# Viera Elementary School



**2023-24**

**Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)**

## Table of Contents

# Viera Elementary School

## 8300 STADIUM PKWY, Melbourne, FL 32940

### brevardschools.org

### School Board Approval

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

### SIP Authority

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

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

### Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

### Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

### Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be

addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

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

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

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

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

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

**Purpose and Outline of the SIP**

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

# I. School Information

## School Mission and Vision

### Provide the school's mission statement.

Viera Elementary will work collaboratively with all stakeholders to provide social, emotional and academic growth for students through engaging learning opportunities that promote critical thinking and problem solving.

### Provide the school's vision statement.

Preparing every student, every day to achieve success academically, while nurturing social and emotional growth for their present and future.

## 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 |
|---|---|---|
| Schwab, Adrienne | Principal | Principal supports the MTSS team and equips teachers with the tools they<br>need to in order to disaggregate the students' performance data. She<br>performs classroom observations, supports the mental health and social/<br>emotional initiatives, participates in parent conferences, refers students and<br>parents to appropriate resources, and continuously reviews school-wide<br>progress monitoring data. |
| Mostowski, Jessica | Assistant Principal | Assistant Principal supports the MTSS team and supports teachers as they<br>disaggregate the students' performance data. She performs classroom<br>observations, supports the mental health and social/emotional initiatives,<br>participates in parent conferences, refers students and parents to<br>appropriate resources, oversees the utilization of district curriculum, serves<br>as the Title IX contact, creates small groups for state testing, and submits<br>the testing to the state. She also serves as the ESOL contact, facilitates<br>WIDA testing, and tracks attendance. |
| Pokorny, Jessica | Instructional Coach | The instructional coach works with teachers to determine appropriate<br>instructional strategies and interventions for students, assists in the<br>development of Tier II<br>and III academic plans, provides observation opportunities for new teachers,<br>refers students and parents to appropriate resources, participates in parent<br>conferences, performs classroom observations, assists third grade teachers<br>with portfolio assessments, oversees the i-ready diagnostic procedure,<br>reviews school-wide progress monitoring data, provides staff training on<br>progress monitoring and interventions. She is a member of the MTSS team<br>to support the social/emotional needs and mental health of students |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---|---|---|
| Brooks, Erin | School Counselor | School counselors create 504 plans, conduct focus group sessions catered to the specific social/emotional needs of identified students, share the Sanford Harmony curriculum with specific activities that are focused on meeting the social/emotional needs of students, and conduct training to proactively combat bullying. School Counselors also provide whole class instruction on sensitive topics, are available to meet with students, teachers and families regarding needs and discuss health care plans with families. |

**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.

Viera Elementary ensures that the mission, vision, and school improvement plan is communicated to all stakeholders. The culture at Viera Elementary is built upon the mission and vision and is prevalent throughout the school community. Staff members are involved in the development of the school-based objective, goals, barriers, and work plan strategies. The final school improvement plan is shared with staff and the SAC committee and is reviewed and referenced throughout the year.

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

Viera Elementary's SIP will continue to be monitored throughout the year. Data from FAST progress monitoring assessments, i-Ready diagnostics and district assessments will be utilized to track progress toward goal. The school leadership team meets weekly and will look at the SIP goals to determine where we are, where we still need to be and what could potentially be taken out. Sub group data will be looked at when monitoring to ensure these groups are progressing and making growth.

| 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** | 28% |

| | |
|---|---|
| **2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** | 11% |
| **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) English Language Learners (ELL) 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 |
| **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 | 3 | 14 | 8 | 16 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 52 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| 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 | 1 | 3 | 10 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 6 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

**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 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| 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 | 3 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 14 |

**The number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 2 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| 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 | 1 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 12 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 5 |
| 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 | 3 | 8 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 7 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 14 |

**The number of students identified retained:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 2 | 3 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| 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* | 81 | 58 | 53 | 85 | 61 | 56 | 85 | | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 73 | | | 76 | | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 78 | | | 69 | | |
| Math Achievement* | 86 | 58 | 59 | 84 | 49 | 50 | 87 | | |

| Accountability Component | 2023 | | | 2022 | | | 2021 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 73 | | | 87 | | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 67 | | | 82 | | |
| Science Achievement* | 91 | 58 | 54 | 93 | 60 | 59 | 80 | | |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | | | | 64 | 64 | | | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | 51 | 52 | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | 56 | 50 | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | 80 | | | |
| ELP Progress | | 54 | 59 | 80 | | | | | |

*\* 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 | 85 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 339 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 4 |
| Percent Tested | 99 |
| Graduation Rate | |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 79 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 633 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| Percent Tested | 97 |
| 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 | 53 | | | |
| ELL | 74 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 88 | | | |
| BLK | 74 | | | |
| HSP | 82 | | | |
| MUL | 84 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 86 | | | |
| FRL | 71 | | | |

| 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 | 55 | | | |
| ELL | 77 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | 90 | | | |
| BLK | | | | |
| HSP | 69 | | | |
| MUL | 76 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 79 | | | |
| FRL | 70 | | | |

## 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 | 81 | | | 86 | | | 91 | | | | | |
| SWD | 44 | | | 61 | | | 50 | | | | 4 | |
| ELL | 58 | | | 89 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 86 | | | 90 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| BLK | 62 | | | 85 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| HSP | 76 | | | 85 | | | 100 | | | | 4 | |
| MUL | 79 | | | 88 | | | | | | | 2 | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 82 | | | 86 | | | 87 | | | | 4 | |
| FRL | 74 | | | 90 | | | | | | | 3 | |

| 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 | 85 | 73 | 78 | 84 | 73 | 67 | 93 | | | | | 80 |
| SWD | 61 | 61 | 67 | 47 | 52 | 40 | | | | | | |
| ELL | 73 | 93 | | 73 | 64 | | | | | | | 80 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | 93 | 91 | | 93 | 82 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 79 | 61 | | 69 | 67 | | | | | | | |
| MUL | 85 | 71 | | 79 | 69 | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 86 | 72 | 74 | 87 | 73 | 70 | 94 | | | | | |
| FRL | 83 | 73 | 70 | 67 | 68 | 58 | | | | | | |

| 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 | 85 | 76 | 69 | 87 | 87 | 82 | 80 | | | | | |
| SWD | 43 | | | 55 | | | | | | | | |
| ELL | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 60 | | | 80 | | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 75 | | | 81 | | | | | | | | |
| MUL | 81 | | | 80 | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 87 | 75 | | 88 | 87 | | 79 | | | | | |
| FRL | 77 | 70 | | 86 | 91 | | | | | | | |

**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 | 82% | 59% | 23% | 54% | 28% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 78% | 61% | 17% | 58% | 20% |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 92% | 61% | 31% | 47% | 45% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 82% | 56% | 26% | 50% | 32% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 95% | 67% | 28% | 54% | 41% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 91% | 60% | 31% | 59% | 32% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 81% | 61% | 20% | 61% | 20% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 85% | 55% | 30% | 55% | 30% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 90% | 57% | 33% | 51% | 39% |

## 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.**

Viera Elementary data shows that the component with the lowest performance in the 2022-2023 school year was ELA proficiency. While the school remained above state and district averages for proficiency there was a slight decrease. In 2022 85% of students were considered scoring at proficient or above while in 2023 only 83% of students scored at proficiency or above.

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

NA

**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.**

The data component that had the greatest gap when compared to the state average was Viera Elementary's Science proficiency scores. The state had a 51% grade 5 proficiency rate while Viera Elementary had a grade 5 90% proficiency rate. The factors that contributed to this were the continued collaborative planning amongst the fifth grade Science teachers and the STEM lab teacher along with the continuous disaggregation of assessment data. Penda was required and utilized by the 5th grade team and students were engaged in hands on Science lessons throughout the year.

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

Math proficiency school wide showed the greatest improvement. In 2021-2022 schoolwide math proficiency was 84% compared to 2022-2023 at 88%. Administration as well as classroom teachers held data meetings after each FAST progress monitoring assessment to disaggregate the data, build interventions and drive instruction. Classroom teachers were required to monitor i-Ready instructional data each week to determine specific student needs in regards to their instructional path. MTSS meetings were held monthly to discuss Lowest25% students as well as to build interventions to meet student needs. Data meetings were held after each i-Ready diagnostic to discuss Tier 1 classroom data as well as individual student growth data. The district math coach conducted classroom walk throughs with administration to discuss math instruction strengths and weaknesses.

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

Reflecting on EWS data, attendance is an area of concern. Students who had less than 90% attendance rate increased drastically from the 2021-2022 school year especially in the primary grade levels. In

2021-2022 we had 12 students who had less than a 90% attendance rate. In 2022-2023 we had 52 students who had less than a 90% attendance rate.

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

Increase Reading proficiency across grade levels and lowest 25% population. Increase math proficiency across grade levels and lowest 25% population. Continue to build a positive culture within the school and increase attendance rates particularly in the primary grade levels.

**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 Other**

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

Viera Elementary continues to grow each year. Through the registration process we noticed that there continues to be a large number of students attending Viera Elementary that are new to Florida or Brevard County. All of these situations combined with the growth of Viera Elementary and building a positive school culture lend itself to the need for a focus on social/emotional learning. Social and emotional learning (SEL) is the process through which children and adults understand and manage emotions, set and achieve positive goals, feel and show empathy for others, establish and maintain positive relationships,
and make responsible decisions. This includes problem-solving skills and intergender communication and understanding, as well as teaching students to embrace diversity and build healthy relationships that will last well into adulthood. Research shows that social/emotional learning is the key to succeeding in the classroom, workplace and at home.

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

According to the 2023 Youth Truth Survey, 49% of students stated that they feel like a real part of the school community compared to 80% reported at other schools. The percent of students who stated that students behave well in their class increased from 25% in 2022 to 33% in 2023. We would like to see at least a 15% increase in these areas in the 2023 survey results.

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

We will monitor this through the Youth Truth survey and student feedback.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Erin Brooks (brooks.erin@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.)

Sanford Harmony will continue to be implemented at Viera Elementary.
Sanford Harmony is a social emotional learning program for Pre-K-6 grade students
designed to foster intergender communication and
understanding, connection, and community both in and outside the
classroom and develop boys and girls into compassionate and caring adults.
This program is a social-emotional teaching program that cultivates strong
classroom relationships between all students. In addition, we will begin a mentoring
program called, Hanging with the Hawks, where students from Viera High help elementary
students build confidence and social skills by playing games, advising them on what to
expect in middle and high school, and offering a big brother/big sister friendship.

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

SEL increases students' academic performance by 11 percentile points,
compared to students who do not participate in such SEL programs. Students
participating in SEL programs also show improved classroom behavior, an
increased ability to manage stress and depression, and better attitudes about
themselves, others, and school. Social Emotional learning can have a positive

impact up to 18 years later on academics, conduct problems, and emotional distress.

**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.

Sanford Harmony Training and Implementation

**Person Responsible:** Erin Brooks (brooks.erin@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** Preplanning 2023

Hanging with the Hawks Mentor Program

**Person Responsible:** Erin Brooks (brooks.erin@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** Throughout the year

Morning Meetings to take place immediately after morning announcements

**Person Responsible:** Adrienne Schwab (schwab.adrienne@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** Every morning each school day

School counselor small group lessons

**Person Responsible:** Erin Brooks (brooks.erin@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** Weekly throughout the year

## #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.

This year Viera Elementary' s student population has grown, resulting in the hiring of many new teachers. Because of this, there is a need to continue to keep math as an area of focus. in 2020-2021, 87% of students in grades 3-6 scored at or above proficiency in math. the following year, there was a drop with 84% of students scoring at or above proficiency. The data from 2022-2023 shows an increase of 4% with 88% of students scoring at or above proficiency. When breaking down the data even further, our 6th grade students were on top with 95% of them scoring at or above proficiency. Next was 3rd grade with 91% and 5th grade with 85%. Students in 4th grade reached 81% proficiency.

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

At least 90% of students in grades 3-6 will score at proficiency or above on the FAST progress monitoring 3 assessment. We would expect to see learning gains from PM1 to PM 3 in at least 85% of students school wide and 85% of students in the Lowest 25% population for math.

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

Administration as well as classroom teachers will hold data meetings after each FAST progress monitoring assessment to disaggregate the data, build interventions and drive instruction. Classroom teachers will be required to monitor i-Ready instructional data each week to determine specific student needs in regards to their instructional path. Sub groups will be created in i-Ready for administration to monitor and discuss with teachers during PLC meetings. MTSS meetings will be held monthly to discuss Lowest 25% students as well as to build interventions to meet student needs. Data meetings will be held after each i-Ready diagnostic to discuss Tier 1 classroom data as well as individual student growth data.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jessica Mostowski (mostowski.jessica@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.)

Providing small group targeted instruction to meet individual student needs.

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

By providing small group instruction in math students will be given scaffolds. According to Joh Hattie scaffolding has an effect size of 0.82. Students will also receive direct instruction from the teacher during small group. Direct instruction has an effect size of 0.6.

**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.

Collaborative Planning Time provided with substitute coverage once each nine weeks. This half day planning session will provide teachers with time to work alongside our district math coach and administration to ensure lessons are engaging and aligned to the standards.

**Person Responsible:** Adrienne Schwab (schwab.adrienne@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** 8/2-8/9, 10/2-10/9, 12/4-12/7, 3/4-3/7

Differentiated Small Group Instruction to both accelerate and remediate.

**Person Responsible:** Jessica Mostowski (mostowski.jessica@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** Ongoing, data driven. Evidenced by lesson plans and walkthrough data. Look-fors to include benchmark aligned instruction and tasks. Small group instruction with differentiation.

Walk Throughs and collaboration with District math Coach. District math coach will provide PD on i-Ready Fluency and Standards Mastery.

**Person Responsible:** Jessica Mostowski (mostowski.jessica@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** Walk throughs-Once every quarter. PD for i-Ready will take place on October 18th.

Provide resources to support math intervention and Tier I instruction. Including i-Ready Fluency and Standards Mastery activities, manipulatives, and "What Works" Clearing House Strategies.

**Person Responsible:** Jessica Mostowski (mostowski.jessica@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** Ongoing, identified through the MTSS process.

Implement common math vocabulary throughout the school. Through our interactive "Wild Words" program, a different math vocabulary word will be introduced and promoted through morning announcements.

**Person Responsible:** Jessica Pokorny (pokorny.jessica@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** Ongoing, Weekly

## #3. 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.

Viera Elementary's population continues to grow with most grade levels increasing by one or two classes. When comparing 2022 FSA data to 2023 FAST PM 3 data, the percentage of students scoring 3 and above dropped by 2 percentage points to 83%. A deeper look at grade level data indicates the largest decline was in 4th grade with 8 percentage points followed by 5th grade with a decrease of 3 percentage points. 6th grade proficiency did show an increase of 8 percentage points.

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

88% of students in grades 3-6 will demonstrate proficiency by scoring a level 3 or higher on FAST.

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

ELA proficiency will be monitored using FAST and iReady assessments as well as common grade level assessments (Benchmark Weekly and Unit assessments, PSI levels, and Running Record levels).

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Jessica Pokorny (pokorny.jessica@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.)

Teachers will participate in purposeful planning, evaluations and reflection of instructional practices pertaining to ELA instruction. This will include long range planning, analysis of data, professional learning, and observation.

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

When looking at factors related to student achievement, planning and prediction, evaluation and reflection, and teacher clarity all have effect sizes of .75 or higher. Focusing on purposeful planning to improve quality ELA instruction touches on all three of these factors. Adding analysis of data and early intervention through the MTSS process will further increase our effectiveness in regards to this strategy.

**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.

Teachers will participate in quarterly planning sessions (1/2 days) with the literacy coach. The focus of these planning sessions will be implementation of standards through district approved curriculum and differentiation to meet student needs.

**Person Responsible:** Jessica Pokorny (pokorny.jessica@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** 8/2-8/9, 10/2-10/9, 12/4-12/7, 3/4-3/7

Teachers will design differentiated small group instruction to meet the needs of all learners within the 90-minute reading block. This design will happen as a result of grade level collaborative planning, coach-led professional learning opportunities, and coach modeling and co-teaching within the classroom.

**Person Responsible:** Adrienne Schwab (schwab.adrienne@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** Ongoing, proficiency indicated on teacher evaluations

Coach's Clinics will be held to reinforce ELA best practices as identified by classroom walkthroughs and the Literacy Instructional Profile. Teachers wanting to further their growth on the Coach Clinic topics may participate in both short and long term coaching cycles with the literacy coach.

**Person Responsible:** Jessica Pokorny (pokorny.jessica@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** Monthly through April

As a result of collaborative planning sessions, classroom walk-throughs or coach led PD opportunities, teachers will participate in coaching cycles with the literacy coach to improve specific areas. Coaching cycles may include a variety of skills and strategies such as differentiation, writing, time management, higher-order questioning, discussion, and engagement techniques. These cycle may also occur as a result of informal administrative observations.

**Person Responsible:** [no one identified]

**By When:** Ongoing September through May

The literacy coach will participate in classroom walkthroughs to determine school, grade level, and individual needs in regards to ELA instruction. Follow up from these walkthroughs will result in additional planning support, professional learning opportunities, or coaching cycles to improve instruction and student achievement.

**Person Responsible:** Jessica Pokorny (pokorny.jessica@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** Weekly through April

Teachers will participate in a book study designed to promote professional growth, collegial conversation and improved instructional practices. The study will be facilitated by the literacy coach with conversation and follow up embedded in the sessions.

**Person Responsible:** Jessica Pokorny (pokorny.jessica@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** Twice a month October - December

Teachers will continue to engage in use of our school-wide writing rubric TEACH. Connections will be made to the new FAST writing rubrics. The literacy coach and AP will support teachers with understanding of quality writing through professional learning and in-class coaching.

**Person Responsible:** Jessica Mostowski (mostowski.jessica@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** March 2024

Students identified as part of our ELA lowest 25% will participate in after school academic support programs.

**Person Responsible:** Jessica Mostowski (mostowski.jessica@brevardschools.org)

**By When:**

Teachers will monitor the use of the iReady instructional path. The expectation will be 30-45 minutes of reading My Path instruction. Progress will be monitored through weekly reports and a digital school-wide gameboard incentive program.

**Person Responsible:** Adrienne Schwab (schwab.adrienne@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** 9/18 - May 2024

Wild Words will be implemented school-wide. This vocabulary incentive will encourage students to be "caught" using vocabulary words (roots, prefixes, suffixes, adjectives) in context and as a result become eligible to become a Weekly Word Superstar. This program will allow Viera Elementary to remain focused on vocabulary community-wide by providing real-world opportunities to use new words.

**Person Responsible:** Jessica Pokorny (pokorny.jessica@brevardschools.org)

**By When:** October 2023-May 2024