

Brevard Public Schools

Gemini Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Gemini Elementary School

2100 OAK ST, Melbourne Beach, FL 32951

<http://www.gemini.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.

Investing in every child, every day in every way.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Gemini community is dedicated to preparing today's students for tomorrow's launch to success.

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
Carver, Christina	Principal	Mrs. Carver supervises front office, cafeteria, Brevard After School staff and conducts teacher and staff evaluations. She is the TEAM meeting leader, Leadership Team leader, Facilitators' leader, SAC, PTO, and School Accreditation contact. She is responsible for campus supervision and monitors the school resource officer. Mrs. Carver tracks and monitors student accountability through data analysis.
Rosado, Christine	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Rosado is responsible for providing and leading professional development for staff, as well as being the Induction contact for all new teachers, and the onboarding process. She creates and manages school schedules, and plans the academic support program. She is the testing coordinator; and coordinates all aspects of Elementary Curriculum.
Steger, Michelle	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Steger is responsible for assisting with the School Improvement Plan. She is the iReady point of contact, as well as participates in the MTSS process for students during IPST meetings weekly. She is the contact for interventions, when discussing students. She is part of the Literacy Leadership Team and conducts classroom walkthroughs.
O'Brien, Erin	Teacher, K-12	Mrs. O'Brien is a member of our School Improvement Committee. She serves Gemini as a 6th Grade Math teacher. In addition, she is the chair of the SAC. She is a point of contact of data analysis and school improvement initiatives and decision making.

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.

We held a faculty meeting where we reviewed data from the Insight Survey, Parent Survey, Youth Truth Survey, and last year's FAST data. Staff split into groups to review the different data points. They highlighted the positive changes, and areas of focus for next year. These areas are also shared with our SAC so they are aware of what Gemini wants to focus on.

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 team will collect walkthrough data, review PM2 data and compare it to PM1. We will celebrate the good work gained, change course and adjust if data doesn't show desired growth. The LLT and Admin team will meet to review the SIP plan.

Grade level monthly data meetings will support the monitoring of data toward SIP goals.

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	12%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	21%
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) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A

	2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	4	6	4	3	6	6	5	0	0	34
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	3	3	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	2	6	0	0	9
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	4	2	4	1	3	2	0	0	20

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	1	1	0	1	0	1	2	0	0	6

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	14	10	21	13	12	13	0	0	83
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	2	1	1	4	0	0	10
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	2	3	2	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	6	3	0	0	0	12
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	7	8	11	3	10	7	0	0	46

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

The number of students by grade level that exhibited each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	14	10	21	13	12	13	0	0	83
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	2	1	1	4	0	0	10
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	2	3	2	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	6	3	0	0	0	12
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	7	8	11	3	10	7	0	0	46

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

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

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	5
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*	79	58	53	83	61	56	79		
ELA Learning Gains				70			73		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				67			70		
Math Achievement*	84	58	59	85	49	50	80		
Math Learning Gains				82			76		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				75			70		
Science Achievement*	66	58	54	76	60	59	71		
Social Studies Achievement*					64	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					56	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		54	59						

* In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	80
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	321
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	77
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	538
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	73			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	71			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	82			

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	74			

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	61			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	89			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	76			
FRL	71			

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	79			84			66					
SWD	65			67							3	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	71			71							2	
MUL												

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	80			86			69				4	
FRL	72			76			56				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	83	70	67	85	82	75	76					
SWD	63	52	42	63	76	67						
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	100			77								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	82	69	67	86	82	72	75					
FRL	74	69	82	78	66	75	50					

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	79	73	70	80	76	70	71					
SWD	53	77	75	59	62							
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	75			67								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	79	72	69	80	75	68	69					
FRL	64	65		66	59	80						

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	68%	59%	9%	54%	14%
04	2023 - Spring	85%	61%	24%	58%	27%
06	2023 - Spring	80%	61%	19%	47%	33%
03	2023 - Spring	90%	56%	34%	50%	40%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	97%	67%	30%	54%	43%
03	2023 - Spring	88%	60%	28%	59%	29%
04	2023 - Spring	78%	61%	17%	61%	17%
05	2023 - Spring	82%	55%	27%	55%	27%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	66%	57%	9%	51%	15%

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 5th grade science. We believe the lack of Penda usage among the school was a factor in this. These students were in 2nd grade when we went out on COVID. Science instruction wasn't as hands-on and interactive coming out of COVID. The master schedule only gave our science teacher one hour, per rotation a day.

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

The greatest decline from prior was in 5th Grade ELA from 77% proficiency to 68% proficiency. Factors include a new staff member with only experience in primary and 3rd grade. Her learning the benchmarks for this grade level was a new challenge, as well as getting acquainted with students of Gemini.

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 greatest gap when compared to the state was our 3rd Grade Math (a difference of +29%). 3rd Grade piloted the 3rd Grade Reveal Acceleration curriculum. They had district support via ZOOM with implementation of this curriculum.

Our 6th Grade Math was a difference of +43% compared to the State. Our teachers ability group the students around math to support the gapped skills needed for success on 6th grade benchmarks.

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

The most improved area was whole school Math. All teachers and administration got trained during the summer of the curriculum and benchmarks. Staff got support from a district math coach to support implementation of the new curriculum and state benchmarks. School used ESSER funds to purchase brand new math manipulatives to support student learning and engagement. We are still working in this area of implementation with the tools.

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

Gemini's area of concerns based off of EVS data is an increased number of absences. This is due to family choices.

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

Our highest priorities are: 1) science, 2) math and 3) continuing our growth in vocabulary instruction.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to 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.

One of our areas of FOCUS last year (2022-2023) was the domain of vocabulary, based on iReady School data. During our monthly IPSPG meetings, our Literacy Coach helped support our teachers with reviewing areas within the district overview document during Benchmark curriculum to ensure rich vocabulary instruction and conversation. The ELA Leadership Team walked classrooms to observe vocabulary instruction and strategies used during the ELA block. For the 2023-2024 school year, we will continue to focus on vocabulary, using our classroom walk through tool, with an emphasis on the Science of Reading, using academic language through the use of higher order questioning and explicit vocabulary instruction using district curriculum routines.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We will expect an increase on iReady Vocabulary domain during the Winter Diagnostic Assessment to increase from 74% on or above grade level to 80% which is a 6% increase.

Monitoring:

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

K-6 grade level teams will gather data through the Brevard Benchmark Assessments and the State Assessment, FAST by honing in on the vocabulary benchmarks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christine Rosado (rosado.christine@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 continue to pay specific attention to the morphology pieces of the curriculum. This will continue to support the needed are of vocabulary. During our IPSPG sessions, teachers will review vocabulary benchmarks within the district scope and sequence to ensure rigor of the benchmark. Teachers will receive professional development from our reading coach, of curriculum resources to enrich vocabulary instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Based on the results of the 2022-2023 End of Year Reading iReady Diagnostic, 378 out of 460 students took this end of year assessment.73% of students were on or above grade level in the vocabulary domain, so there is still a need in this area.

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.

During our IPSPG meetings, the Literacy Coach will support the teachers with reviewing areas in the District Overview document using the Benchmark curriculum to ensure rich vocabulary instruction and conversation.

Person Responsible: Christine Rosado (rosado.christine@brevardschools.org)

By When: End of year.

The ELA Leadership Team will walk to observe vocabulary instruction and strategies used during the ELA block. Literacy Coach will provide glows and grows for teacher self reflection. Data collected during walks will be shared during Faculty Meetings.

Person Responsible: Christine Rosado (rosado.christine@brevardschools.org)

By When: On going

The Literacy Leadership Team will implement positive recognition of student growth quarterly, based on iReady success rate on lessons, focusing on the this domain. Students will be recognized on a red carpet to celebrate as a school.

Person Responsible: Michelle Steger (steger.michelle@brevardschools.org)

By When: End of year- quarterly

Grade level teams will review Diagnostic Data and continue to monitor their student's progress through the use of iReady Mypath, with the support of the Literacy Coach and the Leadership Team.

Person Responsible: Christine Rosado (rosado.christine@brevardschools.org)

By When: End of year, monthly.

LLT will reach out to Laurel Preston to come and provide PD to staff to support the understanding the Science of Reading and provide the WHY behind it.

Person Responsible: Christine Rosado (rosado.christine@brevardschools.org)

By When: End of year, monthly.

#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.

As a higher performing school, it can be difficult to show growth and gains in students. With last year's data of 86% proficiency in math,

Measurable Outcome:

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

We expect an increase in Math FAST PM3 data to improve 2% from 86% last school year. We hope to increase 2% points to 82% on iReady Math as well, with an emphasis on Number Sense.

Monitoring:

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

K-6 grade level teams will gather data with a focus on the 2% in their classrooms through the Brevard Required Assessments and FAST State Assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christine Rosado (rosado.christine@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 K-5 will implement the Reveal 'Be Curious' Number Routine. This supports the development of fluency with targeted concepts, prerequisite skills, and mental math strategies.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Based on the results of the 2023 PM3 FAST Math Assessment, the fidelity of the implementation of the new Reveal/Ed Gems curriculum showed significant gains.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

The Leadership Team will conduct walk throughs during the Math block to monitor math instruction and number routines, with an emphasis of vocabulary and rich conversation. Feedback will be shared during faculty meetings.

Person Responsible: Christine Rosado (rosado.christine@brevardschools.org)

By When: End of year and ongoing.

Debra Gibbs will be supporting the teachers in math instruction by walking classrooms and providing feedback around the use of manipulatives and math discourse. We will have her also focus on increasing the instruction of Number Routines during the math block. She will also use IPSPG time with teachers to support the implementation of the math tools during instruction.

Person Responsible: Christine Rosado (rosado.christine@brevardschools.org)

By When: End of year and ongoing.

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

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

Based on 2022-2023 Science State Assessment with Gemini being at a proficiency of 66%, the area of need is to increase the science instruction in Earth and Space, which was a 32% proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We expect an increase our proficiency from 66% to 70%. This is a 4% increase.

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor through the Penda program. The expectation is to do 2-3 lessons with a passing rate of 80%. We will make sure to bring attention the Earth and Space benchmarks to emphasis this area of need.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christine Rosado (rosado.christine@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.)

3-6 grade teachers will implement the Penda Program. The district releases lessons weekly following the scope and sequence.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

This program has had great success in other counties and our district has added a focus of Science to their Vision of Excellent Instruction. Gemini will support this implementation through monitoring and providing incentives to motivate students.

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.

During Pre-Planning, the area of focus was given to the teachers to start implementation of the Penda Program and teachers gave feedback for what incentives could be given for motivation for students. These incentives were around things that started with a 'P'. (Ex: Pencils for Penda, Popsicles for Penda, Popcorn for Penda.)

Person Responsible: Christine Rosado (rosado.christine@brevardschools.org)

By When: Preplanning Week - August

Monthly, we will run a report on how students did that month and reward those who did 2-3 lessons and 80% passing. Provide incentives to students who met the goal.

Person Responsible: Christine Rosado (rosado.christine@brevardschools.org)

By When: Monthly

Mrs. Rosado will reach out to Nicole Kuiper about supporting our school with implementation of the 5 E model.

Person Responsible: Christine Rosado (rosado.christine@brevardschools.org)

By When: By end of 1st Semester