

Brevard Public Schools

W. Melbourne Elementary School For Science 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

W. Melbourne Elementary School For Science

2255 MEADOWLANE AVE, West Melbourne, FL 32904

<http://www.wmelbourne.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 mission of our faculty and staff at West Melbourne Elementary and our Shooting Star community is to invest in every child, every day and in every way to promote success for ALL.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At West Melbourne Elementary, we are dedicated to create strong readers, writers, mathematicians and scientists, while integrating technology to conquer the challenges of the world of tomorrow.

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
Benson, Theresa	Principal	School Leadership Team, Supervision of Progress Monitoring, Facilitator of Data collection and discussions, ESSA subgroup data, MTSS Team member, instructional leader of Professional Development
Rouse, Kelly	Assistant Principal	Discipline Data and Intervention, professional development, instructional coaching, subgroup data monitoring, MTSS Team member, school leadership team
Kane, Melissa	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coaching, professional development, school leadership team, data monitoring, intervention assistance and design, part of the MTSS team.
Mistretta, Cathy	School Counselor	Serves the needs all of our students and families, professional development, school leadership team, data monitoring, ESOL contact, part of the MTSS team.
Henneman, Heather	Teacher, ESE	Serves the needs of our students with disabilities. Presents professional development, collaborates with school leadership team, monitors data, coteaches with Gen. Ed and is a member of the MTSS Team
Falcone, Megan	Teacher, ESE	Serves the needs of our students with disabilities. Presents professional development, collaborates with school leadership team, monitors data, coteaches with Gen. Ed and is a member of the MTSS Team

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.

Monthly meetings with our School Advisory Council to review school process and needs. Full review of the SIP is conducted to get input and understanding of the academic needs of our students and what resources we will use to implement interventions and enrichment activities.

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))

Our SIP is a fluid document that is referred to on multiple occasions with our SAC and faculty to make certain we are following through with our vision and action steps.

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	37%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	17%
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) Black/African American Students (BLK) 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	3	8	4	5	8	5	0	0	35	
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	1	1	2	5	0	0	12	
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	3	4	4	3	0	0	14	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	1	7	0	0	0	9	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	

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

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	7	4	4	7	3	1	1	0	0	27	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	5	1	0	0	12	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	8	6	0	0	18	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	

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	1	2	4	1	0	0	8

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	1	1	0	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	7	4	4	7	3	1	1	0	0	27	
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	0	0	3	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	6	5	1	0	0	12	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	4	8	6	0	0	18	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	3	

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	1	2	4	1	0	0	8

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	1	1	0	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*	80	58	53	85	61	56	86		
ELA Learning Gains				82			72		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				69			63		
Math Achievement*	85	58	59	85	49	50	88		
Math Learning Gains				73			84		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59			83		
Science Achievement*	94	58	54	86	60	59	81		
Social Studies Achievement*					64	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					56	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		54	59	70			85		

* 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	86
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	345
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	76
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	609
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
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	59			
ELL	85			
AMI				
ASN	86			
BLK	70			
HSP	94			
MUL	93			
PAC				
WHT	85			

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	76			

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	56			
ELL	74			
AMI				
ASN	91			
BLK	78			
HSP	81			
MUL	86			
PAC				
WHT	74			
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	80			85			94					
SWD	52			63							3	
ELL	83			87							2	
AMI												
ASN	86			86							2	
BLK	62			77							2	
HSP	89			92			100				3	
MUL	93			85			100				3	

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	77			85			96				4	
FRL	69			77			81				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	82	69	85	73	59	86					70
SWD	61	60	55	61	50	50						
ELL	80	74		80	65							70
AMI												
ASN	95	94		90	81		93					
BLK	75	92		69	75							
HSP	94	91		86	74	50	92					
MUL	92	85		88	80							
PAC												
WHT	81	77	63	84	69	62	80					
FRL	83	80	75	78	59	42	80					

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	86	72	63	88	84	83	81					85
SWD	65			65								
ELL	72	81		79	86		82					85
AMI												
ASN	89	81		93	80							
BLK	77			77								
HSP	91	75		93	96		100					
MUL	91			91								
PAC												
WHT	84	67	61	85	85	82	80					80
FRL	77	71	58	81	76		86					

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	76%	61%	15%	58%	18%
06	2023 - Spring	82%	61%	21%	47%	35%
03	2023 - Spring	85%	56%	29%	50%	35%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	98%	67%	31%	54%	44%
03	2023 - Spring	90%	60%	30%	59%	31%
04	2023 - Spring	89%	61%	28%	61%	28%
05	2023 - Spring	80%	55%	25%	55%	25%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	94%	57%	37%	51%	43%

ALGEBRA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	51%	*	50%	*

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 lowest area is our SWD. Currently we have 54% proficient in ELA and 75% proficient in math. Last year, we had one ESE teacher for half of the school year. She had a very large caseload. We earned another ESE allocation and hired our second ESE teacher. We also had two general education classrooms with out a general education teacher for over half the year. Our ESE teachers had to help support in the ESE block. This areas has been our lowest performing area for a while. Even, though it is our lowest we are growing. We increased the level of students who are proficient in both reading and math.

Trends for our SWD:

Since the 2020 school year, our students with disability were our highest priority. This continues to be an area of focus for our school. At the end of 21-22 school year, iReady Diagnostic revealed the following information regarding SWD Proficiency: Only 29% of SWD were Proficient and only 24% were proficient in Math. On the 21-22 ELA FSA. 53% of our SWD received a level 3 or higher and on the FSA Math 50% were proficient.

At the end of 22-23 school year, iReady Diagnostic revealed the following information regarding SWD Proficiency: We increased with 62% of SWD being Proficient in ELA and we increased to 58% proficiency in Math. On the 22-23 ELA FAST. 54% of our SWD received a level 3 or higher and on the FAST Math were, we were at 75% proficiency. This was a 25% increase from the previous year.

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

After analyzing our 2022-2023 FAST data and comparing ELA score from the previous year, we declined from 85% to 83%. We feel the factors that contributed to this decline was a loss of 2 primary classroom teachers mid year in which our instructional coach stepped in to cover one of those classrooms and support the other. We were without a guidance counselor for most of the school year, which put more responsibility on our ESE resource teachers.

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.

Our scores are higher than the state average.

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

We scored number one in the county for 5th grade Science on the SSA increasing our proficiency by 8% (86% to 94%). Although we scored number one we increased there are many reasons to celebrate, our walk-through data showed that teachers that incorporated small group instruction daily increased their scores. The new action steps were incorporating vocabulary review weekly, stations set up, hands-on labs, and the STEAM lab supporting the content being taught in the Gen Ed classroom.

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

After reviewing the data, our area of concern is attendance. After reviewing this data we noticed that our number is higher than normal. Looking deeper at the students who have missed a high number days, we noticed that some of these students are new to us this year. This attendance is a reflection from last year. We are going to monitor these students to make sure they are not following below the required number days of school. Also, we noticed there was a few students who have missed because of VISA issues. Unfortunately, this is out of our control, however we did provide work for these students and noticed that these students continue to be proficient and made a learning gain. Again, we are going to continue to monitor these students to ensure students are at school every day.

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

We have a few areas we would like to focus on this year. One, is our subgroup of SWD. We would like to see our level of students who are score a level 3 or higher in ELA to increase. Next, we would like to increase the number of students in grade 3 through 6 who score a level 3 or higher on the ELA assessment. Then, we would to maintain or grow the number of level 3's or higher on both the 5th grade science assessment as well as the 3 through 6 math assessment.

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 Small Group Instruction**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.

WMSS continues to perform in the top 5 in the district. Our overall ELA scores were 83% proficient on FAST and overall Math scores were at 90% proficient on FAST. However, we scored number one in the county for 5th grade Science on the SSA increasing our proficiency by 8% (86% to 94%). Although there are many reasons to celebrate, our walk-through data showed that teachers that incorporated small group instruction daily increased their scores from PM1 to PM3 with the most growth.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In 2023-2024, our school plans to put action steps in place for every student to achieve a learning gain. We will identify student needs through data chats, MTSS meetings, walk-throughs and implementing research based interventions/enrichments for all students in all grades.

Monitoring:

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

- * MTSS team will meet every 6 weeks to review data in interventions and enrichments
- *Teachers have implemented an intervention/enrichment block into their daily schedule.
- *Weekly Admin classroom walk-throughs to monitor the process
- *Admin will provide coaching, professional development and resources to strengthen this area of focus.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Theresa Benson (benson.theresa@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.)

- *Aligning research based interventions and enrichments with purposeful planning
- *Ongoing Progress Monitoring (OPM) tools assessments including 95% Phonological Awareness Activities, Phonics lesson Library, Phonics Chip kit, UF Literacy Institute (UFLI), Vocab Surge A & B, 95% Comprehension, Comprehension Tool Kit (K-2 & 3-6), Expanding Expression Tool kit, and other District approved resources.
- *Intervention and Enrichments will be based on the District Decision Tree
- Analyzing data immediately after progress monitoring testing
- *Meeting every 6 weeks to allow teachers and MTSS team to make decisions and adapt lessons to immediately differentiate their instruction to support every student.
- *Vertical Team Planning and Vertical Teacher Walk-throughs

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The interventions and enrichments being used has been vetted and endorsed by BPS. This system allows us to analyze our data to understand where our students are academically, It also helps us plan instructional support that is customized to each student, especially our SWD subgroup. It helps teachers and students monitor and progress towards goals to improve instruction to meet students diverse needs.

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 and MTSS team will:

*meet every 6 weeks to discuss student progress with intervention and enrichment strategies

*Analyze multiple pieces of data (progress monitoring tools , iReady instruction, Benchmark weekly, Unit tests and classroom formal and informal assessments) to drive instruction. Based on current needs, intervention and enrichment groups will be fluid based on data.

Person Responsible: Kelly Rouse (rouse.kelly@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

Teachers and MTSS team will:

*meet every 6 weeks to discuss student progress with intervention and enrichment strategies

*Analyze multiple pieces of data (progress monitoring tools , iReady instruction, Benchmark weekly, Unit tests and classroom formal and informal assessments) to drive instruction. Based on current needs, intervention and enrichment groups will be fluid based on data.

Person Responsible: Kelly Rouse (rouse.kelly@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

Administration will conduct walk-throughs during scheduled Success Zone time to ensure interventions and enrichments are happening every day with fidelity. Administration will monitor that processes and procedures are in place so that every student is working at their level of need.

Person Responsible: Theresa Benson (benson.theresa@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

Instructional Coach will support teachers by supporting and guiding teachers with research based interventions, enrichments, progress monitoring tools and all resources needed.

Person Responsible: Melissa Kane (kane.melissa@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing based on teacher need

Build capacity among our instructional staff by conducting vertical walk-throughs and integrating vertical planning in our PD calendar. Professional Development will be targeted to small group instruction and know how to analyze their student data to drive instruction.

Person Responsible: Theresa Benson (benson.theresa@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

Instructional Coach will help teacher implement small groups, provide resources, model, and guide. Classrooms that need additional support with have help with the instructional coach weekly.

Person Responsible: Melissa Kane (kane.melissa@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

Instructional Coach will help teacher implement small groups, provide resources, model, and guide. Classrooms that need additional support with have help with the instructional coach weekly.

Person Responsible: Melissa Kane (kane.melissa@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

Professional Development- PD will align to small group instruction. Teachers will indentify students who need small and what instruction is needed when they are at the small group table.

Every teacher was provided small group instruction materials at the start of the school year. Also every classroom has a small group table.

Person Responsible: Kelly Rouse (rouse.kelly@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Since the 2020 school year, our students with disability were our highest priority. This continues to be an area of focus for our school.

At the end of 21-22 school year, iReady Diagnostic revealed the following information regarding SWD Proficiency: Only 29% of SWD were Proficient and only 24% were proficient in Math. On the 21-22 ELA FSA. 53% of our SWD received a level 3 or higher and on the FSA Math 50% were proficient.

At the end of 22-23 school year, iReady Diagnostic revealed the following information regarding SWD Proficiency: We increased with 62% of SWD being Proficient in ELA and we increased to 58% proficiency in Math. On the 22-23 ELA FAST. 54% of our SWD received a level 3 or higher and on the FAST Math were, we were at 75% proficiency. This was a 25% increase from the previous year. WooHoo!!!! :)

Measurable Outcome:

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

ELA proficiency for SWD will increase from 54% to 75 on the PM3 Fast test in 2024. Math proficiency will increase from 75% to 80%. Along with targeted instruction and interventions will bridge the learning gap for our SWD subgroup.

Monitoring:

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

- * MTSS team will meet every 6 weeks to review data, interventions and enrichments
- * Gen. Ed teachers will work and plan with ESE teacher and IA. We will continue to use the Co-teach Inclusion Model
- * Weekly Admin Classroom Walk-throughs to monitor the process.
- * ESE teachers will coach and support Gen Ed Teachers with IEPs, Accommodations, data collection and research based interventions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kelly Rouse (rouse.kelly@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.)

- * Aligning standards with purposeful planning, benchmark/Reveal Assessments, SAAVAS/EdGems Assessments, iReady MyPath and Progress Monitoring will be implemented and used school-wide.
- * PM1,2 & 3 data will be analyzed immediately after diagnostic testing and progress monitoring.
- * Online testing will allow teachers to make decisions and create teacher lessons to immediately differentiate their instruction and support every student.
- * Accommodations will be monitored to ensure that we are meeting students' needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We will continue to use iReady as it has been vetted and endorsed by BPS

- * Using the new UFLI and Expanding Expression Tool, the ESE team will spearhead this program and train teachers on how to implement it with fidelity, which will bridge gaps.

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.

Instruction and Remediation from Gen. Ed teacher, ESE Resource teachers and ESA IA, is inclusive and support facilitative model is adopted. The 2021 BPiE Assessment will be reviewed and incorporated to align with this focus (i.e. resource teacher and IA push in to classrooms to support inclusive best practices, ESE schedule is considered prior to building Master Schedule).

Students will receive scaffolding instruction during a dedicated intervention block based on need.

Person Responsible: Theresa Benson (benson.theresa@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

Instructional Leadership will provide PD and technical assistance to teachers so that SWD have access to on-grade level instruction, curriculum resources, and the use of appropriate accommodations. Our MTSS Support Team will provide examples of research based intervention that teachers will use with students at these Tiered Levels.

Person Responsible: Kelly Rouse (rouse.kelly@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

All students will receive grade level instruction in Tier 1. Teachers will work with students in small groups and provide 30 minutes of instruction from iReady MyPath and customized activities in the instructional Toolbox. Through progress monitoring, teachers will collect data, analyze and present to the MTSS team to review growth and next steps. Students identified at Tier 2 & 3 in reading and math will receive additional support in ASP. ASP and ESSR Funding will be utilized to support students

Person Responsible: Theresa Benson (benson.theresa@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

ESE teachers will continue to support teachers and the data collections for ESE services and accommodations. These teachers will also take part in Vertical Planning with all grade levels to support and meet the wide range of learners at WMSS

Person Responsible: Megan Falcone (falcone.megan@brevardschools.org)

By When: Conducted Monthly

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

If students had the choice of coming to school or not, would our teachers be teaching to an empty room? This is a question that we posed to our teachers this year from the book, "Teach Like a PIRATE," by Dave Burgess. Based on our data from the Youth Truth Survey, many students shared that their classes were boring! Our focus is to build positive student/teacher relationships, increase student engagement and present challenging academic learning activities by using a variety of instructional methods. By having engaging lessons, we are hoping to increase are attendance rates.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We want to increase our instructional methods from 39% to 80%. For the category of Academic Challenge, we want to increase that percentage from 24% to 80%. We would also like to decrease the number of students who fall into the attendance concerns from 33 students to 15 students.

Monitoring:

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

- * Grade Level Meetings
- * Students Chats with Student Council
- * Walk-throughs

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Theresa Benson (benson.theresa@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.)

- * Admin will have Professional Development Check in with Teachers
- * Admin will provide Teacher Surveys on what lessons they could sell tickets for what amazing lessons they teach.
- * Teachers will present ways they have engaged students with positive rapport to colleagues

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our rationale supports the Youth Truth data in making positive changes, relationships, cultures and academic challenges

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.

Instructional Methods

- * Vertical Team Planning to design engaging lessons
- * Professional Development
- * Weekly meetings with Admin
- * Data Chats with students and Teachers

Person Responsible: Theresa Benson (benson.theresa@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

Academic Challenge

- * Teachers will collaborate with ESE team, Instructional Coach and Gifted Teacher
- * All students will have access to grade level content and enrichment opportunities
- * Utilize the data of what's already been mastered so that instruction can be accelerated

Person Responsible: Kelly Rouse (rouse.kelly@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing