Brevard Virtual Franchise School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Brevard Virtual Franchise

1225 CLEARLAKE RD, Cocoa, FL 32922

http://www.brevardschools.org

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.

To inspire and empower students for success through an engaging virtual learning experience (revised SY 2017-2018).

Provide the school's vision statement.

A community of life-long, independent learners prepared to lead in an evolving global environment (revised SY 2017-2018).

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
Price, Heather	Principal	Monitor instructional program, school culture and adjust as data and feedback warrants. Coordinate professional development and resources to meet needs of school.
Kirk, Clarissa	Assistant Principal	Monitor instructional program, school culture and adjust as data and feedback warrants. Coordinate professional development and resources to meet needs of school.
Bussendorf, Kathy	Teacher, K-12	Team leader, provide instructional coaching, facilitate training and monitor data.
Sorrentino, Julie	Teacher, K-12	Team leader, provide instructional coaching, facilitate training and monitor data.
Faro, Sara	Teacher, ESE	Team leader, provide instructional coaching, facilitate training and monitor data.
Brach, Kristin	Teacher, K-12	Team leader, provide instructional coaching, facilitate training and monitor data.
Johnson, Shannon	Teacher, K-12	Leadership team member and math team lead. Monitor school-wide math data and lead professional development and discussions.
Lenox, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	Leadership team member and literacy team lead. Monitor school-wide literacy data and lead professional development and discussions.
Kirk, Lori	Teacher, Career/ Technical	Lead our school's efforts in expanding CTE programs and student participation.
Nichols, Jolene	Teacher, K-12	Leadership team member and K-5 team lead. Monitor school-wide K-5 data and lead professional development and discussions.
Mosley, Catherine	Teacher, K-12	Team leader, provide instructional coaching, facilitate training and monitor data.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

The School Improvement plan will be shared with all stakeholders to gather input during the development process. The School Leadership Team, School Advisory Council and Student Ambassadors will all be involved in the review/development of the 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))

The SIP will be monitored through the School Leadership Team and School Advisory Council during regularly meetings. Revisions will be made to the plan to adjust to new data and new information received throughout the school year.

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)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	36%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	6%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
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: I 2018-19: B 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	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	4	0	7
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	3
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	0	2	1	1	6	11
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	8	4	16
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	1	4

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

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	6	7	30
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	5
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	2	21
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	4	8	2	1	56
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	56

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	18

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	1	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	2

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	6	7	15
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	2	2	7
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	4	8	2	1	18
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	6	13

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

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

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	1	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	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*	71	58	53	61	63	55	68		
ELA Learning Gains				64			56		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				56			48		
Math Achievement*	44	62	55	39	40	42	54		
Math Learning Gains				50			41		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				49			42		
Science Achievement*	75	61	52	56	64	54	60		
Social Studies Achievement*	69	72	68	77	61	59	81		
Middle School Acceleration	55	70	70	45	51	51	46		
Graduation Rate	92	87	74	91	62	50	100		
College and Career Acceleration	49	75	53	55	76	70	59		
ELP Progress		47	55		68	70			

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	65
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	455
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	93
Graduation Rate	92

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	58
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	643
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	86
Graduation Rate	91

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	51			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	63			
HSP	58			
MUL	56			
PAC				
WHT	67			
FRL	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%
SWD	45			
ELL	10	Yes	1	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	54			
HSP	46			
MUL	57			
PAC				
WHT	63			
FRL	54			

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	71			44			75	69	55	92	49	
SWD	35			26				55		38	5	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	73			45			70				3	
HSP	57			33						47	4	
MUL	75			29			64				3	
PAC												
WHT	74			49			77	67	64	49	7	
FRL	70			40						34	4	

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
2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
All Students	61	64	56	39	50	49	56	77	45	91	55	
SWD	36	71	60	20	42		42					
ELL				10								
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	55	67		32	64		50					
HSP	54	39		27	48	40	41	70				
MUL	69	62		52	44							
PAC												
WHT	73	71	80	50	46	30	71	82	48	92	55	
FRL	59	57	40	27	59	62	50	64		86	33	

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
2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
All Students	68	56	48	54	41	42	60	81	46	100	59	
SWD	44	47		48	47							
ELL	40											
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	50	50		39								
HSP	58	54	40	41	29		60	84				
MUL	78	73		62	57		53					
PAC												
WHT	69	53	48	56	40	45	63	82	46	100	58	
FRL	56	48	29	43	40	47	58	74	31			

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
10	2023 - Spring	58%	54%	4%	50%	8%
05	2023 - Spring	77%	59%	18%	54%	23%
07	2023 - Spring	73%	53%	20%	47%	26%
08	2023 - Spring	80%	52%	28%	47%	33%
09	2023 - Spring	81%	56%	25%	48%	33%
04	2023 - Spring	70%	61%	9%	58%	12%
06	2023 - Spring	79%	61%	18%	47%	32%
03	2023 - Spring	*	56%	*	50%	*

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	57%	67%	-10%	54%	3%
07	2023 - Spring	73%	58%	15%	48%	25%
03	2023 - Spring	*	60%	*	59%	*
04	2023 - Spring	30%	61%	-31%	61%	-31%
08	2023 - Spring	*	38%	*	55%	*
05	2023 - Spring	38%	55%	-17%	55%	-17%

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	71%	48%	23%	44%	27%
05	2023 - Spring	45%	57%	-12%	51%	-6%

ALGEBRA

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	57%	51%	6%	50%	7%

GEOMETRY

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	25%	50%	-25%	48%	-23%

BIOLOGY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	82%	61%	21%	63%	19%

CIVICS						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	75%	69%	6%	66%	9%

HISTORY						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	65%	62%	3%	63%	2%

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.

Math proficiency continues to be the area of lowest performance with a 46% pass rate for all grade levels (3-EOC). Although low, it does represent a 3% improvement from the previous year. Math continues to be the hardest subject area for student to learn online, due to the independent learning nature of our program. We continue to put more resources in this area as we attempt to close gaps and increase proficiency.

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

Social Studies EOC test scores showed the greatest decline from 76% to 68%, with the decline being highest in US History. Last year, we had an 81% pass rate, this year was a 65% pass rate. We had many more students scoring in level 2 than in previous years.

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.

Math proficiency in general, Geometry with the greatest gap. Geometry has been challenging for students for many years, it has grown increasingly difficult in the virtual environment.

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

ELA overall proficiency increased from 67% to 73%. Science proficiency increased from 62% to 73%.

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

There are very few students who have shown 2 or more EWS categories. However, our 7th and 8th grade students demonstrate the highest level of concern.

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

Math Proficiency - Geometry #1
Math Proficiency - Grades 3-5
ELA Proficiency - 3rd grade

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

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

As a virtual school, students can feel disconnected from their school community due to the nature of our program, with students working independently from home the majority of the time. In the 2023 Youth Truth Survey of students in grades 3-12, it was evident that we need to work harder on helping students feel like an important part of our school community. In response to the question related to feeling an important part of your school or school community, students responded positively as follows: 41% (no previous data) of students in grades 3-6; 45% (previously 50%) of students in grades 7-8 and 34% (previously 33%) of students in grades 9-12.

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

By increasing our efforts to make homeroom the cornerstone of relationship building at BVS, our YouthTruth data of students responding positively to this question will increase by 10% in each grade level band.

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

Monthly Collaboration Days (where all staff are together in person for meetings and professional development) will include discussion and brainstorming on effective strategies for homeroom teachers. Leadership team members will also review effectiveness of strategies being implemented.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Clarissa Kirk (kirk.clarissa@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.)

PBIS - Positive Behavior Intervention System

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

The PBIS team monitors school-wide data and provides all staff, students and families with a clear understanding of desired behaviors. The goals of being Respectful, Responsible and Engaged apply to the classroom and beyond. The PBIS structure will allow us to monitor the status toward our goal, encourage
student behavior and help our school reach this goal.

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.

Retraining of all staff on the rationale for homeroom and the desired outcome for homeroom teachers.

Person Responsible: Clarissa Kirk (kirk.clarissa@brevardschools.org)

By When: August 10, 2023

Monthly training, discussion and planning for homeroom activities to increase engagement of students in all aspects of our school community.

Person Responsible: Heather Price (price.heather@brevardschools.org)

By When: April 30, 2024

Monthly monitoring of student engagement in Live Virtual Classes and Homeroom through the PBIS app data.

Person Responsible: Kathy Bussendorf (bussendorf.kathy@brevardschools.org)

By When: May 15, 2024

Review of YouthTruth data from the January 2024 implementation with the Leadership Team.

Person Responsible: Heather Price (price.heather@brevardschools.org)

By When: February 1, 2024

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners

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.

BVS was identified as ATSI following the 21-22 school year due to proficiency rate for our students in the ELL program. At the time, our enrollment had increases substantially due to COVID (over 500 students). Since that time, our enrollment has returned to traditional levels of around 230 students. During the 22-23 student we did not have the minimum number of student in the ELL program to qualify for reported data. We currently have one student in the ELL program (8th grade) and a first year kindergartner being assessed. The 8th grade student tested as proficient in both ELA and Math last year.

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

BVS students in the ELL program will continue to perform well on state assessments and we anticipate a 100% pass rate.

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

The ELL committee will monitor FAST PM 1 & 2 data to ensure our student in on track for proficiency and will provide tutoring or further assistance if necessary.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sara Faro (faro.sara@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.)

Data based decision making - data teams

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

Monitoring student performance on progressing monitoring tools will allow us to intervene early, if necessary, to ensure mastery of content at the end of the school year.

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.

Progress monitoring of student performance outcomes on PM 1 & 2 of FAST.

Person Responsible: Ashley Lenox (lenox.ashley@brevardschools.org)

By When: February 2024

Provide targeted instruction and remediation as needed to address student gaps in knowledge.

Person Responsible: Sara Faro (faro.sara@brevardschools.org)

By When: May 2024

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

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

The online program is primarily asynchronous, which means students are engaging independently with the curriculum. In 22-23, students in grades K-5 participated in a Live Virtual Class (LVC) with their peers twice weekly basis (an increase from once weekly the year before). LVC in 6th grade was held once weekly and in grades 7-12 the LVC varied monthly. By continuing our focus on increasing our content-based instruction and opportunities for peer collaboration, we anticipate a higher level of interest and participation. Increased participation will result in higher achievement across all measures. The 2023 Youth Truth data shows that students in grades 7-12 work with their peers at a rate below the district average.
Grades 7-8: 19% work with peers because the teacher asks/tells them to (decreased from 33%)
Grades 9-12: 10% work with peers because the teacher asks/tells them to (no change
from previous year)

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

This metric on our YouthTruth survey will increase by 10% in each grade level.

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

PBIS app has been modified to allow for teachers to issued BVS Bucks specifically for engagement in LVC, this data can then be monitored by the PBIS team for growth over time.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Clarissa Kirk (kirk.clarissa@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.)

PBIS - Positive Behavior Intervention System

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

The PBIS team monitors school-wide data and provides all staff, students and families with a clear understanding of desired behaviors. The goals of being Respectful, Responsible and Engaged apply to the classroom and beyond. The PBIS app has been modified to all us to track participation in LVC sessions as a school.

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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

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).

Academic support funds (ARP funds) as well as Post-Secondary Remediation funds received will be prioritized for tutoring students who have demonstrated an academic need. Priority will be given to students in the ELL program who are not showing on grade level performance on FAST testing or other progress monitoring tools utilized for their grade level. BVS Leadership Team and School Advisory Council will be briefed and consulted for effective use of allocations.