

Brevard Public Schools

Ralph M Williams Junior 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	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	26
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Ralph M Williams Junior Elementary School

1700 CLUBHOUSE DR, Rockledge, FL 32955

<http://www.williams.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.

Together with our families and community partners, Williams provides every student with a relevant and rigorous education to prepare them to learn, grow, and succeed in all aspects of their lives.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The Williams community ensures that every crane learns, grows and succeeds.

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
Brancaccio, Paulette	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Brancaccio provides curriculum support for all teachers and assists teachers with classroom management and behavioral management implementation. She provides observation and feedback for teachers to improve the learning cycle and support instruction aligned to the Benchmarks. Mrs. Brancaccio will assist with the facilitation of the MTSS process insuring that the intervention process supports all students and will monitor the warning indicators for all grade levels and students.
Schroeder, Susan	Principal	Mrs. Schroeder supports student and teacher growth. As the leader of our improvement team, she sets the tone and provides guidance to ensure that the needs of students and staff are consistently met. As part of the planning for improvement process she meets biweekly with all teachers to review student achievement, behavior and attendance data. She supports teachers with professional development to ensure students receive high quality instruction that will enable students to achieve their highest academic performance. Through the observation and feedback cycle she works with staff to continuously improve instruction and build their professional practices. Mrs. Schroeder works with the Crane community to plan for upcoming projects and initiatives.
Lundberg, Christine	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Lundberg supports all instructional staff with implementation of the BEST standards. She provides support with the learning cycle through planning, modeling and providing feedback for teachers to improve core instruction and ensure that interventions align with student needs and ELA Benchmarks. She collaborates with the design of school improvement processes.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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

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

All stakeholders were invited to meet with the new school principal individually over the summer and were included in a survey to identify school strengths and challenges. The areas identified by staff as areas of challenge coincide with data points identified on staff and community surveys as well as student assessment data. School culture, and ESE services were identified by staff as the areas of needed improvement. During the first SAC meeting of the school year, our FAST data were shared with all stakeholders and the need to improve the performance of our students with disabilities was a noted area for improvement. Additionally concerns with 4th grade overall performance and 3rd grade math performance were identified.

Our focuses this year will be continuing literacy improvement with an intent focus on this year's fifth graders, (last year's fourth graders), reversing the downward trend of student math performance with a specific focus on our current fourth graders (last year's third graders), improving our student achievement within the students with disabilities subgroup, as well as overall improvement of school culture for both staff and students.

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))

SIP goals will be monitored throughout the year through our MTSS meetings, Impact (PLC) meetings with teachers, classroom walkthrough look-for data, as well as FAST and iReady diagnostic progress monitoring. Overall grade level data will be examined and there will be a heightened focus on the growth and performance of our students with disabilities.

Math quarterly assessment data will be disaggregated to ensure that gaps are addressed and students are making growth. Our math coach will conduct walk throughs with the leadership team with a focus on hands on manipulatives to improve conceptual understanding, and teachers will be provided grade level training and individualized coaching to improve their instructional practice and add to their toolboxes.

Teachers are expected to utilize exit tickets with their math instruction and use this daily data to plan for small group instruction and support.

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	36%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	41%
Charter School	No

RAISE School	No
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)* Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: A
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	3	8	6	6	9	6	0	0	42	
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	1	2	1	11	0	0	18	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	3	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	10	22	14	0	0	51	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	23	16	0	0	42	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	5	1	5	2	0	0	13	

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	3	1	1	5	0	0	10

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	2	0	4	0	0	0	0	0	6
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2

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	7	7	11	11	19	20	14	0	0	89	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	0	0	7	
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	14	8	10	15	0	0	47	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	20	15	14	11	0	0	60	
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	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	4	2	3	0	0	0	9

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	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	7	7	11	11	19	20	14	0	0	89
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	0	0	7
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	14	8	10	15	0	0	47
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	20	15	14	11	0	0	60
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	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	4	2	3	0	0	0	9

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
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*	55	58	53	62	61	56	68		
ELA Learning Gains				66			67		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				42			46		
Math Achievement*	55	58	59	62	49	50	65		
Math Learning Gains				70			55		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				48			32		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	68	58	54	57	60	59	53		
Social Studies Achievement*					64	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					56	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		54	59						

* 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	59
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	234
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	407
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	36	Yes	2	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	43			
HSP	47			
MUL	65			
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	49			

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	30	Yes	1	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	45			
HSP	62			
MUL	68			
PAC				
WHT	60			
FRL	50			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

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

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	55			55			68					
SWD	31			30			35				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	43			43							2	
HSP	41			52							2	
MUL	65			65							2	
PAC												
WHT	56			56			69				4	
FRL	43			41			65				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	62	66	42	62	70	48	57					
SWD	22	39	30	25	40	33	21					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	32	46	47	48	65	40	38					
HSP	68	72		55	53							
MUL	56	73		70	73							
PAC												
WHT	66	68	41	64	72	50	62					
FRL	54	63	44	48	63	44	36					

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	68	67	46	65	55	32	53					
SWD	33	52	29	30	42	22	20					
ELL	73			73								

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
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	38	50		49	43							
HSP	73	50		67	40							
MUL	65			65								
PAC												
WHT	73	72	61	68	60	44	59					
FRL	55	63		47	40	13	50					

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	67%	59%	8%	54%	13%
04	2023 - Spring	51%	61%	-10%	58%	-7%
06	2023 - Spring	62%	61%	1%	47%	15%
03	2023 - Spring	61%	56%	5%	50%	11%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	78%	67%	11%	54%	24%
03	2023 - Spring	46%	60%	-14%	59%	-13%
04	2023 - Spring	63%	61%	2%	61%	2%
05	2023 - Spring	62%	55%	7%	55%	7%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	72%	57%	15%	51%	21%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

Our students with disabilities demonstrated proficiency below the district and state expectations school wide. In addition, 4th grade reading and 3rd grade math scores were substantially below expected and school wide proficiency performance.

As a group 4th grade and students with disabilities continued to be substantially deficient in foundational reading skills. While this deficiency began with the pandemic of 2020, it has been compounded by being understaffed in our ESE Resource team, with only two teachers allocated to serve 7 grade levels with inclusive practice. Additionally, addressing the demonstrated needs as a tier 1 issue has not been consistent. Currently, our 4th grade students demonstrated 51% proficiency in English Language Arts significantly below both the district average of 61% and the state average of 59% proficiency respectively. Worse, our ESE students overall demonstrated 37% proficiency in English Language Arts. This is below the minimum state proficiency expectation of 41% for this subgroup.

Additionally of concern are third grade students' math proficiency. In 2023 all grade levels with the exception of 3rd demonstrated proficiency above both the state and district averages. Our third graders, however demonstrated a 46% proficiency rate in math which is significantly below both the district proficiency rate of 60% and the state proficiency rate of 59%. Third grade math deficiency could be attributed in part to the change of curriculum, as scope and sequence has been changed and prior knowledge gaps were present. This does not however, explain the discrepancy with district proficiency rates as the curriculum change was district wide. Additionally, our three year trend for mathematics proficiency is downward schoolwide, although overall proficiency leveled off in the 2023 school year with the percentage of mathematics proficiency schoolwide remaining at 62% repeating the 2022 school year proficiency rate.

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

Our students with disabilities subgroup continues to be below the minimum state proficiency expectation of 41%. We feel this is due to ESE personnel being spread too thin with only two resource teachers serving seven grade levels with inclusive practice. Additionally Tier 1 instructional practices need to be reviewed and consistently implemented to ensure that students are gaining content knowledge at a consistent rate.

Additionally, our third grade mathematics proficiency dropped from 55% in the 2022 school year to 46% in the 2023 school year significantly below the district average of 60% and state average of 59%.

Changes in curriculum could have contributed to this decline in performance. Again, Tier 1 instructional practices need to be reviewed and shored up with intentional use of manipulatives and exit tickets to ensure student conceptual understanding and application of learned skills.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

Our third grade students are 13 percentile points below the the state average in mathematics. This is a concerning as our three year data demonstrates a downward trend in schoolwide overall mathematics proficiency with a level off in 2023 with overall performance matching the 2022 performance of 62% proficiency schoolwide. Should this proficiency level not significantly increase for these third grade students in their fourth grade year (2024), and should current third graders demonstrate similar proficiency in the 2024 school year, mathematics proficiency schoolwide is at serious risk of a significant drop. Thus, mathematics instruction will be an area of significant focus school wide for the 2024 school year. Instruction in line with district pacing and sequencing guides, use of manipulatives to support student conceptual knowledge and review of exit tickets to ascertain student application skills and plan for further instruction will be mandatory in all classrooms. Though there was a change in mathematics curriculum that could have contributed to the low performance of our third grade students in the 2023 school year including a change in scope and sequence within the new curriculum this does not explain the discrepancy with district scores as the curriculum change was district wide.

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

5th grade Science scores demonstrated 15 percentile points of growth. Our staff invested time in utilizing the online resource of PENDA for science, and made a strategic effort to engage students in hands on science activities at least weekly schoolwide.

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

Our focus for the 2023 - 2024 school year includes our students with disabilities as this subgroup demonstrated only 37% proficiency in ELA substantially below the minimum state standard of 41% and also significantly below school wide proficiency of 61%. Our students with disabilities exceeded the state minimum standard of proficiency in Mathematics with 51% of students scoring a level three or higher, however this was still significantly below the school wide proficiency rate of 62%. Additionally, our grade 4 students ELA proficiency at 51% was significantly below our school wide proficiency rate of 61%, and grade 3 students Math proficiency was only at 46%, again significantly below school wide proficiency average of 62%.

Our EWS data demonstrate a need for intensive reading support for substantially deficient students. This will be supported by our schoolwide walk to intervention time and the use of explicit instructional tools to support the needs of these students. Additionally, we have added another Resource teacher to support our students with disabilities, many of whom fall into this substantially deficient category.

Additionally, attendance is an area of concern for many of our students who have substantial deficiencies in academic performance. Our Guidance Counselor and Intern will be a key component to improvement as they reach out to families to ascertain family needs and barriers to attendance and provide the supports to overcome these barriers.

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

1) Students with disabilities proficiency in ELA

This is an ESSA subgroup that is demonstrating proficiency below the state minimum standard for the second year in a row. We have added an additional ESE Resource teacher to provide more consistent services within the inclusive model for ELA. This will ensure support within the reading block as well as intensive intervention within our school wide walk to intervention.

2) Tier 1 Mathematics instruction

Our schoolwide trend in mathematics is downward over the last three years. In addition our third grade math scores fell significantly from 55% proficiency in 2022 to 46% proficiency in 2023. This performance is significantly below both state and district averages. We plan to utilize the skills of our Math Coach to

provide PD as well as weekly walkthroughs focused on mathematics with identified look-fors including consistent use of manipulatives to ensure student conceptual knowledge as well as use of mathematics exit tickets focused upon student application of concepts. Expectations will include daily review of exit tickets to set and improve focus of Tier 1 instruction as well as providing guidance for small group instruction and intervention groups.

3) Tier 1 ELA Instruction

Williams will continue to focus on academic vocabulary and student engagement to improve our Tier 1 ELA instruction. Professional development in the use of Kagan structures began in the 2023 school year and will continue in school year 2024. Kagan structures foster student conversation and collaboration and provide authentic opportunities for students to discuss content. Use of academic vocabulary throughout these conversations will cement student conceptual knowledge.

4) Positive School Culture

Opportunities for our students, staff and families to actively participate in the learning process builds enthusiasm and supports a positive school culture. We are working with our Parent/Teacher Organization to provide opportunities throughout the year for all stakeholders to participate in hands-on learning. This was kicked off in August with our first annual Hands-On Science Night and will continue with Literacy Night and Hands-On Math Night as well as other planned community events focused on fun and community building.

Area of Focus

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

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

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

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

Our SWD subgroup demonstrates the greatest need for improvement with only 37% proficient in ELA and 51% proficient in Math. The 37% proficiency rate is below the minimum state expectation for this subgroup at 41% for ELA and significantly below the schoolwide average proficiency rate of 61%. While our Math proficiency rate is above the minimum state expectation it remains below the school wide proficiency rate in Mathematics of 62%.

Measurable Outcome:

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

SWD are currently at 37% proficiency in ELA and with implementation of our SIP will achieve a minimum 41% Federal Index score based on grade level proficiency in ELA, and Math. Additionally, though Annual Learning Gains were not calculated for the 2022- 2023 school year due to the state assessment change, we expect 60% of our students with disabilities to make an annual learning gain.

Monitoring:

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

At the end of every PM cycle, the MTSS coach and administration will analyze and disaggregate the SWD scores. Walkthroughs will be conducted weekly to examine students' learning environment and experience.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Susan Schroeder (schroeder.susan@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.)

Inclusive practice for students with disabilities will be provided throughout the ELA/reading block. Students with disabilities will also receive daily intensive interventions outside of the reading block to support their learning gains.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Inclusive reading instruction has positive effects for all students. Inclusive practice exposes our students with disabilities to grade level curriculum and offers supports and scaffolding to ensure successful experiences and student academic progress. Hattie's research on instructional effect size shows that a RtI model demonstrates a positive 1.29 effect size and Interventions for students with learning needs demonstrates a .77 positive effect size. Providing both within the general education setting will set our students up for accelerating their learning and academic progress.

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.

Hire a third ESE resource teacher/MTSS coordinator.

Person Responsible: Susan Schroeder (schroeder.susan@brevardschools.org)

By When: August 10, 2023

Realign teachers with the highest need students. The students with the greatest need will be paired with the most highly effective teachers in ELA and Math.

Person Responsible: Susan Schroeder (schroeder.susan@brevardschools.org)

By When: This will be decided before the first day of school.

The ESE master schedule will be built on the needs of students' IEP.

Person Responsible: Susan Schroeder (schroeder.susan@brevardschools.org)

By When: The schedule will be completed by August 10, 2023.

Analysis of student progress and comparison of general education student rate of progress and that of SWD. Data to be analyzed includes weekly assessments and exit tickets, District quarterly assessments, FAST PM1, PM2 and PM3 data, as well as iReady diagnostic assessments.

Person Responsible: Susan Schroeder (schroeder.susan@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout school year. Monthly MTSS meetings.

Provision of additional intervention resources and training in the use of these resources to include the Comprehension Toolkit, Barton, iReady tool kit, 95% group materials and Lexia lessons.

Person Responsible: Christine Lundberg (lundberg.christine@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year.

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

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

The school culture at Williams Elementary has suffered over the last several years due in large part to four changes in administrative leadership over the last four years. The impacts of the COVID epidemic and changes to social and academic practices as well as these changes in leadership have had a negative impact on student performance data specifically in our fourth grade students and below, as well as our community involvement and staff satisfaction and retention. Additionally, Williams student enrollment is declining.

Our plans to improve school culture include a focus on staff unity through positive relationships, community involvement events and research into possible magnet school opportunities that will revitalize our school community and increase student enrollment.

Measurable Outcome:

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

70% of staff will indicate Agree or Strongly Agree on School Culture Indicators of the annual Insight Survey.

70% of parents will indicate satisfaction with school safety, school communication, office staff interactions, and participation in schoolwide events on the annual parent survey.

Youth Truth Survey school culture indicators will increase by at least 3%.

Attendance Rate will increase by 2%.

Discipline referrals will decrease by 5%.

Monitoring:

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

Student attendance will be monitored quarterly for improvement. Additionally teachers will reach out to the families of absent students after the second consecutive day of absence to inquire about student/family well-being and offer support.

Steering Committee meetings will be initiated during the 2023-24 school year and will be held monthly enabling staff the opportunity to voice concerns and viable solutions to school climate issues pertaining to campus safety, student behavioral supports, student attendance and enrollment concerns.

Behavior plan implementation and monitoring will have a team approach including teacher, guidance counselor, IPST chair and administration.

Community, student and staff participation in quarterly scheduled events will be monitored for increased participation and satisfaction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Susan Schroeder (schroeder.susan@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.)

Planned parental involvement opportunities

Evening curricular activities quarterly

Consistent support in behavior intervention strategies

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Hattie's research on effect size determines positive effect on student achievement of .32 for a positive school culture. Parental involvement has a positive effect size of .42 and our of school curricula

experiences indicate a positive .26 effect. Continued positive effects are noted with decreasing classroom disruptions at .34 and Behavioral Intervention Plans have a positive effect size of .62. Collectively the above evidence based interventions will support our student's achievement levels. Additionally the Crisis Prevention Institute notes that,

" A positive school climate is associated with a range of positive outcomes for students, staff, and entire systems:

Higher levels of attendance and engagement for students and staff;

Reduced teacher turnover;

Reduced bullying and violent behaviors; and

Improved academic outcomes."

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 all school staff individually to provide an opportunity for them to share perceived strengths and challenges with school culture and their ideas on improvement.

Person Responsible: Susan Schroeder (schroeder.susan@brevardschools.org)

By When: August 10, 2023

Schedule Welcome Back to School, School Family Celebration and subsequent quarterly school assemblies to celebrate student achievements and establish school unity.

Person Responsible: Susan Schroeder (schroeder.susan@brevardschools.org)

By When: August 30, 2023 and ongoing quarterly throughout school year.

Establish staff steering committee and advisory board to meet monthly to provide solution oriented problem solving to school culture issues.

Person Responsible: Susan Schroeder (schroeder.susan@brevardschools.org)

By When: August 10, 2023 through BFT representative to meet monthly ongoing throughout the school year.

Collaboration between PTO and school staff to initiate and plan quarterly curricular family involvement events beginning with our Hands On Science Night in August.

Person Responsible: Paulette Brancaccio (brancaccio.paulettea@brevardschools.org)

By When: August 10 for Hands On Science Night and ongoing quarterly throughout the year to include a Math, ELA and Learning Strategies Night.

Quarterly attendance reviews and student/family followup

Person Responsible: Susan Schroeder (schroeder.susan@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year.

Provide committee support to teachers for the creation of BIP's for students with behavioral challenges. IPST chair and Guidance Counselor will attend training on Behavior support strategies and BIP writing. Support will be scheduled at monthly MTSS meetings

Person Responsible: Susan Schroeder (schroeder.susan@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year.

Behavior Toolkit training for all staff

Person Responsible: Susan Schroeder (schroeder.susan@brevardschools.org)

By When: Pre-planning week, August 2023

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

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

In 2023, the overall proficiency stayed the same as the year before at 62%, however mathematics proficiency in our third grade students dropped 9% from the previous year to an all time low of 46% proficiency. This proficiency is significantly below the district proficiency rate of 60% at third grade and also significantly below the statewide proficiency in third grade of 59%. As a result, Williams Elementary will be focused on Tier 1 Mathematics Instruction schoolwide in the 2024 school year. Expectations for instruction include explicit instruction utilizing the I do, we do, you do model, use of hands on manipulatives in every lesson to improve student conceptual knowledge and tie learning to previous knowledge, use of exit tickets daily to review student successful application of skills and focus future instruction including Tier 1, small group and intervention groups as needed to ensure student proficiency. Our Math Coach will provide professional development to teachers in our IMPACT meetings and assist the administrative team in our look-fors for weekly walk throughs. Collaborative planning time for teachers will be protected. Additionally, quarterly district math assessments will be disaggregated and analyzed to further align instruction and support student learning through further Tier 1, small group and intervention group instruction.

Measurable Outcome:

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

3rd grade: Proficiency scores will increase from 46% to 60%

4th grade: Proficiency scores will increase from 63% to 66%

5th grade: Proficiency scores will increase 62% to 65%

6th grade: Proficiency scores will increase from 78% to 80%

SWD: Proficiency scores will increase from 37% to 41%

Although Learning Gains were not calculated for the 2022 - 2023 school year due to the change in assessment, we expect 60% of all ESE students will demonstrate Mathematics Learning Gains on the FAST.

Monitoring:

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

Weekly instructional walks during mathematics instruction with identified look-fors will be conducted at all grade levels with feedback provided to teachers. Look-fors include: consistent instructional modeling using I do, we do, you do process, hands on manipulatives tied to cementing conceptual knowledge and aligning new content to previously learned concepts, use of exit tickets and their analysis to plan for future instruction and student support. Data analysis to include FAST PM1, PM2 and PM3, as well as iReady Diagnostics as well as quarterly District Assessments will provide guidance on Tier 1, small group and intervention group instructional focus.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Susan Schroeder (schroeder.susan@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.)

Deliberate action from all stakeholders to utilize data-driven analysis to improve instruction and meet student needs is required to turn the downward trend of student proficiency in mathematics. Student data will be used to shore up Tier 1 instruction and provide consistent instructional modeling and independent student application opportunities. Use of hands on manipulatives will be required to enhance student problem solving, increase mathematics conceptual learning and tie student learning to previously learned

concepts. Additionally exit tickets will be utilized daily to analyze student success in application and problem solving. These will be analyzed and used to plan for further Tier 1, small group and intervention instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Hattie's effect size data indicates that Cognitive task analysis and Rtl both demonstrate an effect size of 1.29. Use of strategies to integrate new learning with prior knowledge indicates an effect size of .93 and deliberate practice demonstrates an effect size of .82. We believe that our plan for improvement utilizes all of these evidence based strategies and consistent implementation will result in significantly improved student outcomes. Additionally, numerous educational research articles, including an article from The Pathway to College Network, "Using Data to Improve Educational Outcomes," states the use of data is a powerful tool to strengthen academic outcomes for all students-especially underserved students. Data use informs teacher preparation and training needs, supports instructional practices to improve student performance, and measures the effectiveness of ongoing academic and social support programs.

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.

Coaching and modeling of explicit instruction within the general education classroom. Establish a schedule so that all instructional staff can observe Math Coach modeling grade level math lesson at all grade levels.

Person Responsible: Susan Schroeder (schroeder.susan@brevardschools.org)

By When: October, 2023.

Professional development provided by Math Coach in the use of manipulatives integrated within the mathematics lesson and the use of grade level exit tickets.

Person Responsible: Christine Lundberg (lundberg.christine@brevardschools.org)

By When: September 30, 2023

Schedule weekly Mathematics walk throughs in all classrooms with established look-fors and feedback to teachers on instructional practice.

Person Responsible: Susan Schroeder (schroeder.susan@brevardschools.org)

By When: September 30, 2023 and ongoing throughout the school year.

Collaborative planning time in mathematics scheduled.

Person Responsible: Susan Schroeder (schroeder.susan@brevardschools.org)

By When: September 2023 and ongoing throughout the school year.

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

2023 fourth graders demonstrated ELA proficiency of 51% below both state and district averages. Additionally our schoolwide proficiencies remain stagnant. Continued focus on Tier 1 instruction to include an emphasis on academic vocabulary and active student engagement strategies, as well as inclusive practices in serving our SWD, and routine data analysis of student formative and summative assessments to plan for future instruction will support our ELA student outcomes.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Current 5th graders (2023 fourth graders) ELA proficiency will match district proficiency levels.

3rd grade proficiency will increase from 61% to 64%

4th grade proficiency will increase from 61% in 2023 to 64% in 2024

5th grade proficiency will increase from 51% in 2023 to 55% in 2024

6th grade proficiency will increase from 67% in 2023 to 70% in 2024

SWD proficiency will increase proficiency levels 37% to 41%.

Although Learning Gains were not calculated in 2022 - 2023 due to the state assessment change, our expectation is that 60% of our SWD will make an annual learning gain in 2024.

Monitoring:

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

FAST PM1, PM2 and PM3 ELA data.

iReady ELA diagnostic assessments and growth measures

Benchmark Advance assessments (quarterly) in ELA

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Deliberate action from all stakeholders to utilize data-driven analysis to improve instruction and meet student needs is required to improve student proficiency in ELA. Student data will be used to shore up Tier 1 instruction and provide consistent instructional modeling and independent student application opportunities. Use of academic vocabulary as well as active student engagement will be required to enhance student comprehension and performance. Additionally, quick write strategies will be utilized daily to determine student understanding and ability to demonstrate Benchmark application. These will be analyzed and used to plan for further Tier 1, small group and intervention instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Hattie's effect size data indicate that Cognitive Task Analysis and RtI both demonstrate an effect size of 1.29. Additionally, Cooperative vs. Independent learning and Mainstreaming/Inclusive practice demonstrate positive effect sizes of .55 and .27 respectively. We believe that our plan for improvement utilizes all of these evidence based strategies and consistent implementation will result in significantly improved student outcomes. Additionally, numerous educational research articles, including an article from The Pathway to College Network, "Using Data to Improve Educational Outcomes," states the use of data is a powerful tool to strengthen academic outcomes for all students-especially underserved students.

Data use informs teacher preparation and training needs, supports instructional practices to improve student performance, and measures the effectiveness of ongoing academic and social support programs.

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.

Analyze data for FAST PM1 - PM3, iReady diagnostics and quarterly literacy assessments.

Person Responsible: Susan Schroeder (schroeder.susan@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

Collaborative planning schedule for all grade levels with leadership team members.

Person Responsible: Susan Schroeder (schroeder.susan@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

Establish coaching and feedback cycle for teachers.

Person Responsible: Christine Lundberg (lundberg.christine@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

MTSS meetings and student progress monitoring.

Person Responsible: Susan Schroeder (schroeder.susan@brevardschools.org)

By When: September and ongoing throughout school year.

After School Programming to offer support to students

Person Responsible: Paulette Brancaccio (brancaccio.paulettea@brevardschools.org)

By When: October, ongoing throughout school year

School wide Walk to Intervention support schedule M-F

Person Responsible: Susan Schroeder (schroeder.susan@brevardschools.org)

By When: August - ongoing throughout school year.

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

Williams' leadership team meets during the summer/early fall to align all resources from multiple funding sources to provide the best learning environment for students.

- Title II funding partially funds the school-based literacy coach that supports K-6 ELA instruction.
- District resource teachers and content specialists are arranged by leadership to provide professional development aligned to SIP goals and underperforming subgroup (SWD).
- District ASP funding is aligned to provide support to students based upon demonstrated proficiency needs.