Brevard Public Schools

Freedom 7 Elementary School Of International

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Freedom 7 Elementary School Of International Studies

400 S 4TH ST, Cocoa Beach, FL 32931

http://www.freedom.brevard.k12.fl.us

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.
Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.
Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To continue the International Baccalaureate Primary Years Programme, a concept based curriculum that empowers students to become inquirers who are responsible, globally-minded citizens and reflective lifelong learners.

(Reviewed 9/2019)
(Reviewed 9/2020)
(Reviewed 8/2021)
(Reviewed 8/2022)
(Reviewed 8/2023)

Provide the school's vision statement.

Freedom 7 Elementary School of International Studies, an International Baccalaureate Primary Years Programme School, provides a quality public education with a rigorous and relevant transdisciplinary curriculum. Students are encouraged to become critical and open-minded thinkers, lifelong learners and compassionate world citizens who respect cultural diversity and take action to better our world.

(Reviewed 9/2019)
(Reviewed 9/2020)
(Reviewed 8/2021)
(Reviewed 2022)
(Reviewed 8/2023)

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
Lott, Kathryn	Principal	The Principal is crucial for creating a positive learning environment, enhancing student outcomes, and fostering the overall development of the school community. The Principal participates in grade level 80-minute weekly PLC's, an active member of MTSS meetings, standards alignment, oversees all aspects of school safety. The principal works with the school leadership team to develop strategic plans to achieve the school's improvement goals. These plans may cover curriculum enhancements, teaching methodologies, student support, and more.
Megown, Lisa	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal assists teachers with instructional support and coordinates the mentor program throughout the school. She oversees the MTSS process and coordinates additional supports for differentiation. She is responsible for supporting growth and development of the IB-PYP and collaborates with the principal on discipline. The Assistant Principal participates in grade level 80-minute weekly PLC's and coordinates committees and clubs.
Noe, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	The instructional coach is a member of the leadership team that supports all teachers as a coach of different disciplines and the implementation of the IBPYP. The coach supports the professional growth of teachers by providing training, workshops, and collaboration. She ensures that teachers have the tools and knowledge to implement best practices in their classrooms. She also assists in student assessment and serves as the Lead Mentor for the school. Mrs. Noe participates in each of the grade level and enrichment team's 80-minute PLCs.

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.

Reference Parent Survey, Youth Truth Survey and Insight Surveys. Information from overall survey trend data is used for school improvement. The Youth Truth revealed that students are not feeling challenged with their academics. Adding agency and student input throughout our goals will help increase rigor and relevance for our 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))

Evidence of implementation
-Classroom walkthroughs
-data meetings

-PLCs
-Agendas from meetings
-standards based unit assessments
-Progress Monitoring

Evidence of Impact
-Achievement data (district assessments, FAST data, exit slips, etc)

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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	25%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	12%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) Asian Students (ASN) 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: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 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	2	4	1	2	6	5	1	0	0	21
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	3
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that have two or more early warning indicators:

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

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	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	2
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	1	3	2	3	2	2	2	0	0	15
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	4
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	0	3	3	1	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	0	5
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4
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	1	3	2	3	2	2	2	0	0	15
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	4
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	0	3	3	1	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	0	0	5
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	4
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*	92	58	53	89	61	56	94		
ELA Learning Gains				68			75		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				67			81		
Math Achievement*	91	58	59	92	49	50	89		
Math Learning Gains				81			68		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				87			65		
Science Achievement*	89	58	54	88	60	59	81		
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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	93
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	370
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	82

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	572
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
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	82			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	95			
BLK				
HSP	92			
MUL	84			
PAC				
WHT	93			
FRL	87			

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	80			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	89			
BLK				
HSP	79			

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%
MUL	83			
PAC				
WHT	82			
FRL	79			

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	92			91			89					
SWD	82			82							2	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	89			100							2	
BLK												
HSP	100			83							2	
MUL	88			79							2	
PAC												
WHT	92			92			89				4	
FRL	87			87							2	

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	89	68	67	92	81	87	88					
SWD	84	54		89	92							
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	93	64		100	100							

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
BLK												
HSP	85	52		93	75	90						
MUL	95	71		89	77							
PAC												
WHT	89	71	75	91	79	87	85					
FRL	87	74		82	70	75	83					

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	94	75	81	89	68	65	81					
SWD	83			83								
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	94			89								
BLK												
HSP	86	77		83	62							
MUL	100			100								
PAC												
WHT	94	77	94	89	68	75	82					
FRL	94	67		78	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	88%	59%	29%	54%	34%
04	2023 - Spring	95%	61%	34%	58%	37%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	91%	61%	30%	47%	44%
03	2023 - Spring	98%	56%	42%	50%	48%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	92%	67%	25%	54%	38%
07	2023 - Spring	*	58%	*	48%	*
03	2023 - Spring	95%	60%	35%	59%	36%
04	2023 - Spring	92%	61%	31%	61%	31%
05	2023 - Spring	88%	55%	33%	55%	33%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	89%	57%	32%	51%	38%

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 proficiency for ELA 88 and Math 88 and Science was 89 where all other grades perform in their 90s. This grade level trends lower than the others. Due to focus on 3 state assessed subjects areas, we show a trend of lower performance in ELA and Math in 5th grade.

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

Although grades 3, 4, 6 have increased their scale score in ELA from 2022 compared to 2023, three year trend data shows an over all decrease in the ELA Scale Score for 5th (-1) and students scoring at 3+ in 6th grade decreased by 3 points. In mathematics, grades 4-6 show a slight decrease in the percent of students scoring at 3+. This grade level trends lower than the others. Due to focus on 3 state assessed subjects areas, we show a trend of lower performance in ELA and Math in 5th grade.

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.

We do not have a gap in performance compared to the state average.

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

3rd grade reading improved by 16% from YR 22 82%- YR 23 98%. In math, increased 11% YR 22 84% to YR 23 95%. All 3rd grade participated in acceleration in 4th grade mathematics. Students were not only exposed to grade level standards, but the teachers also spiraled into the following year's standards to accelerate understanding of concepts.

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

N/A

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

1. Vocabulary- Having explicit conversations in PLC's regarding vocabulary development, professional development support, and vertical conversations has supported observed learning engagements in this area from last year to this year. We would like to continue to support learners by broadening our knowledge in teaching and learning of best strategies in vocabulary development in context to continue to make gains. Additionally, a strategic look at the academic vocabulary across subjects and a focus on mathematics.
2. Strategic and Intentional focus on 5th grade. This includes vertical studies of the spirals and intent of the standards from 3rd to 5th in ELA and Math. Strand data shows the need for continued focus on vocabulary and Informational Text in ELA and Geometric Reasoning, Measurement, data and probability for math.
3. Science Proficiency- When strategically looking at our Science Performance and the performance of similar demographic schools, we find that science is still an area for improvement.

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to 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.

Mathematics proficiency remained at 92% according to FAST data in 2022-2023 school year, this is 4% higher than schools demographically similar to Freedom 7 but still an area we will continue to grow. In order to support greater growth, a focus on explicit instruction and differentiated instruction will provide a focus to support growth of all students. In addition, increasing agency among all students through student data tracking in both goal setting and reflection, will support growth in student learning gains. Academic math vocabulary instruction will be purposefully incorporated into math instruction and visible for students.

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

Looking at FAST data we would like to see all grade levels at 95% proficiency. This will require intentional focus on subskills and grade levels

3rd to maintain 95% at 3 and above
4th to increase from 92%- 95%
5th Grade to increase from 88% to 95%
6th grade to increase from 92% to 95%

This work will increase our school overall achievement and help us maintain top performance in Brevard,

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

Teachers will monitor and bring forward Reveal and EdGems data points to MTSS meetings to support small grouping needs. FAST data will be analyzed quarterly along with formative and summative unit assessments o inform instruction. i-Ready Diagnostic and Instructional Path data will be analyzed to support differentiated instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Noe (noe.jennifer@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.)

According to L. S. Fuchs et al., Good, Grouws, & Ebmeier), the use of explicit instruction in mathematics is shown to be effective for students to learn math skills and concepts. Instruction that provides clear and structured explanations, models, and examples to help students understand mathematical concepts and procedures. Several studies have shown that explicit instruction can be highly effective in improving problem-solving skills and is often recommended for teaching arithmetic operations, fractions, and algebraic concepts. Acceleration and remediation of skills should be supported while also providing quality, standards aligned, on grade level instruction. Deeper knowledge of adopted standards and aligned resources will support this growth. To further foster growth, a differentiated approach should be established so that learning gains are achieved. Whether teachers differentiate content, process, products, or the learning environment, coupled with ongoing assessments is a successful strategy.

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

According to What Works Clearinghouse, Acceleration Instruction is a Tier 1 Strong level 1 strategy and has .68 effect size according to Hattie. Explicit Instruction is a Tier 1 Strong level 1 strategy and has .57

effect size according to Hattie. Ongoing progress monitoring will support reflective learning and teaching of the conceptual understandings of mathematics.

In addition, building student agency through the reflective goal setting perspective and data chats will also support student growth. Refelction is a .75 effect size according to Hattie. Children have ownership, voice/ choice in their decision making, will be successful.
We know that differentiation means tailoring instruction to meet individual needs. Whether teachers differentiate content, process, products, or the learning environment, coupled with ongoing assessment is a successful strategy. The work of Tomlinson and Wormelli helps to guide our development in this area.

Student agency, as conceptualized by Bandura's social cognitive theory, allows students to take part in their own self-development. Self Efficacy .92 effect size according to Hattie. This helps to build community and belonging and ultimately have an awareness of others. A student's self-efficacy will determine success in decision making and therefore supports the skills needed to acquire, make meaning and transfer learning into a variety of contexts.

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.

Utilize the Reveal and EdGems assessments in the MTSS process to support tier 2 and tier 3 instructional planning. Reflect on instructional and monitor groups through MTSS meetings.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Noe (noe.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

By When: On-Going

Agency will be increased through the use of data notebooks, student led-conferences and the learning reflection cycle. Teachers will be provided with professional development through faculty meetings and PLCs to support growth in increasing student agency. Students will be able to articulate learning goals in mathematics, make plans and select strategies for problem solving and then reflecting on their learning and progress.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Noe (noe.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

By When: On-Going

Provide professional development with differentiated instruction from the district provided math coach from the district on an early release PDD and through directed discourse with in PLCs during the first semester.

Person Responsible: Lisa Megown (megown.lisa@brevardschools.org)

By When: Quarterly

#2. 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.

The results of the iReady data for fall 2023, indicate an area of potential growth in vocabulary proficiency across all grades 3-6 with 19% scoring one or more grade levels below. Previous year's School Improvement Plans documented a need to support growth in this area. We would like to continue to work on gains as seen in assessment data and would like to continue to improve proficiency, while supporting our ELA B.E.S.T standards, in vocabulary acquisition.

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

Goal for 2023-2024 MEASURABLE OUTCOME based on iReady scores in the vocabulary domain.
6th Grade: 83% Window 1 to 90%
5th Grade: 72% Window 1 to 90%
4th Grade: 90% Window 1 to 95%
3rd Grade: 79% Window 1 to 90%
2nd Grade: % Window 1 to 90%
1st Grade: % Window 1 to 90%

23-24 MEASURABLE OUTCOME based on STAR and FAST students scoring at/above proficiency by EOY
6th- 88%- 95%
5th- 95%- 98%
4th- 98%- 100%
3rd- 52%- 95%
2nd- 93%- 95%
1st- 91%-95%
Kdg- 87%- 95%

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

Ready diagnostic assessments and ongoing progress monitoring of the iReady instructional path use will be discussed and reflected upon in PLCs and Leadership Team meetings. In addition, observations by administrators will include conversations about how vocabulary instruction is being supported.

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.)

School-wide support with explicit vocabulary instruction across all subject areas using a variety of complex texts will support continued vocabulary growth for all students. Attention to the morphology timeline will be provided so that all grade level appropriate prefixes/suffixes are taught and not repeated. i-Ready student instructional path lessons will focus on the Vocabulary domain following the Diagnostic 1 assessment.

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

Having explicit conversations in PLC's regarding vocabulary development, Professional Learning (PL) support, and vertical conversations has supported observed learning engagements in this area from last

year to this year. We would like to continue to support learners by broadening our knowledge in teaching and learning of best strategies in vocabulary development in context including implementation of BEST E.L.A. vocabulary standards, to continue to make gains.

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.

Purposeful conversations regarding explicit vocabulary teaching during PLCs and vertical team meetings guided by the instructional coach. Teachers will document learning experiences within each unit of inquiry, including a relevant vocabulary list to be shared and connected though enrichment.
Provide Professional Learning (PL) for teachers regarding vocabulary strategies to all grade levels and Enrichment staff.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Noe (noe.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

By When: On-Going

Walkthroughs by leadership team will provide ongoing support to teachers in vocabulary instruction. Walk through “look fors” will be collaboratively created based on SIP goals, IBPYP action plans and individual grade level goals.
The BPS Vision for Excellent Instruction has been given to all teachers. Teachers will be provided time to reflect and analyze their growth and successes with the agreements.

Person Responsible: Kathryn Lott (lott.kathryn@brevardschools.org)

By When:

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

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

We have seen an increase in students scoring at 3 or above in FCAT Science scores over the past three iterations of the assessment. This continues to be an intentional area of focus because schools with similar demographics are demonstrating slightly higher scores and we continue to strive for improvement. In 2021, proficiency was 81%. In 2022 proficiency was 88%. In 2023 89% scored on grade level.

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

Students scoring on grade level will increase from 89%- 93% on the state science assessment

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

5th grade teachers will monitor student understanding using the district provided standards-aligned assessments throughout the year. Teachers will increase student agency with students' own tracking of data through goal setting and reflection. Discourse within PLCs, in all grades, will support student growth in science.

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.)

Students will engage in increased hands-on, inquiry-based lessons to increase conceptual understanding. Using tools like the 5E model, PENDA and the science fair process will support positive student engagement and transfer of knowledge. Science academic vocabulary acquisition strategies will also be implemented.

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

We believe student engagement with inquiry will lead to great understanding of scientific concepts. Students need more involvement using hands-on experiences with science concepts and within the contexts of the units of inquiry to make connections. In addition, differentiation will be offered through the PENDA application with students in grades 3-6.

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.

Science Saturdays Participants (to be announced), inviting the lowest 25% of 5th grade to participate after school to build their conceptual knowledge of the most difficult Grade 5 Florida Standards NGSSS Science topics, we will use test item specs and years past/initial beginning of school year data to identify problematic areas to focus hands-on labs to provide students with relevant context before taking the assessment.

Person Responsible: Jennifer Noe (noe.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

By When: January-April 2024

The science lab is organized so that functionality is increased to support student learning within the space. Collaboration with science parent educators will help with logistics/set up of lessons to provide rich, standards aligned, conceptually based learning engagements for students within the space.

Person Responsible: Lisa Megown (megown.lisa@brevardschools.org)

By When: September 2023

Vocabulary

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When: