings, and weekly PLC's. All meetings will have planned agenda's to ensure the school goals stay the focus. Evidence on impact.

As a result of the new steps we are taking in instructional planning student achievement data will increase on progress monitoring assessments throughout the year. To monitor progress daily teachers will use exit slips and identify areas that need re-teaching. During data chats teachers will share student performance in the classroom.

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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	42%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	93%
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)
<p>School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.</p>	2021-22: B
	2019-20: A
	2018-19: A
	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	4	17	19	17	12	11	14	0	0	94
One or more suspensions	1	8	7	5	8	5	14	0	0	48
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	5	2	1	8	0	16
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	2	5	9	0	18
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	7	10	13	0	0	30
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	15	13	0	0	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

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	2	1	7	6	11	0	0	27

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	8	7	6	11	0	2	0	0	0	34
Students retained two or more times	0	0	2	3	2	0	0	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	3	9	13	13	7	11	8	0	0	64
One or more suspensions	0	3	2	6	0	3	5	0	0	19
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	6	8	13	18	0	0	45
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	16	12	19	0	0	53
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	5	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	3	0	0	2	3	7	0	0	15

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	7	3	6	2	3	1	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	3	9	13	13	7	11	8	0	0	64
One or more suspensions	0	3	2	6	0	3	5	0	0	19
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	6	8	13	18	0	0	45
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	16	12	19	0	0	53
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	5	3	7	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	3	0	0	2	3	7	0	0	15

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	7	3	6	2	3	1	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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*	56	58	53	61	61	56	61		
ELA Learning Gains				58			56		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				44			36		
Math Achievement*	60	58	59	64	49	50	65		
Math Learning Gains				65			75		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48			70		
Science Achievement*	46	58	54	47	60	59	52		
Social Studies Achievement*					64	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					56	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	46	54	59	70			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	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	274
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	57
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	457
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98
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	39	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	46			
HSP	45			
MUL	68			
PAC				
WHT	61			

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	47			

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	61			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	63			
HSP	60			
MUL	72			
PAC				
WHT	54			
FRL	53			

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	56			60			46					46
SWD	32			35			13				4	
ELL	40			32							3	46
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	41			50							2	
HSP	44			49			31				5	44
MUL	60			75							2	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	61			63			50				4	
FRL	51			52			33				5	37

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	61	58	44	64	65	48	47					70
SWD	28	42	31	38	46	43	15					
ELL	57	56		52	69							70
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	47	58		53	92							
HSP	58	63		64	77	55	40					64
MUL	79	71		68	71							
PAC												
WHT	63	57	42	63	58	44	49					
FRL	57	56	46	58	59	47	35					67

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	61	56	36	65	75	70	52					56
SWD	30	20	0	43	70	75	46					
ELL	50	85		46	79		50					56
AMI												
ASN	67			67								
BLK	50			50								
HSP	66	79		60	83		47					31
MUL	75	67		80	75							
PAC												
WHT	59	48	22	66	73	59	49					
FRL	50	47	36	56	71	63	47					53

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	49%	59%	-10%	54%	-5%
04	2023 - Spring	57%	61%	-4%	58%	-1%
06	2023 - Spring	48%	61%	-13%	47%	1%
03	2023 - Spring	56%	56%	0%	50%	6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	49%	67%	-18%	54%	-5%
03	2023 - Spring	68%	60%	8%	59%	9%
04	2023 - Spring	71%	61%	10%	61%	10%
05	2023 - Spring	48%	55%	-7%	55%	-7%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	40%	57%	-17%	51%	-11%

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.

Roy Allen dropped below the federal index in the SWD subgroup (35%) Science Proficiency (47% to 40%).

Multiple factors contributed to the need for improvement including:

- * Insufficient collaboration with professionals to increase student success.

- * Increased level of absenteeism
- * Staff Retention

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

ELA proficiency dropped 9% from 2022 to 2023. ELA in grades 5th and 6th were below district and state averages.

Teacher shortage contributed in both grade levels. Classrooms were above class size due to instructional vacancies. Behavior increased with lowered student engagement in the lessons.

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.

Science continues to trend downward as evidenced by the 2023 SSA with only 40% of Grade Five students scoring proficiently (-6.9% from 2022). In 2021, 52% of Roy Allen students scored proficient in Science and each year since there has been a decline. Science SSA scores have been greater than or equal to the Statewide average since 2020 until the 2023, in which the school score is 11% lower than the

state average (51%).

Factors include:

- * Long term effect of inconsistent standards based science instruction and pacing
- * Master Schedule with sufficient time for Science Instruction
- * Minimal use of supplemental program such as PENDAS

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

3rd and 4th grade math proficiency showed the most improvement from SY 2022. They scored well over the district and state proficiency rates. 3rd grade was 68% and 4th was 71%.

3rd grade moved to a team teaching model so teachers could focus on specific content areas.

4th grade taught all subjects but used the new Reveal math curriculum with fidelity.

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

Retentions and Level 1 achievement levels are areas of concern.

The number of retentions increased from 25 in 2022 to 35 in 2023.

Level 1's on FAST increased in each grade level 3-6 in ELA.

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

SWD Subgroup ELA Proficiency

5th grade Science Proficiency (3rd -5th grade science instruction)

1st Grade ELA proficiency on STAR

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.

If we collaborate with professionals when planning student growth and proficiency will increase. Our students with disabilities subgroup according to ESSA was 35%, which is below the threshold of 41%. 0% of students with disabilities were proficient in science in FY23. ELA achievement for students with disabilities decreased from 30.3 % in FY21, to 27.7% in FY22 to 18.6 in FY23.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Baseline data (FAST PM3) and where we want to be in FAST PM 3 2024
By January 2024, our students with disabilities will achieve 39% proficiency in ELA overall and 40% proficiency in Math as demonstrated by FAST progress monitoring 2.
By May 2024, our students with disabilities will increase ELA and math achievement and learning gains demonstrated by FAST progress monitoring 3, which will compile to a Federal Points Index above 41%. Specifically, our students with disabilities will achieve 50% proficiency in ELA overall and 42% proficiency in Math as demonstrated by FAST progress monitoring 3.
10% of SWD students will meet proficiency level on the 2024 SSA.

Monitoring:

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

Monitoring is a very important step toward student achievement and school improvement. Data will be analyzed and shared during PLCs that targets ELA and Math and Science achievement and learning gains. Subgroup data will also be analyzed to ensure that students with disabilities are making adequate progress. Classroom walkthroughs will ensure that implementation of standards-based instruction and differentiated instruction is occurring with fidelity. Feedback will be given to teachers after walk-throughs are completed.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kelly Grugan (grugan.kelly@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.)

Provide Scaffolding supports so students can work on grade level content.
Collaborate with professionals weekly to increase student success.
An evidenced-based strategy being implemented to improve academic achievement in the SWD subgroup is to implement the researched based intervention program Lexia (reading).
Every six weeks, data chats will be done with teachers and coaches to determine the effectiveness of intervention and small group ELA instruction that is targeted on SWD. Additionally another Instructional Assistant focused on providing support to ESE students will be added to our current staff.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Scaffolding supports provide temporary assistance to students so they can successfully complete tasks they they cannot yet do independently and with high rate of success. Teachers select visual, verbal, and

written supports until they are no longer needed.

Lexia will be utilized as Tier 2/3 intervention, which has a strong level of evidence to increase student achievement in reading. It is a systematic and structured approach to the six critical areas of reading and aligns with phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency and B.E.S.T. Standards.

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.

Schedule weekly planning with teachers to increase student success.

Teachers will participate in weekly collaborative planning sessions which have a clear structure and focus on B.E.S.T Standards, alignment of benchmarks, resources, student tasks, assessments, and transfer to quality instruction.

Through increased development and full day planning sessions, teachers will learn about the the K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-Based Reading Plan and the Science of Reading with a focus on the core components of explicit instruction and scaffolded instruction.

Person Responsible: Kelly Grugan (grugan.kelly@brevardschools.org)

By When: September 2023

Meet monthly with classroom teachers, administration, and the literacy coach to analyze intervention data and plan intervention groups for the following cycle.

Person Responsible: Lorelee Franklin (franklin.lorelee@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

Teachers utilize scaffolding strategies to support ALL students' access to grade level work.

Person Responsible: Amanda Batman (batman.amanda@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

Implement data chats with students after each STAR/FAST assessment to discuss areas of strength/weakness and set goals for improvement.

Person Responsible: Amanda Batman (batman.amanda@brevardschools.org)

By When: September, January, and May

Scaffolding PD provided in the 1st nine weeks of school.

Person Responsible: Kelly Grugan (grugan.kelly@brevardschools.org)

By When: October

Science of reading PD provided during 1st semester of the school year.

Person Responsible: Lorelee Franklin (franklin.lorelee@brevardschools.org)

By When: 1st semester of 2023 school year.

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

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.

For years, stagnant Science State Assessment (SSA) data supports the need to increase student proficiency. Our 2023 SSA plummeted to 40%, the lowest it has been in a decade. Our subgroup data also reflects a need for improvement in Science. Our SWD population had 0% proficiency. To achieve an increased overall proficiency of at least 50% (a 10% increase overall) on SSA, our focus will be geared toward utilizing Penda Science in conjunction with collaborative planning using the 5 E model for standards aligned science instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Fifth grade SSA proficiency will increase as a result of increasing teacher collaboration for standards aligned planning and instruction with fidelity, providing weekly hands-on Science instruction and by implementing Penda Science. In 2022, 47% of students in grade 5 were proficient on the SSA. The goal for 2024 is to increase students meeting proficiency to at least 50% on the SSA. Additionally, our goal is for the SWD subgroup to increase in proficiency by at least 10%.

Monitoring:

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

Monthly, teachers will receive a standards-based "Penda Class Mastery Report" detailing every student's progress towards standards mastery. Teachers will assign lessons to students that show deficits in skills. Those lessons can be attempted 3 times. The teacher will then know additional instruction needs to be planned and implemented. Monthly, this report will be monitored by admin and addressed in grade level data chats. Teachers will use the District Science Assessments to monitor student progress. Administration will monitor this data and support planning for Science instruction based on the data-determined needs. Teachers and admin will monitor students in the Lowest 25% and SWD subgroups specifically as well.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Amanda Batman (batman.amanda@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 5E Instructional Model is used to design science units that can be based upon cognitive psychology, constructivist-learning theory, and best practices in science teaching. The 5E cycle consists of cognitive stages of learning that engage, explore, explain, elaborate, and evaluate.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research states that "using this approach, students redefine, reorganize, elaborate, and change their initial concepts through self-reflection and interaction with their peers and their environment. Learners interpret objects and phenomena, and internalize those interpretations in terms of their current conceptual understanding". Penda Science will allow us to better support our struggling readers by providing inclusive differentiated science instruction. Individual learning gaps will be monitored and addressed.

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. Designate science time for each grade level and will be monitored by admin walk-throughs. Feedback will be given.
2. Utilize Penda Science to expand and monitor science knowledge. Make families aware that this platform can be used at home. Administration will create a visible classroom graph to incentivize students and teachers.
3. Data team meetings will occur on a monthly basis to review data (including Penda Science data) and decide on next steps. Particular attention will be paid to our subgroups.
4. Grades 3-5 will complete all District science summative assessments.
5. Science ASP will be offered to our 5th grade students.
6. Schedule instructional monitoring, feedback, coaching, and follow-up based on student data trends.
7. Teachers will participate in a 5-E Model training in the first nine weeks of school.

Person Responsible: Amanda Batman (batman.amanda@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

#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.

During preplanning, the staff reviewed the following surveys: Youth Truth Student Survey 2022- 2023, Parent Survey 2022- 2023 and the Teacher Insight Survey 2022-2023. From the results of these surveys, we found that we need to focus on building relationships with students, clear communication with parents, and providing more in school activities for parents to attend.

Although, we provide a rigorous curriculum within the classroom, we recognize the importance of developing relationships with students must come first and we will thrive to do this within the first month of school and continue throughout the school year. We aim for students to be able to reach and expand their potential and prepare them to become productive, responsible, ethical, creative and compassionate members of society.

Communication with parents is key to maintaining a positive school climate. We strive to provide parents avenues of communication that will involve one mode through the Focus Portal and student planners.

Teachers may use other modes of communication, as well. Together, we will all work as a team for students to be successful academically and socially.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The 2024 parent survey will reflect higher higher percentages in parents feeling welcomed into the school, and communication from teachers about how a child is performing.

2024 school year we will reduce the amount of retentions by 10%.

Monitoring:

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

Monthly newsletters will go home. On the back there will be a section for families to express concerns about school happenings. Administration will review these concerns and meet with families to improve the situation.

After PM1 below grade level students will have PMP created. All PMP identified students will be in a Tier II intervention.

The Leadership team monitors school climate data reported by students, parents and teachers annually. Additionally, attendance and discipline data are monitored quarterly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kelly Grugan (grugan.kelly@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.)

Intervention will be done for 30 minutes five days a week. Data will be monitored monthly and adjustments to interventions will be made. Students will be eligible for ASP before, during, or after the school day three days a week.

School connectedness. Students are more successful when they have a trusting relationship with at least one adult in school. Students who feel connected to school are more likely to attend school and give their best effort.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Collaborate with families to support learning and secure needed services. Teachers collaborate with families about individual children's needs, goals, programs, and progress over time and ensure families are informed about their rights as well as special education programs.

A school's environment—and the degree to which students feel connected, accepted, and respected—heavily influences students' academic achievement, mental health, and overall school success. Research reveals several essential components of school climate, which foster flexibility for schools and districts to align the unique needs of individual communities with explicit efforts to improve school climate.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

Monthly newsletters that include section for family feedback to administration.

Person Responsible: Kelly Grugan (grugan.kelly@brevardschools.org)

By When: Monthly

Student award ceremony per semester. (Grades K-6)

Person Responsible: Amanda Batman (batman.amanda@brevardschools.org)

By When: December and May

SAC - The school has established an infrastructure to support family engagement, such as a decision-making SAC council. It reaches out to families and the community early and often - not just when there is an issue. Seeking input from families on how the school can support students, and follow up with what's being done as a result. We also ensure that logistics of parent/teacher conferences and other school events enable all parents to participate (schedule to accommodate varied work hours, offer translation, and provide food and childcare). It is a priority for the school to intentionally engage with families of historically under-served students (e.g., by providing opportunities for small-group conversations with school leaders).

Person Responsible: Kami Gelfond (gelfond.kami@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

Academic Support Program offered to below grade level students.

Person Responsible: Amanda Batman (batman.amanda@brevardschools.org)

By When: October-February

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).

The leadership team meets often pre-planning week to partake in the needs assessment process for the school. This process allows the leadership and SIP team to identify areas in need of improvement and to develop a strategic action plan to make improvements in these specific areas. Federal, state, and local funds are coordinated to support the school's goals, thus impacting academic achievement. Goals, strategies, and action steps are always aligned to the most recent data and adjustments to school improvement are made monthly based on data and best practice teaching strategies.

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

D3 Star data from 2023 showed that 75% of 1st grade students scored below the 40th percentile. Weekly grade level planning with literacy coach and administration will focus on alignment of curriculum, student tasks, and assessment. Evidence of planning sessions should be reflective in mastery of skills on state assessments.

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

2023 FAST data shows that 3-5 grade students at Roy Allen did not have 50% or more students scoring below grade level in ELA.

3-5 grade proficiency dropped 9 points from the 2022 school year.

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

- Short Term – From FAST-STAR-PM1 to PM2, literacy achievement of 50% of students will increase by one or more levels.
- Long Term - By the Spring 2024 FAST, literacy achievement of 75% of students will increase by one or more levels.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

- Short Term – From FAST-STAR-PM1 to PM2, literacy achievement of 50% of students will increase by one or more levels.
- Long Term - By the Spring 2024 FAST, literacy achievement of 75% of students will increase by one or more levels.

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.

- PM 1, PM 2, FAST
- i-Ready D1 and D2
- Walkthroughs with feedback
- Benchmark Advance Assessments
- Intervention Data
- Intervention instruction to specifically target identified gaps

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Grugan, Kelly, grugan.kelly@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?
- Explicit instruction
 - Systematic instruction
 - Scaffolded instruction
 - Differentiated instruction
 - Corrective Feedback

Collaborative Planning: Supports consistent, high-quality implementation of Benchmark Advance

Allows for instructional strategies, resources, tools, and materials to be scaffolded and differentiated.

95% Group (Strong level of evidence): Instructional materials and processes are geared towards struggling readers at student's lowest skill deficit. Systematic and explicit instruction on foundational skills utilizing evidence-based practices

i-Ready (Promising level of evidence): Formative data to differentiate instruction. Helps educators accelerate growth and grade-level learning. Tools provide rigorous and motivating reading instruction.

Benchmark Advance: Implementation of high-quality ELA instructional materials with fidelity supports the explicit instruction of phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension

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?

All evidence-based practices/programs listed above address the identified need that is improving primary literacy achievement. The identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target

population as they are:

B.E.S.T. Standards Aligned

Aligned with the Brevard K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan

Meet Florida's definition of evidence-based

Systematic and/or Explicit

Geared towards struggling readers with an emphasis on Foundational Skills such as Phonological Awareness and Phonics

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
-------------	-----------------------------------

Literacy Leadership

1. Establish Principal-Coach partnership to specify duties and activities of the coach and support.
2. Collaborate with content coaches before/after each planning. (literacy and math)

Literacy Coaching:

1. Lesson planning with teachers, modeling, co-teaching, engaging in reflective conversations, and engaging in data chats
2. Prepare for planning process and send teachers agenda, items, tasks, and other resources in advance for them to complete the pre-work

Assessment

1. Teachers will use program assessments for foundational reading skills, along with DIBELS measures, PASI/PSI and/or Running Records to monitor reading skills development.
2. Define performance criteria based on assessment data that prompts Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 interventions for students not meeting expectations/benchmarks
3. Data chats will occur regularly around Benchmark Advance Assessments, i-Ready, FAST, and intervention OPM

Franklin, Lorelee,
franklin.lorelee@brevardschools.org

Professional Learning

1. Literacy Coaches will provide job-embedded PD and side by side coaching
2. Time is provided for teachers to meet weekly for professional development