

Brevard Public Schools

# Mims Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

<b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>I. School Information</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>	<b>15</b>
<b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>	<b>26</b>
<b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>	<b>0</b>

# Mims Elementary School

2582 US HIGHWAY 1, Mims, FL 32754

<http://www.mims.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.**

The Mims Elementary family takes pride in providing opportunities for each member to reach their individual potential through knowledge, skills, and values in a respectful and safe learning environment.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

To serve every student with excellence as the standard.

### 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
Cochran, Cheree	Principal	School Leadership Team, progress monitoring, data collection, ESSA subgroup identification and collection, instructional coaching, professional development
Alfonso, Javier	Assistant Principal	discipline data and intervention, professional development, instructional coaching, subgroup data monitoring, school leadership team, testing coordinator
Bissett, Samantha	Other	data collection, Title 1 compliance, parent and family involvement, data monitoring, school leadership team, mentoring, instructional coaching, intervention design and development, intervention delivery.
Hurley, Robin	Instructional Coach	instructional coaching, professional development, school leadership team, data monitoring, intervention design and monitoring

**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.

Mims strives to provide positive school culture and environment for all stakeholders. We build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders by listening intently to our families and community and responding to their feedback, offering meaningful opportunities and events for

our families to participate in, communicating proactively, and making it known that having all of our stakeholders engaged is a priority here on campus. We hold multiple parent night events in which exit slips are provided to solicit feedback. Parent and community engagement events throughout the North Area Feeder Chain have been influential in allowing parents and community members the opportunity to learn about the progress of our achievement data and to identify ways to support.

Teacher and staff survey reveals a few areas that are lower than the national average in: Academic Opportunities, School Operations, Diversity/Equity and Inclusion, Classroom Learning Environment. These will be a focus this year to improve.

Insight Survey results by teachers indicated:

35% of teachers believe that students can achieve the academic standard for their grade level

38% of teachers believe that there are consistent expectations and consequences for behavior

65% of teachers believe that there is professional development opportunities at school to help improve their effectiveness as an educator

Data was reviewed to support school-wide plans and promote a positive school culture for all stakeholders including students, teachers, and parents.

Students in 3rd -6th grade participated in the Youth Truth Survey and results reflected that:

88% students indicated that they believed their teacher wanted them to work their hardest

59% of students indicated that they learned interesting things in school

53% of students believed that what they learn in class will help them in life

56% of students indicated that they felt like they could ask questions in math class when they needed help

76% of students indicated that they keep trying in math when the work gets hard

33% of students indicated that they believed they worked on fun problems in math

87% of students indicated that they could be good at math if they worked hard at it

36% of students believed that other students were friendly to them

58% of students indicated that they felt safe at school

80% of students indicated that they felt their teacher cared about them

58% of students indicated that when they are upset, there is an adult from school they can talk to

Parent Survey results indicated that:

69% of parents prefer newsletters and paper flyers to come home

81% of parents like to be communicated with by email

80% of parents prefer a paper copy of interims and report cards coming home

90% of parents feel welcome at Mims Elementary

73% of parents believe that staff is helpful in addressing their concerns or questions

64% of parents attended school activities once or twice a year

68% of parents expressed an interest in needing academic support materials for home

65% of parents report that our teachers communicate either weekly or monthly with them

### **SIP Monitoring**

Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be regularly monitored for implementation and impact on student achievement in a variety of ways. The first way will be by examining data collected in classroom walkthroughs. Administration will be conducting weekly walkthroughs to collect data on effective teaching and learning. Feedback from walkthroughs will be shared with teachers within 24 hours with the expectation that teachers will reflect, ask questions for clarity, and implement the feedback within the same week. Mims Elementary will be working with Oak Park, our neighboring elementary school, to schedule monthly walkthroughs in

partnership to share feedback with one another.

Another way the goals of the SIP will be regularly monitored is through collaborative planning structures. Teachers will collaboratively plan together for a minimum of at least one day per week. The goal of these structures is to discuss best practices, examine student data, and plan for closing the achievement gap. Administration will follow up on collaborative planning during leadership team meetings that are held bi-weekly as well as by attending various grade level meetings during the week.

Team meetings are scheduled for the entire year and occur each Tuesday. These meetings will focus on trainings from the reading coach, administration, math and reading interventionists, MTSS, and data chats. Trainings will be developed based upon need as reflected from data collected during walks. Once per month the team meeting will focus on data chats to ensure that teachers are regularly examining and able to present their student data to administration. During each team meeting the data at the center of the focus will come from curriculum tests/exit tickets, iReady, and FAST PM1 and 2.

The School Improvement Plan will be revised as needed and advised by the leadership team. These reviews will occur during the LT meetings in September, October, January, and March.

**Demographic Data**

Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024

<b>2023-24 Status</b> (per MSID File)	Active
<b>School Type and Grades Served</b> (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
<b>Primary Service Type</b> (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
<b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>	Yes
<b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>	45%
<b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>	100%
<b>Charter School</b>	No
<b>RAISE School</b>	Yes
<b>ESSA Identification</b> *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
<b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>	No
<b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b> (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)
<b>School Grades History</b> *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
<b>School Improvement Rating History</b>	
<b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>	

**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	10	12	14	15	14	6	13	0	0	84
One or more suspensions	0	7	10	12	17	2	10	0	0	58
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	3	0	4	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	31	6	13	16	0	0	66
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	35	4	21	14	0	0	74
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	4	2	7	15	4	11	0	0	43

**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	2	1	0	10	1	0	0	0	0	14
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	2	0	1	0	0	5

**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	10	9	19	10	7	8	11	0	0	74
One or more suspensions	0	4	4	6	4	4	18	0	0	40
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	11	4	7	19	0	0	41
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	8	10	24	0	0	50
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	11	4	7	19	0	0	41

**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	2	1	3	8	7	7	23	0	0	51

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	7	5	11	0	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	3

**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	10	9	19	10	7	8	11	0	0	74
One or more suspensions	0	4	4	6	4	4	18	0	0	40
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	11	4	7	19	0	0	41
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	8	10	24	0	0	50
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	11	4	7	19	0	0	41

**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	2	1	3	8	7	7	23	0	0	51

**The number of students identified retained:**

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	7	5	11	0	0	0	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	2	0	0	3

**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*	37	58	53	46	61	56	46		
ELA Learning Gains				64			51		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				55			43		
Math Achievement*	33	58	59	46	49	50	41		
Math Learning Gains				62			50		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				43			55		
Science Achievement*	35	58	54	25	60	59	34		
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	34
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	135
Total Components for the Federal Index	4

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	341
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	10	Yes	4	1
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	24	Yes	1	1
HSP	22	Yes	1	1
MUL	53			
PAC				
WHT	38	Yes	1	
FRL	29	Yes	1	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	34	Yes	3	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	45			
HSP	50			
MUL	62			
PAC				
WHT	50			
FRL	46			

**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	37			33			35					
SWD	11			13							3	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	24			29			18				4	
HSP	25			19							2	
MUL	58			47							2	
PAC												
WHT	41			35			46				4	
FRL	33			28			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	46	64	55	46	62	43	25					
SWD	17	50	50	23	48	44	9					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	34	59	50	40	61	50	20					
HSP	38	45		42	73							
MUL	57	70		50	70							
PAC												
WHT	51	68	65	49	60	38	22					
FRL	44	62	52	43	63	39	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	46	51	43	41	50	55	34					
SWD	19	35	45	17	63		36					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	40	45		35	52	50						
HSP	38			31								
MUL	60											
PAC												
WHT	49	52		44	53		41					
FRL	47	52	42	44	48	56	28					

**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	47%	61%	-14%	58%	-11%
06	2023 - Spring	38%	61%	-23%	47%	-9%
03	2023 - Spring	29%	56%	-27%	50%	-21%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	40%	67%	-27%	54%	-14%
03	2023 - Spring	23%	60%	-37%	59%	-36%
04	2023 - Spring	77%	61%	16%	61%	16%
05	2023 - Spring	33%	55%	-22%	55%	-22%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	32%	57%	-25%	51%	-19%

### 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.**

The data component that showed the lowest performance was Science proficiency which was 32%. The state science proficiency is 51% which means Mims 5th grade students underperformed the state by 19%. Additionally our 3rd grade ELA proficiency was the area of greatest concern at Mims and showed the greatest gap when compared to the state and district average scores in both reading and math.

Overall Proficiency grades 3-6:  
 Math proficiency was 36% as compared to 46% in 2022  
 ELA proficiency was 39% as compared to 46% in 2022.  
 Science proficiency was 32% as compared to 25% in 2022.

ELA:  
 State/District/School  
 3rd Grade: 50/56/29 Mims 3rd graders underperformed the state by 21% and the district by 27%.  
 4th Grade: 58/61/47 Mims 4th graders underperformed the state by 11% and the district by 14%.

5th Grade: 52/59/49 Mims 5th graders underperformed the state by 5% and the district by 10%.

6th Grade: 47/61/38 Mims 6th graders underperformed the state by 9% and the district by 23%.

Math:

State/District/School

3rd Grade: 59/60/23 Mims 3rd graders underperformed the state by 36% and the district by 37%.

4th Grade: 61/61/76 Mims 4th graders outperformed the state and the district by 15%.

5th Grade: 55/55/33 Mims 5th graders underperformed the state by 22% and the district by 22%.

6th Grade: 54/67/40 Mims 6th graders underperformed the state by 14% and the district by 27%.

Subgroup Data:

Students with Disabilities (SWD) are historically underperforming. They have fallen below the federal index for more than 3 consecutive years.

There were several contributing factors and classroom walkthrough data revealed a weakness in teacher retention which directly impacted scores. Additionally, this was an implementation year for a new curriculum in math and teachers were getting to know that new curriculum.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was Math proficiency. Math proficiency was 36% as compared to 46% in 2022. The factors that were the most impactful and that contributed to this decline were: implementing a new math curriculum, administration and coach staffing changes, 4 new teachers to Mims, and 8 teachers with less than 3 years teaching experience.

**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.**

3rd grade Math scores had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Mims 3rd graders underperformed the state by 36% and the district by 37%.

Classroom walkthroughs revealed

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

A standout data component was 4th grade math with 76% of students proficient with Mims outperforming the state and district by 15%. 4th grade was departmentalized during this accomplishment and the teacher in this grade level attended trainings and has a history of helping students close gaps in math. A new action being taken in the 23-24 SY is this teacher is part of the Title One Team and serving as a schoolwide math interventionist and leader of our school-based Math Leadership Team (T). She will be able to tailor interventions for students across many grades and work with teachers on how to do this as well.

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

The main area of concern was 3rd grade retentions due to students scoring a level 1 on the 3rd grade ELA FAST PM 3 assessment.

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

1. Increase 3rd grade ELA and Math scores (including decreasing the number of students scoring a level 1)
2. Increase Math achievement across all grade levels and increase supports for implementation of new



curriculum

3. Continue the upward trend in Science proficiency
4. Develop a Math Leadership Team (MLT)

**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.

Students with Disabilities subgroup has performed below the 41% federal index level for at least three years in a row.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Students with Disabilities subgroup will increase proficiency to from 28% to 45% in ELA and from 34% to 50% in Math.

**Monitoring:**

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

This area of focus will be monitored during monthly data chats with administration and teachers, iReady and Lexia weekly progress review (T), and by reviewing the score reports after FAST PM 1 and PM2.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Robin Hurley (hurley.robin@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.)

Some evidence-based intervention being implemented for SWD include professional development using high leverage practices with occur during the 23-24 SY (T) and participating in collaborative planning sessions.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The planning sessions will consist of grade level teachers and ESE teachers focusing on the implementation of the district adopted curriculum to target the specific needs of our SWD. Administration and instructional coaches will use "High Leverage Practices in Special Education" text and videos to identify best practices and train our ESE and classroom teachers on quality instructional practices and routines (T).

**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.

We will plan our ESE resource teachers schedules around the needs of the students in efforts to best meet the needs of all students, regardless of which homeroom classroom they are in. Students will be grouped accordingly to maximize inclusion opportunities and schedules will be adjusted as needed to meet the need of new or departing students.

**Person Responsible:** Robin Hurley (hurley.robin@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** Ongoing during the 23-24 SY

Instructional walk throughs will be preformed monthly to assess the effectiveness of instructional practices and level of collaboration between the grade level and ESE teachers.

**Person Responsible:** Robin Hurley (hurley.rob@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** Beginning in September-May 2024

## #2. 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.

36% proficiency overall in Math Grades 3-6 on PM 3 in May 2023

State/District/School comparison

3rd Grade: 59/60/23 Mims 3rd graders underperformed the state by 36% and the district by 37%.

4th Grade: 61/61/76 Mims 4th graders outperformed the state and the district by 15%.

5th Grade: 55/55/33 Mims 5th graders underperformed the state by 22% and the district by 22%.

6th Grade: 54/67/40 Mims 6th graders underperformed the state by 14% and the district by 27%.

### Measurable Outcome:

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

Mims Elementary will move from 36% proficiency to 50% overall on FAST PM3.

### Monitoring:

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

This year we will complete walkthroughs to gather data on math practices, providing feedback to teachers, and coaching cycles.

### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Javier Alfonso (alfonso.javier@brevardschools.org)

### Evidence-based Intervention:

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

This year we will:

- Develop a Math Leadership Team to assist with developing a math best practices walkthrough tool and serve as school-based experts.
- Collaboratively plan with departmentalized grades with Math interventionist/Math Leadership Team Leader
- Create best practices for math videos that will used for PD and coaching
- Provide modeling and side by side coaching as a reflection on best practices for instruction (T)
- Provide Professional Development specifically related to math instruction (T)

### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The leadership team met and decided that a leadership team for math (as we have for ELA) was needed in order to help develop, guide, and plan with teachers.

### 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.

Develop a Math Leadership Team

**Person Responsible:** Javier Alfonso (alfonso.javier@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** By the end of September 2023

Create a math walkthrough tool

**Person Responsible:** Javier Alfonso (alfonso.javier@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** By end of September 2023

Begin walkthroughs and collaborative planning.

**Person Responsible:** Javier Alfonso (alfonso.javier@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** By end of September 2023

### #3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

#### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Attendance below 90% is a concern for Mims Elementary. During the 2022-23 SY there were 84 students with attendance below 90% in grades K-6.

#### Measurable Outcome:

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

The goal for the 23-24 school year is to lower the number of students with attendance below 90% by at least 20%.

#### Monitoring:

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

Parent liaison, principal, and office clerk will review attendance reports weekly to identify students that are having attendance issues. These students will be added to a students of concern list in order to begin an attendance incentive program with the parent liaison.

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cheree Cochran (cochran.cheree@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.)

Student attendance will be reinforced through positive incentives to improve attendance.

#### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Implementing positive incentives and implementing supports for improving attendance may provide the necessary motivation that students and their families need to attend school regularly.

#### 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.

Weekly review of attendance reports

**Person Responsible:** Cheree Cochran (cochran.cheree@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** Ongoing/weekly

Incentives set up with families to encourage regular attendance in school.

**Person Responsible:** Cheree Cochran (cochran.cheree@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** Ongoing and as needed

## CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

The Title One team, SAC, and teacher leadership team reviews any items that are brought to the team for purchase with regards to enhancing teaching and learning. Decisions are made based upon many factors including: the number of students the purchase will affect, the alignment of the materials/program with Florida's BEST standards, evidence of effectiveness of materials/programs, the short term and long term cost(s) of implementation and utilization, and the coaching and leadership support to implement materials/programs.

Funds are allocated to support students in need of additional supports beyond Tier 1 instruction.

1. Academic Support Programs (ESSER & Count Funds) target Tier 2 & 3 students with additional help in ELA, Math and Science.
2. Lexia will support Tier 2 students in need of foundational skills in ELA (T).
3. 95% Group Materials are utilized to support foundational skills for students in ELA.
4. Funds are spent to increase hand-on engagement with science materials (T).
5. Funds are allocated for supplies and materials that are consumable or need replacing for State and District adopted programs (T).
6. Funds are allocated for professional development to promote learning communities that address the needs of all students (T).
7. Funds are allocated for professional development to promote student engagement (T).

## 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

The importance of closing gaps in reading in the primary grades is crucial for all students and student subgroups.

In grades K-2 the results on the STAR Reading assessment were:  
(Percentage of students in the grade level scoring below 40th percentile)  
Kindergarten- 41%

First Grade-61%  
Second Grade- 57%

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

ELA FAST Data from 2022-23 SY

State/District/School

3rd Grade: 50/56/29 Mims 3rd graders underperformed the state by 21% and the district by 27%.

4th Grade: 58/61/47 Mims 4th graders underperformed the state by 11% and the district by 14%.

5th Grade: 54/59/49 Mims 5th graders underperformed the state by 5% and the district by 10%.

6th Grade: 47/61/38 Mims 6th graders underperformed the state by 9% and the district by 23%.

In grades 3-5 the results on the FAST Reading assessment were:

(Percentage of students in the grade level scoring below 40th percentile)

Third Grade- 69%

Fourth Grade- 54%

Fifth Grade- 47%

### **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**

ELA proficiency will increase by 15% proficiency across all grade levels on the 2023-24 ELA STAR assessment as compared to the 22-23 results.

### **Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes**

ELA proficiency will increase from 39% proficiency on the FAST to 50% overall on the 2023-24 ELA FAST assessment.

## **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.

This year teachers will use an at a glance form that tracks student progress on district assessments and diagnostic tools. The teachers will use this data during data chats with administrators and students to reflect and set goals for instruction, teacher planning, intervention grouping, and overall student outcomes.

Teachers will use a quarterly expectations good to great tool to self-assess their classroom practices. Administration will use the walkthrough data tool to drive professional development and coaching cycles



with teachers. Administration will review iReady, Lexia, and Penda data on a weekly basis to ensure all students are making progress.

### **Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Cochran, Cheree, [cochran.cheree@brevardschools.org](mailto:cochran.cheree@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?

Mims Elementary uses the following programs for the core curriculum that aligns with BEST ELA Standards and meet Florida’s definition of evidence based programs:

Benchmark Universe (K-5) Magnetic Reading (T) (K-5) SAVVAS Realize (6th)

Intervention programs are chosen carefully and are aligned with the student’s needs as defined through various diagnostic assessments. The programs that align with the district’s K-12 CERP used include:

95% Group Phonics (Core/Advanced/Multi-syllabic)

Read Naturally (T)

95% Group Comprehension

Lexia (T)

### **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 in the programs listed above address the identified need. The identified programs show proven effectiveness for the target population because they are: BEST standards aligned, aligned with the district reading plan, meet Florida’s definition of evidence-based, include systematic/explicit practices, and are geared toward struggling readers with an emphasis on foundational skills of reading.

**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
<p>The Literacy Leadership Team will meet monthly in order to review classroom data as collected by walkthroughs that highlight the strengths and weaknesses of teaching practices specifically related to Reading. As weaknesses are identified in teacher practice, the reading coach will begin coaching for support.</p>	<p>Hurley, Robin, hurley.robin@brevardschools.org</p>
<p>Regular review of assessment data will occur during monthly data chat meetings that take place with both the Principal and Assistant Principal. During this time, administrators will discuss specific students and set goals with teachers for improving students that are not meeting standards as revealed on unit assessments and state standardized testing. Teachers will specifically and strategically plan to remedy student weaknesses during small group and explain the process to administration during data chats.</p>	<p>Cochran, Cheree, cochran.cheree@brevardschools.org</p>
<p>This year teachers will use an at a glance form that tracks student progress on district assessments and diagnostic tools. The teachers will use this data during data chats with administrators and students to reflect and set goals for instruction and student outcomes.</p>	<p>Hurley, Robin, hurley.robin@brevardschools.org</p>
<p>Kindergarten teachers will use alphabet routines daily to ensure a solid foundation letter and sound recognition.</p>	<p>Hurley, Robin, hurley.robin@brevardschools.org</p>
<p>HIITS training was attended by several teachers in the summer of 2023 and several teachers will be attending the training in November to build knowledge in the Science of Reading. There will be at least one HIITS trained teacher in each grade level by November.</p>	<p>Hurley, Robin, hurley.robin@brevardschools.org</p>

**Title I Requirements**

**Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements**

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

**Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))**  
List the school's webpage\* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Parents were informed about the SIP during the annual Title One meeting held on August 17th. Other ways that parents can review a copy of the School Improvement Plan will be: requesting to see a copy of the SIP in the front office, reviewing the Title One Binder in the front office, reviewing it via the school website, attending a SAC meeting and requesting a copy and/or providing feedback during one of the meetings.

The SIP will be reviewed during team meetings and each team will review and have an opportunity to provide feedback to the leadership team. The leadership team will meet and review the SIP during the meetings previously listed and revise the SIP as needed.

Monthly communication will be provided to parents about our school progress in our monthly parent newsletter (T).

**Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.**

List the school's webpage\* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

The SIP will be available at all family engagement events and as part of the exit ticket, parents will have a spot to add feedback as to how they feel we are progressing toward our goal.

The most updated version of the SIP will be located at the school's website:  
<https://www.brevardschools.org/MimsES>

**Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii)**

Parent and family engagement events will be held to help bridge the school to home connection (T) in the areas of reading and math.

**If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))**

Students receive opportunities to try food of high nutritional value multiple times a week through our Fresh Fruit and Vegetable Program at Mims. Our school engages both 3 and 4 year old students and their families by facilitating a Pre-K Head Start program. Additionally, our 6th grade students have the opportunity to participate in ICT Fundamentals which is a Career and Technical Education (CTE) experience for sixth graders in Brevard County that increases their knowledge in areas such as word processing, spreadsheets, cybersecurity, coding, and digital literacy.