Brevard Public Schools

Robert L. Stevenson Elementary School

2023-24
Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Robert L. Stevenson Elementary School

1450 MARTIN BLVD, Merritt Island, FL 32952

http://www.stevenson.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 school conducted a vision and mission workshop with all stakeholders over the course of 3 weeks in August 2020. The school revisited the vision and mission in August 2023. It was determined, after gathering input and feedback from stakeholders, that the vision and mission is still a reflection of what Stevenson is and what Stevenson strives to be. The final vision and mission for the school was developed collaboratively and is as follows:

Mission - To inspire students to strive for excellence through a rigorous, academic and arts-integrated curriculum in a safe, equitable learning community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision - Exemplify excellence in cognition, character, and creativity.

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
Fleeger, Tiffiny	Principal	Mrs. Fleeger is the instructional leader of Stevenson Elementary. She provides leadership that allows teachers to grow in their craft and supports a choice school learning environment to enrich the community. She believes that all students can learn and that all learners deserve enrichment opportunities. Mrs. Fleeger is a huge supporter of the arts and its integration into the RLS curriculum. She also has a strong interest in technology and how it can impact learning in the classroom when integrated into instruction. Mrs. Fleeger works collaboratively with stakeholders and the parent community to assess the needs of the school and implement improvement efforts. She utilizes multiple methods to identify areas of need to include observation and feedback cycles. Mrs. Fleeger is dedicated to academic excellence, arts integration, community connectedness, and the growth of all individuals.
Harrigan, Patrick	Assistant Principal	Mr. Harrigan's duties and responsibilities are to support teachers in curriculum and instruction. He is the liaison between district initiatives, directives, and classroom teachers. He communicates how the latest programs are tied to best practices and student achievement. He collaborates with teachers to evaluate student, class, and school data and develop instructional plans that lead to student successes as noted during observation and feedback cycles.
Barrons, Angela	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Barrons, Instructional Coach, provides instructional support to teachers and oversees and participates in common planning for kindergarten through sixth grades. Mrs. Barrons also supports teachers in data analysis, leads them in the MTSS process, and plans for differentiated activities, small group instruction, and interventions in order to increase student learning gains. Mrs. Barrons works with teachers through the coaching cycle to improve instructional practices school-wide. She shares her strong pedagogy with all stakeholders at Stevenson. She provides training for both teachers and parents as it relates to instructional programs and best practices.

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.

The leadership and committee structures put in place at Stevenson intentionally include all stakeholders to
assist in the development of a positive learning environment that also instills excellence and accountability.
The purpose of the work of these committees, such as the Leadership Team, Principal Cabinet, Student Executive Council, Positive Behavior Committee, and Equity Committee is to include stakeholders in the decision making process in support of the learning community. Each committee
clearly understands their roles and purpose as our mission and vision is the umbrella under which they operate. The involvement of those that serve indicates there is a high level of trust and respect in their ability. This trust extends to other stakeholders as academic conversations take place in and beyond

each grade level.
The Leadership Committee, made up of 5 members, the principal being the leader, manages school academic and procedural needs. It also gathers data and information from a variety of sources to determine
needs and develop the school improvement plan.
The Principal Cabinet is involved in the decision-making process as it relates to professional development,
grading, determining the members of our student executive council, and accreditation. This group also examines opportunities for growth and provides input regarding any decisions that impact the whole school community.
Our Student Executive Council, facilitated by the Principal, looks at student data and analyzes the information gained from the Youth Truth Survey. Yearly, they present to our School Advisory Council (SAC) and
share the information learned from this particular survey. Teachers are interested in student perceptions and suggestions for school improvement.
The SAC, with members of teachers, parents, and individuals from the community assist by providing input in school related decision, to include input regarding the School Improvement Plan. This
year we have an individual from Launch Learning, a local community pre-school. This committee also assists with ideas and resources to improve the school. It also discusses and votes as to how the SAC budget will assist in
the improvements.
One tool that each committee utilizes to gain information from stakeholders is the survey. Each group sometimes develops, always analyzes, and uses the information gained to improve practice. Surveys include our annual Parent Survey, Teacher Survey, Youth Truth Survey, and even some ad-hoc surveys to collect specific data. For example, leadership changed the procedures of the car loop. To gather information, a survey was sent to parents to answer questions specifically related to this change. This way the team knew the overall effectiveness of the decision made. Surveys provide open and honest feedback that assists in improving the quality of education, enhances teaching methods, and the learning environment. It also helps us to understand the student's perspective which gives us insight to their thinking. Teacher surveys help give a picture of the school climate, their sense of satisfaction, and their points of view on a variety of educational topics.
Surveys provide the feedback that can track student performance, faculty performance, and the quality of
education.

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 leadership team will meet regularly to discuss the implementation of the SIP. In particular, math data from various sources will be reviewed regularly in order to measure growth and student outcomes. Regular observations of classroom instruction will be an important part of monitoring the effect of professional learning. In particular, focusing on the percent of teachers implementing Kagan Cooperative Learning Structures and the regularity of their use will be instrumental to evaluating effectiveness. Updating stakeholders, particularly the School Advisory Council, is another critical step of regularly monitoring the SIP.

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	15%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	23%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) Asian Students (ASN) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	2	4	6	7	3	2	6	0	0	30
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	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	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	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	8	4	3	0	2	6	3	0	0	26
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
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	1	3	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	0	0	6
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	

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	2	0	0	0	0	2

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
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	8	4	3	0	2	6	3	0	0	26
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
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	1	3	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	0	0	6
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	

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	2	0	0	0	0	2

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	2
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*	90	58	53	91	61	56	93		
ELA Learning Gains				77			82		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				76			85		
Math Achievement*	82	58	59	87	49	50	87		
Math Learning Gains				78			61		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				76			59		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	87	58	54	89	60	59	91		
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	87
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	346
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	82
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	574
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	72			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	74			
MUL	90			
PAC				
WHT	87			
FRL	81			

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	69			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	92			
BLK				
HSP	80			
MUL	79			
PAC				
WHT	84			
FRL	75			

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	90			82			87					
SWD	79			68			70				3	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	82			65							2	
MUL	79			100							2	
PAC												
WHT	91			81			85				4	
FRL	88			72			73				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	91	77	76	87	78	76	89					
SWD	75	58	58	81	71							
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	100	83		100	83							
BLK												
HSP	88	86		82	64							
MUL	80	64		87	86							
PAC												
WHT	92	76	78	88	79	79	94					
FRL	87	72	67	77	76	65	82					

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	93	82	85	87	61	59	91					
SWD	89	83		82	50							
ELL												

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
AMI												
ASN	100			100								
BLK												
HSP	94	90		82	70							
MUL	83	77		79	46							
PAC												
WHT	94	85	83	87	61	62	94					
FRL	93	87		83	52		92					

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	87%	59%	28%	54%	33%
04	2023 - Spring	97%	61%	36%	58%	39%
06	2023 - Spring	91%	61%	30%	47%	44%
03	2023 - Spring	86%	56%	30%	50%	36%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	93%	67%	26%	54%	39%
03	2023 - Spring	84%	60%	24%	59%	25%
04	2023 - Spring	86%	61%	25%	61%	25%
05	2023 - Spring	71%	55%	16%	55%	16%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	87%	57%	30%	51%	36%

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.

Mathematics proficiency in grades 3-6 demonstrated the lowest performance. One contributing factor may have been a change of curriculum as well as the new BEST benchmarks. Inconsistent use of engagement strategies or manipulatives may have also contributed to this lower performance. A targeted time during the Math block for small group Tier 1 instruction with scaffolds was not always present in every grade level.

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

Mathematics proficiency in grades 3-6 declined from 87% in 2022 to 81% in 2023. Inconsistent use of engagement strategies and manipulatives in math instruction were a likely contributing factor. The implementation of a new math curriculum may also be a contributing factor. A targeted time during the Math block for small group Tier 1 instruction with scaffolds was not always present in every grade level.

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.

4th Grade ELA scores were considerably higher than the state average. Differentiated instruction, consistent use of engagement strategies, and rigorous instruction contributed to this gap. A development of a strong classroom community that encourages both individual and classroom accountability for success is present in each of the fourth-grade classrooms.

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

Fourth grade ELA proficiency scores jumped to #3 in the state and #1 in Brevard. Collaborative planning provides teams of teachers time to establish common language and impactful strategies in supporting instruction. Vertical collaboration between the teachers helped to determine what areas in demonstrated the greatest need. A rigorous and engaging curriculum also helped drive positive student outcomes. Pre and Post assessments with a targeted analysis of standards was conducted to improve student mastery of those standards.

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

When compared to 2021-2022, more students were absent 10% or more in the 2022-2023 school year. A targeted approach to increase attendance, including the adherence of the school of choice agreement, will be utilized consistently this school year.

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

1.) Improving mathematics student outcomes across all grade levels.
2.) Improving ELA student outcomes in grades 3, 5, and 6.
3.) Maintaining high student achievement in ELA in Grade 4.
4.) Improving science proficiency.

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 Student Engagement

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

In order to promote engagement uniformly though the school, Kagan Cooperative Learning structures are being adopted in all grades. Data from the FAST tests have demonstrated a drop in overall performance in mathematics and a stagnation in ELA in many grade levels. Additional student survey data demonstrated a perceived lack of engagement and rigor in classroom activities. By adopting Kagan, teachers will have a common language in planning lessons to be engaging and rigorous across all grade levels and subjects.

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

The overall goal is for student proficiency in mathematics to increase from 87% in 2022 to greater than 90% in grades 3-6, as evidenced by FAST PM 3 results. Additionally, grades K-2 should post an initial proficiency of 90% as evidenced by FAST PM 3 results.

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

Data from multiple sources will be used to measure the implementation and effectiveness of Kagan strategies in mathematics throughout the year. Key sources will include FAST PM 1 and PM 2, iReady Diagnostics, quarterly Benchmark assessments, and classroom walk-throughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tiffiny Fleeger (fleeger.tiffiny@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.)

Professional learning focusing on implementation of Kagan structures in a variety of subjects throughout the year. In particular, how these structures can benefit engagement in math instruction especially when combined with the use of manipulatives and small group/interventions.

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

By providing easy to implement strategies, teachers should be able to improve student engagement in mathematics learning. Cooperative structures provide students more ownership over their learning, and provides collaboration with peers. The use of manipulatives is another important component of improving student outcomes in mathematics. In addition, engagement, reflective practices, acceleration, and intervention are rated as Tier 1 - Strong Evidence by the What Works Clearinghouse.

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.

Organize staff led professional development sessions which highlights teachers utilizing high impact engagement strategies in the classroom. The staff will be led in groups to help facilitators focus on Kagan strategies that are more beneficial with particular student age groups.

Person Responsible: Patrick Harrigan (harrigan.patrick@brevardschools.org)

By When: 5/1/2024

Arrange professional learning opportunities throughout the course of the school year focused on the 23-24 Instructional Agreements (use of manipulative, small group instruction, and interventions), high-yield instructional strategies for rigor, student engagement, ELA curriculum (Benchmark Advance/Savvas), BEST Math Benchmarks, math curriculum (Reveal/EdGems), and task alignment, and enrichment/ acceleration.

Person Responsible: Angela Barrons (barrons.angela@brevardschools.org)

By When: 5/1/2024

Collaborative Planning
Provide teachers with additional common planning time facilitated by a member of the leadership team to build arts-integrated, quality Tier 1 lessons with tasks that include student engagement strategies. Dates will be determined and placed on the master calendar by the leadership team during pre-planning.

Person Responsible: Tiffiny Fleeger (fleeger.tiffiny@brevardschools.org)

By When: 5/1/2024

Prioritizing Interventions Strategically and Effectively
Provide a master schedule that has dedicated daily intervention time to support the MTSS process as needed. Arrange team members to support teachers in identifying student areas of need, prescribing interventions/enrichment, and monitoring students' progress in response to targeted instruction. Utilize ESSER Funding and Academic Support Funding to support students (before/during/after school) who are identified as needing more instruction and support to meet grade level standards
to support students that may be struggling with current standards or as requested by parents.

Person Responsible: Angela Barrons (barrons.angela@brevardschools.org)

By When: 5/1/2024

Monitor implementation of action steps via leadership walk-throughs and provide support for teachers during weekly Student Success Team meetings. Support may be through coaching cycles, data analysis, model lessons, and/or planning for instruction.

Person Responsible: Tiffiny Fleeger (fleeger.tiffiny@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing until 5/1/2024