Imperial Estates Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Imperial Estates Elementary School

900 IMPERIAL ESTATES LN, Titusville, FL 32780

http://www.imperial.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.

Building positive relationships. (During the 2019-2020 school year our faculty began working on a new mission statement to reflect our current needs and goals. It was finalized in June 2020.)

Provide the school's vision statement.

Imperial Estates strengthens academic success and develops compassionate community leaders. (During the 2019-2020 school year our faculty began working on a new vision statement to reflect our current needs and goals. It was finalized in June 2020.)

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
Adams, Cynthia	Principal	Instructional leader is essential in providing the vision for standards-aligned instruction through professional development, resources, collaboration, planning, observation & feedback, and coaching practices.
Lawson, Rodrick	Assistant Principal	Instructional leader is essential in providing the vision for standards-aligned instruction through professional development, resources, collaboration, planning, observation & feedback, and coaching practices. Mr. Lawson is lead with science instruction, our Academic Support Program, provides weekly updates of encouragement with classroom management, and responds to student misbehavior.
Toliver, Whitney	Reading Coach	The literacy coach is essential in providing the vision for standards-aligned instruction through professional development, resources, collaboration, planning, observation & feedback, and coaching practices. Specifically leads interventions, team planning, ELA PD, data review, and MTSS.
Galioto, Amanda	Math Coach	The math coach is essential in providing the vision for standards-aligned instruction through professional development resources, collaboration, planning, observation & feedback, and coaching practices. Specifically leads interventions, team planning, math PD, data review, and MTSS.

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.

School-wide data, including student, staff, and parent survey results) was shared with staff and with our School Advisory Council in the Spring of 2023.
In June 2023, our school leadership team met for a week reviewing the data, identifying successes and needs and formalized a plan of focus for the upcoming year. Additional input and feedback opportunities were provided to our SAC members in June 2023 as well.

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))

Based upon our SIP goals. we have pre-planned monthly PD sessions and placed the intended topics on our calendar in advance so that we do not lose our focus. It is embedded. This will be reflective in the written communication from the leadership team as well. Other components that contribute include: classroom visits and observations, student data analysis.
We will review student growth and proficiency data in grade level meetings with teachers, administrative team, and our literacy and math coaches. We will revise the plan as necessary to ensure continuous improvement and adjust our tiered instruction.

Demographic Data Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	49%
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)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Absent 10% or more days	0	16	11	4	9	11	10	0	0	61
One or more suspensions	0	1	8	6	4	19	3	0	0	41
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	3	1	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	10	38	22	0	0	76
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	14	37	33	0	0	90
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	7	9	6	15	9	13	0	0	59

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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	6	2	9	16	16	0	0	49

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
Retained Students: Current Year	6	12	3	6	0	0	1	0	0	28
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	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	0	34	18	28	30	19	20	0	0	149
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	2	4	1	1	0	0	9
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	8	15	23	20	0	0	66
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	29	30	35	0	0	99
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	14	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	4	1	4	10	9	14	0	0	42

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	12	12	4	10	2	0	0	0	0	40
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	0	34	18	28	30	19	20	0	0	149
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	2	4	1	1	0	0	9
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	8	15	23	20	0	0	66
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	5	29	30	35	0	0	99
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	14	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	37

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	4	1	4	10	9	14	0	0	42

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	Total
				Grade Level						
Retained Students: Current Year	12	12	4	10	2	0	0	0	0	40
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*	49	58	53	52	61	56	50		
ELA Learning Gains				58			46		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43			24		
Math Achievement*	49	58	59	49	49	50	47		
Math Learning Gains				57			41		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				53			24		
Science Achievement*	44	58	54	32	60	59	42		
Social Studies Achievement*					64	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					56	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	67	54	59	80			50		

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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	260
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	424
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	12	Yes	4	2
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	26	Yes	3	1
HSP	34	Yes	2	
MUL	56			
PAC				
WHT	60			

	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	38	Yes	1	

	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	24	Yes	3	1
ELL	80			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	38	Yes	2	
HSP	39	Yes	1	
MUL	61			
PAC				
WHT	59			
FRL	45			

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	49			49			44					67
SWD	11			10			7				4	
ELL	27			36							3	67
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	27			28			17				4	
HSP	40			38			25				3	
MUL	60			57							3	

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	60			58			60				4	
FRL	40			40			29				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	52	58	43	49	57	53	32					80
SWD	12	33	32	9	37	38	7					
ELL												80
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	34	48	39	29	41	41	35					
HSP	27	42	31	30	54	50						
MUL	66	61		62	56							
PAC												
WHT	63	68	62	60	63	69	29					
FRL	41	57	51	40	52	52	19					

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	50	46	24	47	41	24	42					50
SWD	19	20	9	13	23	21	27					
ELL	33			38								50
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	24	33	23	27	20							
HSP	36	35		35	37	30	18					
MUL	59	54		43	38							
PAC												
WHT	62	51	25	58	49	43	57					
FRL	36	39	22	33	35	21	25					

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	52%	59%	-7%	54%	-2%
04	2023 - Spring	46%	61%	-15%	58%	-12%
06	2023 - Spring	45%	61%	-16%	47%	-2%
03	2023 - Spring	51%	56%	-5%	50%	1%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	49%	67%	-18%	54%	-5%
03	2023 - Spring	60%	60%	0%	59%	1%
04	2023 - Spring	53%	61%	-8%	61%	-8%
05	2023 - Spring	41%	55%	-14%	55%	-14%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	42%	57%	-15%	51%	-9%

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.

5th grade math and science proficiency levels were the lowest performance areas.
A contributing factor: Our biggest challenge and barrier during the 22-23 school year was an extreme teaching staff shortage, which affected instruction for our students in general education and Exceptional Student Education. Throughout the year we had nine to thirteen vacant teaching positions at any given time.

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

In comparing our 4th grade ELA & Math student proficiency levels from Spring 2022 (when the same students were in 3rd grade) to Spring 2023, we experienced a decline in meeting proficiency by 5% in each subject area.

A contributing factor: Our biggest challenge and barrier during the 22-23 school year was an extreme teaching staff shortage, which affected instruction for our students in general education, Exceptional Student Education, Title 1 support, and our Literacy Coach position. Throughout the year we had nine to thirteen vacant teaching positions at any given time.

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.

5th grade math is identified as having the greatest gap compared to the state average by 14%.

A contributing factor: Our biggest challenge and barrier during the 22-23 school year was an extreme teaching staff shortage, which affected instruction for our students in general education and Exceptional Student Education. Throughout the year we had nine to thirteen vacant teaching positions at any given time.

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

In comparing our 6th grade Math student proficiency levels from Spring 2022 (when the same students were in 5th grade) to Spring 2023, we experienced an increase in meeting proficiency by 22%.

A contributing factor: Our 6th grade teachers departmentalize by subject area.

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

The number of students not at proficiency in reading and math in grades 4-6.

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

1. Percent of students reading at proficiency
2. Percent of students meeting proficiency in math
3. Percent of students meeting proficiency in science
4. Decrease student misbehavior that leads to suspensions
5. Build a positive learning/teaching culture

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

Through observations, feedback, and conversation with our staff throughout the 22-23 school year, as well as depicted in the January 2023 staff Insight survey, improvement in our school's positive culture and environment has been identified. The Insight survey results identified 10 out of 10 domains with a decrease in positive indicators. Instructional culture is essential to student success. Schools with strong instructional cultures tend to have strong student outcomes and retain more of their most effective teachers.
Also in January 2023, our students in grades 3-6 participated in the Youth Truth survey. In meeting with our faculty and reviewing the results, the domain of Belonging and Culture was decided on to be a focus.

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

As related to students, these three areas will be our focus this school year.
1. Do you think your teacher cares about you?
2. Do you feel you are an important part of the school?
3. Do students in your class treat the teacher with respect?

As a staff, in response to this need we are participating in professional development on Collective Efficacy
.

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

We will ask our students these three questions quarterly to gather data sooner in the year and make adjustments as necessary.
1. Do you think your teacher cares about you?
2. Do you feel you are an important part of the school?
3. Do students in your class treat the teacher with respect?

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cynthia Adams (adams.cynthia@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.)

Albert Bandura is credited with introducing the concept of CTE, defining it in the 1970s. In a landmark 1993 study, he explained that teachers who work together to develop a strong sense of collective efficacy in their school community can make significant contributions to the academic success of children. Putting his theory into practice, he was able to show that the positive effects of CTE on student academic performance outweigh the negative effects of low socioeconomic status. That set the stage for other researchers to build on Bandura's findings; among them Roger Goddard, Wayne Hoy, and Anita Wollfolk Hoy. Together, the trio demonstrated how collective teacher efficacy is positively associated with differences between schools in student-level achievement in both reading and mathematics. John Hattie continued to highlight the strong effect size 1.36 in using this strategy. (https://pce.sandiego.edu/collective-teacher-efficacy/)

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

Collective efficacy refers to the shared belief that through their collective action, educators can influence student outcomes and increase achievement for all students (Jenni Donohoo 2017).
If Imperial's staff can adopt this framework of beliefs, we can see favorable increases with our positive school culture as reflected in our staff's Insight results and our students Youth Truth results.

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.

A staff member from each grade level will be invited to attend professional development on the high effect size strategy of Collective Efficacy.

Person Responsible: Cynthia Adams (adams.cynthia@brevardschools.org)

By When: June 2023

Administration and teacher leaders share what they learned with faculty focus group and determine shared decision making is a skill to focus upon.
School theme of Choosing, Creating, & Spreading Joy was established.
Then administration and teacher leaders share the core beliefs of Collective Efficacy with the whole staff. Shared decision making amongst staff members will be implemented throughout the school year. Focus on student relationships and after-school clubs.

Person Responsible: Cynthia Adams (adams.cynthia@brevardschools.org)

By When: August 2023

Quarterly student survey to measure three focus areas
1. Do you think your teacher cares about you?
2. Do you feel you are an important part of the school?
3. Do students in your class treat the teacher with respect?

Person Responsible: Cynthia Adams (adams.cynthia@brevardschools.org)

By When: October 2023, December 2023, March 2024, and May 2024.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

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 reviewing of school data over the past few years our Black students, Hispanic students, and students with disabilities are not performing at the same level of proficiency as their peers outside of those subgroups in math.

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

We want to see our students' proficiency scores in math increase as measured by FAST PM3.

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

We will monitor their growth by reviewing data available in iReady and FAST PM 1 and 2.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cynthia Adams (adams.cynthia@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.)

Mathematical use of visual representations and manipulatives.

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

Visual representations help students learn abstract mathematics concepts and solve problems. The purpose of this visual is to reflect a student's understanding of the problem and to help them correctly solve it.

Students who struggle with mathematics often require different types of visual representations known as manipulatives. These concrete, hands-on materials and objects help students to represent the mathematical idea they are trying to learn or the problem they are attempting to solve. Manipulatives can help students develop a conceptual understanding of mathematical topics. (https://iris.peabody.vanderbilt.edu/module/math/cresource/q2/p05/#content)

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.

Math manipulatives will be purchased for student use.

Person Responsible: Amanda Galioto (galioto.amanda@brevardschools.org)

By When: August 2023

Grade level teachers will participate in professional development opportunities specific to math and manipulatives.

Person Responsible: Amanda Galioto (galioto.amanda@brevardschools.org)

By When: September 2023, and ongoing

Administration will walk through classrooms to observe and provide feedback regarding tier 1 / tier 2 instruction; aids in fidelity.

Person Responsible: Rodrick Lawson (lawson.rodrick@brevardschools.org)

By When: September 2023, and ongoing

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

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.

Small Group Math Instruction:
In reviewing our state assessment and progress monitoring data from last school year 22-23, it is evident that we need to increase the amount of students who are meeting proficiency in math especially in our intermediate grades.

FAST Spring 2023 (PM3):
K: 55%, 1st grade: 78%, 2nd grade: 73%, 3rd grade: 61%, 4th grade: 52%, 5th grade: 41%, 6th grade: 49%

iReady Spring 2023 (D3) Standard VIew (Green includes Early, Mid & Late):
K: 68%, 1st grade: 43%, 2nd grade: 62%, 3rd grade: 67%, 4th grade: 53%, 5th grade: 57%, 6th grade: 40%

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

Students in grades K-6 will increase their overall proficiency as measured by the FAST from PM1 to PM3 by 20% in Math.

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

iReady K-6 Diagnostic data
FAST progress monitoring
Our Leadership Team will walk into classrooms during the intervention times to monitor and inspect this practice. Our Leadership Team will also be active participants when reviewing the data and planning for intervention with our teachers. By adding this strategy, it will make an impact on our students' learning as measured by iReady/FAST.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cynthia Adams (adams.cynthia@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.)

Fidelity to Intervention block (tier 2 and tier 3) MTSS with explicit instruction in key concepts.
Response to Intervention and Improving Adolescent Literacy: Effective Intervention Practices. Effect size: Response to Intervention – 1.29, Interventions for Learning Needs .77, Feedback .70, Scaffolding .82, Rehearsal and Memorization .73, Direct Instruction .60

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

Diagnosing essential missed learning: provide targeted instruction to bridge the gaps of missed concepts/ skills.
Some of our students have skill gaps in foundational math skills and are in need of tiered intervention.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

1. Teachers and administration will use student achievement data to determine which students need small group instruction, which skills need to be addressed during tier 2 instruction.

Person Responsible: Cynthia Adams (adams.cynthia@brevardschools.org)

By When: September 1, 2023 will be the first cycle. Every 6 weeks teacher teams will meet to collaborate with leadership team to revise the plan.

2. Teachers and administrators will collaborate with district-based math content specialist to understand student data, and use data to plan content for intervention (assisting with action step #2).
District-based math content specialist will work with grade level teams to provide PD on pacing and framing intervention, based on data, with a focus on learning gains for all students.

Person Responsible: Amanda Galioto (galioto.amanda@brevardschools.org)

By When: end of first quarter, and ongoing

3. Teachers will create Progress Monitoring Plans for students who receive tier 2 & 3 instruction. PD will be provide by our leadership team.

Person Responsible: Rodrick Lawson (lawson.rodrick@brevardschools.org)

By When: end of first quarter, and ongoing

4. Teachers will use IPST Form 7 to track students" progress within tiered instruction and will review at MTSS meetings.

Person Responsible: Whitney Toliver (toliver.whitney@brevardschools.org)

By When: end of first quarter, and ongoing

5. Teachers will meet with students individually to review their iReady performance data, how it guides their learning path, and set goals regarding their stretch growth; data chats with parents and support for parents to help their children.

Person Responsible: Rodrick Lawson (lawson.rodrick@brevardschools.org)

By When: each testing window

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).

School administration will utilize funding allocations for hiring staff, providing professional development, purchasing supplemental materials, and offering tutoring services to students.
In response to last year's 4th grade reading proficiency scores (48%), these same students are now 5th grade students. This was kept in mind when strategically selecting 5th grade teachers for this school year and building the student schedule. We decided to departmentalize by subject area. Our 5th grade ELA teachers are reading endorsed.
Last school year, our 4th grade teaching staff remained with vacancies until the end of January. This school

year we have started the year with a full staff (no vacancies) in 4th grade and our teachers are expanding their knowledge with instructional materials and grade level benchmarks.

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

2022-2023 FAST ELA data shows 43% of kindergarten students, 48% of 1st Graders and 39% of 2nd Graders scored below grade level.

Phonics instruction and word study skills must occur in K-2. Use of supplementary resource and extend the core reading block to 120 minutes; iReady Magnetic for all K-2 classrooms.

Planning sessions need to have a clear structure to focus on the alignment of benchmarks, resources, student tasks, assessments, and the transfer to instruction.

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

2022-2023 FAST ELA data shows 49% of 3rd Graders, 52% of 4th Graders and 45% of 5th Graders scored
below grade level.

Therefore, tier 1 ELA instruction is a critical need .

• Increasing strength of tier 1 reading instruction so that skill / achievement gaps will not be as prominent in grades 3-5
• Planning sessions need to have a clear structure to focus on the alignment of benchmarks, resources, student tasks, assessments, and the transfer to instruction

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 will increase by 10%.
• Long Term - By the Spring 2024 FAST, literacy achievement will increase by 20%.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

• Short Term – From FAST PM1 to PM2, literacy achievement will increase by 10%.
• Long Term - By the Spring 2024 FAST, literacy achievement will increase by 20%.

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.

Toliver, Whitney, toliver.whitney@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?

• Benchmark Advance / myPerspectives
Tier 1 (Core) Curriculum is on the 2021 approved Florida Instructional Materials list.
Florida Benchmark Advance 2022 (K-5) , Florida Edition
myPerspectives Florida English Language Arts Grade 6

- All instructional materials are aligned with B.E.S.T. Standards
- Implementation of high-quality ELA instructional materials with fidelity will support the explicit instruction of phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension
- Focus on tightening up delivery of instruction focusing on the systematic, explicitness of instruction and reinforcing the "why" – with Science of Reading

• i-Ready (Promising level of evidence)
- Universal screener data is used to start data conversations at school level
- Formative data used to differentiate instruction
- This approach helps educators accelerate growth and grade-level learning. These tools provide rigorous and motivating reading instruction that provide scaffold support that meets the needs of all students

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
- Systematic and/or Explicit
- Geared towards struggling readers with an emphasis on Foundational Skills such as Phonological Awareness and Phonics

**Benchmark Advance/SAVVAS implementation
Implementation of high quality ELA instructional materials with fidelity will support the explicit instruction of vocabulary, phonics, phonemic awareness, fluency and comprehension. Collaborative planning for

instruction and use of high quality instructional materials will support teachers to understand how to identify their students' instructional needs, select appropriate materials, organize instruction to maximize learning, and differentiate instruction to meet individual needs.

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
Administration will set clear expectations for tiered instruction tiers 1-3 in ELA, will monitor, and provide feedback. (Literacy Leadership)	Adams, Cynthia, adams.cynthia@brevardschools.org
2. Teachers and the reading leadership team will support improved student reading outcomes by leading or participating in PD on evidence-based strategies, assisting with implementing data-informed instruction, monitoring the use of high quality instructional materials, and the use of multi-tiered system of supports. (Literacy Leadership, Literacy Coaching, Professional Development)	Toliver, Whitney, toliver.whitney@brevardschools.org
3. Teachers will be intentional with the implementation of Benchmark Advance / myPerspectives / iReady high quality instructional material. (Literacy Leadership, Literacy Coaching, Professional Development) Administration will walk through classrooms to observe and provide feedback regarding tier 1 instruction; aids in fidelity. (Literacy Leadership)	Adams, Cynthia, adams.cynthia@brevardschools.org
4. Teachers & our Literacy Coach will use student achievement data to determine which students need small group instruction, which skills need to be addressed, which teaching materials to use, & which progress monitoring assessments to complete outside tier 1 instruction. - Instructional staff will collaborate to understand student data, & use data to plan content for intervention -Teachers will create Progress Monitoring Plans for students who receive tier 2 & 3 instruction. - Teachers will use IPST Form 7 to track students' progress within tiered instruction & will review at MTSS meetings. - Every 6 weeks, teacher teams will meet to collaborate with leadership team to revise the plan.	Toliver, Whitney, toliver.whitney@brevardschools.org