

Brevard Public Schools

Harbor City 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	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	22
VI. Title I Requirements	27
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Harbor City Elementary School

1377 SARNO RD, Melbourne, FL 32935

<http://www.harborcity.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.

Our purpose is to create a safe environment where students are inspired to be lifelong learners and where everyone makes a difference.

(revisited 2021)

Provide the school's vision statement.

Students who rise above;
Teachers who go beyond!

(revisited 2021)

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
Boyd, Christine	Principal	School Leadership Team, monitoring progress monitoring, data collection, ESSA subgroup data identification and collection, instructional leaders, engage stakeholders, and collaborate in the school's decision making process, manage and administer the instructional program so as to ensure all students have the opportunity to learn, instructional coaching, and professional development.
Lanterman, Tami	Assistant Principal	Discipline data and intervention, professional development, instructional coaching, subgroup data monitoring, assist teachers in organizing classrooms for effective learning, implement and schedule all standardized testing, assist teachers in interpreting and implementing the district's curriculum and School Leadership Team.
Brown, Audra	Reading Coach	School Leadership Team, plan and organize for appropriate instruction, utilize a variety of instructional techniques to meet the individual needs of students, evaluate student's progress on a regular basis, use appropriate Instruction strategies and materials that reflect each student's culture, learning styles, ESE needs and socioeconomic background and train teachers in data analysis and using data to differentiate instruction.
Tingle, Matt	Instructional Coach	School Leadership Team, plan and organize for appropriate instruction, utilize a variety of instructional techniques to meet the individual needs of students, evaluate student's progress on a regular basis, use appropriate Instruction strategies and materials that reflect each student's culture, learning styles, ESE needs and socioeconomic background and train teachers in data analysis and using data to differentiate instruction. He is funded by Title I.

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.

Held CNA over the summer, including a variety of instructional staff and administration, diving into district, school, and grade level data, focusing on subgroups. Identified trends and patterns, both positive and negative, creating goals for the school and grade levels. Collaborated and outlined SIP with SAC and community members (PTO). At Annual Title One Meeting, provided parents with plan to support and implement the title one plan and goals written in SIP.

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))

SIP monitoring will be continuous throughout the school year, focused at each grade level and as the site as a whole after each iReady Diagnostic and FAST assessment period. Individual subgroup and student progress will be reviewed and discussed at grade level PLC meetings and the 6 week data chats. Staff PD and conversations with SAC, will also occur monthly throughout the school year. Our instructional leadership team will meet bi-weekly, adjusting to focus, as needed, to meet our students' needs.

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	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	40%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
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) 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: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C
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	11	14	10	10	14	9	14	0	0	82	
One or more suspensions	2	7	3	2	4	1	3	0	0	22	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	4	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	3	2	2	0	0	8	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	11	12	8	0	0	36	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	10	9	0	0	22	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	9	5	5	5	2	3	5	0	0	34	

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	0	0	3	8	3	6	0	0	21

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	1	19	15	12	10	7	8	0	0	72	
One or more suspensions	0	5	2	2	1	3	2	0	0	15	
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	6	7	15	10	0	0	38	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	10	11	15	0	0	42	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	8	20	11	0	0	0	0	0	39	

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	2	1	0	2	3	5	0	0	13

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	3	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	1	19	15	12	10	7	8	0	0	72	
One or more suspensions	0	5	2	2	1	3	2	0	0	15	
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	6	7	15	10	0	0	38	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	10	11	15	0	0	42	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	8	20	11	0	0	0	0	0	39	

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	2	1	0	2	3	5	0	0	13

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	3	2	6	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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*	59	58	53	55	61	56	49		
ELA Learning Gains				64			52		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				59			50		
Math Achievement*	62	58	59	58	49	50	61		
Math Learning Gains				56			64		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				52			44		
Science Achievement*	52	58	54	38	60	59	47		
Social Studies Achievement*					64	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					56	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	75	54	59						

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	61
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	303
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	382
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
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	37	Yes	1	
ELL	55			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	64			
HSP	48			
MUL	50			
PAC				
WHT	61			
FRL	53			

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	48			
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	45			
HSP	59			

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%
MUL	34	Yes	2	
PAC				
WHT	54			
FRL	55			

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	59			62			52					75
SWD	27			44			58				4	
ELL	45			45							3	75
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	68			59							2	
HSP	39			56							2	
MUL	46			54							2	
PAC												
WHT	61			64			54				4	
FRL	55			58			50				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	55	64	59	58	56	52	38					
SWD	24	52	63	33	56	62						
ELL	36			50								
AMI												
ASN												

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
BLK	37	50	45	38	57	60	27					
HSP	57	69		52	56							
MUL	25			42								
PAC												
WHT	63	68		67	56	30	40					
FRL	51	63	65	53	56	57	38					

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	49	52	50	61	64	44	47					
SWD	28	48	47	44	48	31	31					
ELL	38			54								
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	15			52								
HSP	44	40		40	53							
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	56	52		66	70		56					
FRL	43	47	54	55	60	46	45					

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	62%	59%	3%	54%	8%
04	2023 - Spring	48%	61%	-13%	58%	-10%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	59%	61%	-2%	47%	12%
03	2023 - Spring	49%	56%	-7%	50%	-1%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	48%	67%	-19%	54%	-6%
03	2023 - Spring	49%	60%	-11%	59%	-10%
04	2023 - Spring	55%	61%	-6%	61%	-6%
05	2023 - Spring	75%	55%	20%	55%	20%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	46%	57%	-11%	51%	-5%

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 components that showed the lowest performance was our overall percentage of students proficient and above in 5th Grade Science at 46%, 4th Grade ELA at 48%, and 3rd grade ELA and Math at 49% proficient. The multi-racial subgroup scored below the federal index of 41% at 34% in ELA. The math curriculum was not taught with fidelity. Small group ELA and Math instruction was not used for acceleration at each grade level with fidelity. We will follow the MTSS process, putting in acceleration groups in both ELA and Math, as well as working with district resource teachers on MTSS and data collection Professional Development.

Science was not taught with hands on learning. We will need to monitor this at all levels and add Professional Development from the District Resource teacher, the Starbase Program in fifth grade, PENDA for 3rd-6th, and the teachers will write a plan to improve, and we will observe and give feedback. Lack of strategies shared and used by parents resulted in lower scores for the multi-racial subgroup. Though Penda was used in Science, the hands-on instruction and observations with feedback did not occur.

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

The data point that showed the greatest decline was in 3rd Grade Math, down 12% students proficient or above, 3rd grade ELA, down 6% students proficient or above, and 4th Grade Math down 6 % proficient or above.

Low performance was connected to adopted curriculum not being taught with fidelity and the Benchmark standards not being taught to the correct level of rigor. Explicit instruction, with a daily walk to intervention was not put into place nor checked for fidelity. The Literacy Coach, teachers, and MTSS team did not identify Tier II and III student intervention groups.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The data component with the greatest gap compared to state average was 4th grade ELA, 10% below state (48% compared to 58%) and 3rd grade math 10% below state (49% compared to 59%).

Low performance was connected to adopted curriculum not being taught with fidelity and the Benchmark standards not being taught to the correct level of rigor.

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

The data component that showed the most improvement was the amount of students proficient and above in 5th grade ELA (increasing by 16%) and Math (increasing by 24%) in 5th grade.

New Actions, from last year's SIP, in fifth grade, Math groups were pulled by the Title One team, math fluency was monitored through an incentive program called Math Party. Teachers used iReady Math, with their students, with fidelity. Instructional strategies around standards based instruction contributed to the growth in math.

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

According to the EWS data provided in the SIP, SWD have a higher rate of suspension.

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

1. Communicating and collaborating with families, building partnerships, and giving parents tools on how to support their child's educational success.
2. Increase overall proficiency in Core Instruction from 50%, focusing on the subgroups below 41%.
3. Increase overall proficiency in 5th grade Science scores.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to 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.

This area of focus on Parent and Community Involvement. Increased community and family engagement provides our school with resources only available from these stakeholders. By creating a partnership with families students will extend their learning outside the school day. Outside community partnerships offer learning experiences students may not have access to on their own.

When parents and families connect with school stakeholders, information can be shared on how to continue the learning at home; thus increasing student achievement potential for all students.

SWD have a higher rate of suspension. Some multi-racial students also fell under the category of SWD.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Increase attendance at Title One academic evenings (T) and events where parent involvement is requested throughout the school year (Meet the Teacher, Back to School Night, Open House, Parent/Teacher conferences), consistent communication (newsletters) with families by administration, resulting in a decrease in suspension rates of SWD, increase in parent participation with student's educational goals, carrying over into the home setting, increasing or maintaining student achievement to 41% or above with SWD, Multi-racial, ELL, and black subgroups.

Monitoring:

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

Tracking data of attendance of academic events, fidelity of communication (newsletters), suspension data, and subgroup data of FAST testing.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christine Boyd (boyd.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.)

Having family engagement be at the forefront of our family partnership and is grounded in the notion that schools can thrive when families and teachers work together as genuine partners to maximize student learning inside and outside of school. The model is research-based and aligns grade-level learning concepts, student performance data, and family-school communication and collaboration. Based on feedback from families, the information and resources shared during parent-teacher conferences will continue, however students will take more ownership of their academic data by creating goals for each FAST PM and iReady Diagnostic.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

By including all stakeholders in the school's affairs, students benefit because they are encouraged to take ownership in their learning from more than just the teachers at school. A student only spends 12% of their year in school and 55% with their families. By capitalizing on the time students are at home by empowering families through data and actionable at-home practice, we can increase student proficiency quicker.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Weekly informational newsletters from .administration. This includes events, parent tips, school and BPS information, links for hw support, etc. Translation provided for families in all languages spoken at site.

Person Responsible: Christine Boyd (boyd.christine@brevardschools.org)

By When: Throughout School Year

Review Parent Survey from prior year and participation data for current school year academic evening events. Use this data to plan family and community engagement activities. (T)

Person Responsible: Matt Tingle (tingle.matt@brevardschools.org)

By When: Throughout Year.

Schedule and collaborate on teacher planning sessions to prepare student data and learning activities, which will be paid for by Title One funds (T)

Person Responsible: Audra Brown (brown.audra@brevardschools.org)

By When: Throughout the year.

Collect Student Data and create activities to share with families. Materials and printing will be funded with Title One funds (T).

Person Responsible: Matt Tingle (tingle.matt@brevardschools.org)

By When: Throughout year.

Integrate Title I Family Engagement activities at school or at partnership locations, including 21st Century Parent Workshops and tutoring, literacy event, math event, and Kindergarten Orientation, funded through the Title I budget(T).

Person Responsible: Matt Tingle (tingle.matt@brevardschools.org)

By When: Throughout Year.

Teachers will conduct student data chats with their students regularly. During these chats, teachers and students will discuss students' achievement data from sources included but not limited to iReady, FAST, Benchmark Assessments, and Reveal Math assessments. Each student will have at least one opportunity during each grading period to meet with the teacher for student data chats. (T)

Person Responsible: Audra Brown (brown.audra@brevardschools.org)

By When: Throughout year

Increased interactions with administration, including but not limited to Meet the Teacher, Tears and Cheers, Coffee with the Principals, Back to School Night, Open House, PTO, SAC, attendance conferences, parent/teacher meetings, and student PBIS rewards.

Person Responsible: Christine Boyd (boyd.christine@brevardschools.org)

By When: Throughout year.

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Multi-Racial**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.

The multi-racial subgroup scored 34% in ELA, below the 41% federal index.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The Multi-racial subgroup will perform above 41% in Core Instructional areas.

Monitoring:

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

Student data will be monitored with a focus of subgroup data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christine Boyd (boyd.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 use the BPS adopted curriculum with fidelity, teaching the BEST standards to the correct level of rigor. Title One Coach support (T) and Literacy Coach Support (T) will assist teacher in teaching the curriculum with fidelity and reviewing data with the teachers after each diagnostic or PM. Lexia will be used school-wide. Walk through observation system with feedback will be put into place.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Using the adopted curriculum, focusing on the correct level of Rigor, using the BEST standards is an evidence based instructional strategy.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Provide PD to retrain staff on Math Curriculum. (T)

Person Responsible: Matt Tingle (tingle.matt@brevardschools.org)

By When: Preplanning training and grade level support throughout the school year.

ELA Curriculum overview and training. (T)

Person Responsible: Audra Brown (brown.audra@brevardschools.org)

By When: Throughout school year in grade level meetings and at the Science of Reading PD in September.

Fidelity walks and observations of lessons, with feedback.

Person Responsible: Christine Boyd (boyd.christine@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout school year.

PD on teaching to the correct level of rigor, understanding the level of rigor of the standards, and discussing resources to support student proficiency.

Person Responsible: Christine Boyd (boyd.christine@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout year.

Reviewing subgroup data in Math, after each PM/Diagnostic.(T)

Person Responsible: Matt Tingle (tingle.matt@brevardschools.org)

By When: After each FAST PM or iReady diagnostic.

Reviewing subgroup data in ELA.(T)

Person Responsible: Audra Brown (brown.audra@brevardschools.org)

By When: After each FAST PM or iReady diagnostic.

Small group instruction within the classroom.

Person Responsible: Christine Boyd (boyd.christine@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

Grade Level data chats every 6 weeks.

Person Responsible: Christine Boyd (boyd.christine@brevardschools.org)

By When: 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.

In 5th Grade Science, the overall proficiency rate was 46%. Though this percentage grew 12% this past year, it still remains an area of weakness.

Measurable Outcome:

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

In 5th Grade Science, the overall proficiency will be at 50% or higher.

Monitoring:

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

The 5th grade teachers will give the Science pre-test at the beginning of the year and fill in instructional gaps, by reteaching skills/standards and working in small groups. Units assessments and Penda scores will be monitored.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christine Boyd (boyd.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.)

Students will use Penda and teachers will use the adopted curriculum with fidelity, covering the Science Standards at each grade level.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Penda a proven program to fill student gaps or misconceptions. Students will score higher when all masters are taught in each grade level, preparing them for science mastery.

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.

Penda use and lesson percentages monitored, with a reward system in place for students and classes.

Person Responsible: Tami Lanterman (lanterman.tami@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

Science curriculum used with fidelity, standards taught, and observations/feedback provided to teachers.

Person Responsible: Christine Boyd (boyd.christine@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

Science Saturdays for 5th grade, Girls in STEM Saturdays

Person Responsible: Christine Boyd (boyd.christine@brevardschools.org)

By When: Throughout the school year.

PD regarding Science Test for 5th grade, discussing the standards that are taught at all grade levels. Science Assessment Alignment.

Person Responsible: Christine Boyd (boyd.christine@brevardschools.org)

By When: By end of 1st semester.

PD for staff on the 5 "E" Components of Science Instruction; Engage, Explore, Explain, Extend, and Evaluate.

Person Responsible: Christine Boyd (boyd.christine@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

As an ATSI site, we will use improvement funding allocations toward our SIP goals, based on data. This will be targeted and strategic, conferring with our Leadership team, BPS Director, Staff, SAC and Community members. The academic data, especially our SWD, ELL, Black, and multi-racial subgroups, will be reviewed throughout the year, as outlined previously and adjustments made to allocations as needed. The laser focus of student proficiency will drive the expenditures of allocations provided to increase student success.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

D2 i-Ready data from 22-23 shows that 45% of our K-2 are not on track to score grade level or above on the statewide ELA assessment.

Planning sessions need to have a clear structure to focus on alignment of benchmarks, resources, student tasks, assessments, and the transfer of instruction.

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

22-23 FAST data shows 51% of 3rd Graders, 52% of 4th Graders, 38% of 5th Graders, and 41% of 6th Graders scored below grade level. (Level 1 and 2)

Increasing Primary Literacy Achievement so that gaps will not be as prominent in 3-5

Planning sessions need to have a clear structure to focus on alignment of benchmarks, resources, student tasks, assessments, and the transfer of instruction

Measurable Outcomes

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

Short Term-From STAR-PM1 to PM2, literacy achievement will increase by 10%.

Long Term--By the Spring of 2024 FAST, literacy achievement will increase by 15%.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Short Term-From FAST PM1 to PM2, literacy achievement will increase by 10%.

Long Term--By the Spring of 2024 FAST, literacy achievement will increase by 15%.

Monitoring

Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

PM1, PM 2, FAST

iReady D1 and D2

Walkthroughs with feedback

Benchmark Advance Assessments

Intervention Data-Intervention instruction to specifically targeted identified gaps

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Boyd, Christine, boyd.christine@brevardschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term “evidence-based” means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida’s definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida’s definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
 - Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district’s K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
 - Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?
- Explicit instruction
 - Introduces new content, concept, or skill clearly and directly
 - Models/demonstrates use of the new or retaught content, concept, or skill
 - Provides visual/auditory examples
 - Frequent opportunities for guided and independent practice
 - Systematic instruction
 - Logical progression from simple to more complex
 - Conducts a cumulative review (enables students to make connections)
 - Opportunities for students to practice previous content to progress toward learning goals
 - Scaffolded instruction
 - Intentional, temporary, support
 - Open-ended questions, prompts and cues, breaking down into smaller steps, visual aids, examples and/or encouragement
 - Gradual release until student(s) can perform independently
 - Lexia (Strong level of evidence)
 - Aligns with PA, Phonics, Fluency B.E.S.T. Standards
 - Systematic and structured approach to the six critical areas of reading
 - Science of Reading domains include PA, Phonics, Structural Analysis, Fluency, Vocabulary, Comprehension
 - 95% Group (Strong level of evidence)
 - Aligns with B.E.S.T. Standards and the Foundational Benchmarks under PA
 - Instructional materials and processes are geared towards struggling readers and permit teachers to begin instruction at student’s lowest skill deficit, with a focus on PA and Phonics
 - Systematic and explicit instruction on foundational skills utilizing evidence-based practices as listed in the IES’ Practice Guides Assisting Students Struggling with Reading
 - Corrective Feedback
 - Identifies student’s misunderstanding relative to the target instructional goal
 - Immediate/timely feedback using student-friendly language
 - Provides student opportunity for self-correction
 - Repeat as needed based on student response
 - Collaborative Planning
 - Supports consistent, high-quality implementation of Benchmark Advance
 - Allows for instructional strategies, resources, tools, and materials to be scaffolded and differentiated
 - i-Ready (Promising level of evidence)
 - Universal screener data is used to start data conversations at school level
 - Formative data used to differentiate instruction
 - This approach helps educators accelerate growth and grade-level learning. These tools provide rigorous and motivating reading instruction that:

- Personalize pathways to growth with precise instruction that is guided by i-Ready Assessment data
- Motivate students to persist in building their skills
- Provide scaffold support that meets the needs of all students
- Benchmark Advance
 - o All instructional materials are aligned with B.E.S.T. Standards
 - o Implementation of high-quality ELA instructional materials with fidelity will support the explicit instruction of phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, vocabulary, and comprehension
 - o Focus on tightening up delivery of instruction focusing on the systematic, explicitness of instruction and reinforcing the “why” – with Science of Reading

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

All evidence-based practices/programs listed above address the identified need that is improving primary literacy achievement. The identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target

population as they are:

- o B.E.S.T. Standards Aligned
- o Aligned with the Brevard K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan
- o Meet Florida’s definition of evidence-based
- o Systematic and/or Explicit
- o Geared towards struggling readers with an emphasis on Foundational Skills such as Phonological Awareness and Phonics

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school’s Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Literacy Leadership: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Define roles and responsibilities of team members (coaches, teachers, administrators, district) for before, during and after common planning sessions. o Develop content area Planning Protocols that will delineate expectations for benchmark-aligned instructional practices. o Clearly communicate the expectations for planning with coaches and teachers at Sustainable Elementary School. o Establish Principal-Coach partnership agreement to specify duties and activities of the coach and how the Principal will provide support (could mean eliminating duties for the coach and establishing criteria for determining who the coach will work with during the school year). o Collaborate with content coaches before/after each planning. 	Brown, Audra, brown.audra@brevardschools.org
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Literacy Coaching: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Lesson planning with teachers, modeling, co-teaching, engaging in reflective conversations, and engaging in data chats o Prepare for planning process and send teachers the agenda, items, tasks, and other resources in advance for them to complete the pre-work o During planning, focus on teacher clarity, instructional model, strategies, questioning and assessments that align to the benchmark(s) and will support the intended learning. o Identify and plan for the supports that teachers will need before, during, and after planning (preplanning sessions, coaching questions to connect teacher thinking to aligned instruction, etc.) 	Brown, Audra, brown.audra@brevardschools.org
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Assessment <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Teachers will use program assessments for foundational reading skills, along with DIBELS measures, PASI/PSI and/or Running Records to monitor reading skills development. o Define performance criteria based on assessment data that prompts the addition of Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 interventions for students not meeting expectations/benchmarks o Data chats will occur regularly around Benchmark Advance Assessments, i-Ready, FAST, and intervention OPM o Daily exit tickets and other formative assessments are used to determine what scaffolds or reteaching is needed 	Brown, Audra, brown.audra@brevardschools.org
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Professional Learning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Literacy Coaches will provide job-embedded PD and side by side coaching o On-side intervention material and instruction PD will be provided by Literacy Coach and/or Leadership Team o Identify mentor teachers and establish model classrooms o Ensure that time is provided for teachers to meet weekly for professional 	Brown, Audra, brown.audra@brevardschools.org

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
development o Maximize time for PD by infusing small chunks during grade level data and planning sessions	

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

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

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

The SIP, UniSIG budget, and SWP will be disseminated in various ways to our stakeholders. These documents will be shared and discussed in-person at SAC, PTO, faculty meetings and the Annual Title 1 Meeting. Also, flyers, emails, and text messages will be used to notify our stakeholders where these documents can be found in the front office, online, and can be provided in their native language when feasible. Additionally, the progress of the SIP will be shared in the same manners as mentioned above. The SIP will be made available publicly at <https://www.brevardschools.org/domain/5908>

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

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

Harbor City encourages and values positive relationships with our parents, families, and other community stakeholders. These positive relationships are built by actively involving the participants in planning, reviewing and improving our school. Harbor City's School Wide Improvement Plan (SWIP), Parent and Families Engagement Plan, Compact and School Wide Title 1 program are reviewed and developed annually with their input to ensure we are meeting the current needs of our students, parents, and families. Input from parents, families, and other community stakeholders is gathered from the following sources, the District Survey, evaluations of Family Night Events, SAC and PTO meetings. These results and academic data are reviewed during a process called the Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA). The CNA allows us to determine our top priorities for the upcoming school year based on the needs of our students. Our parents, families, and other community stakeholders are also involved in the CNA process. The following data sources are analyzed: FAST, STAR, iReady, Lexia, attendance, discipline, subgroups, stakeholder and parent surveys. The CNA is the foundation upon which our SWIP is built. Parents are kept informed of their child's progress via Interim Reports, Report Cards, phone calls, emails, text, and test results (FAST, STAR, Penda, Lexia, and iReady). This open two-way communication and viewing parents, families, as well as other community stakeholders as equals in improving our school, builds positive relationships. Harbor City's Family Engagement Plan can be viewed publicly at <https://www.brevardschools.org/Page/11569>

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

1. Increase overall proficiency in ELA and Math for all students, focusing on the multi-racial subgroup.
2. Use State approved, district adopted curriculum with fidelity.
3. Implement an academic support system, using the Tiers of Intervention.
4. Implement PBIS and a behavioral support system, using the Tiers of Intervention.
5. Communicating and collaborating with families on how to support their child's success.

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

Title II- Professional Development District resource teachers will provide training for staff members that will focus on engaging students during ELA and mathematics instruction.

Title III-ESOL Harbor City will implement appropriate programs, services and training opportunities for school staff and families who have ESOL/ELL students. The Title 1 contact will work with our ESOL/ELL teachers to ensure that information is translated to native languages of our students.

Title IV-Well-Rounded Education/School Safety/Educational Technology Harbor City collaborates with the office of Title 1 who works collaboratively with the Office of Educational Technology to address the technology needs of students and families in Title I schools. We work collaboratively to plan and implement appropriate programs, services and training opportunities for school staff and families. These opportunities include access to and utilization of FOCUS as a means of communication between home and school.

Title IX-Homeless Our school works collaboratively with the office of Title 1 and the district Homeless Liaison to meet the varying needs of our homeless students' families. Title IX funds provide these families with tutoring.

FDLRS/ESE services Joint professional development opportunities are provided for staff and training opportunities for parents of Title I ESE students by staff from the Office of Exceptional Education, Title I, and FDLRS. We collaborate to address the exceptional needs of students and families without duplicating services.

Preschool Programs (Head Start/VPK) Title 1 funding supplements our VPK program, allowing us to offer full day services for our VPK students and families. These offices work together to coordinate parent training opportunities and transitional services for students entering our school. Activities may include coordinated meetings with ELC, Title I staff, school staff, families, VPK, and kindergarten teachers to discuss specific needs.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

Proactive items will be put into place by implementing a Class Meeting time each day, focusing on the Sanford Harmony instructional program.

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

A 3 Tier support system will be implemented for students that may require mental health support outside of the regular classroom. This will include Tier II small group, Tier II 1:1 counseling. The guidance counselor will track student improvement, as well as collaboration with families and the teacher. These students will be referred during our 6 week data chats.

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

PLC, Collaborative Teaching, Staff Meetings, and PD will focus on the improvement of instruction, including but not limited to the Science of Reading, Engagement, Scaffolding techniques, ELA/Math curriculum training, Tier Intervention training and support, and providing support plans/mentors to struggling teachers.

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

The VPK program supports students both academically and behaviorally, preparing them for their educational career. Our students will begin to interact with kindergarten students the final quarter of the school year, becoming familiar with the kindergarten schedule, areas on the school site, and academic demands. A Kindergarten Orientation, including tours, parent education, and overview of the upcoming year is provided.