

Brevard Public Schools

Fairglen 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	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	24
VI. Title I Requirements	28
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Fairglen Elementary School

201 INDIAN TRL, Cocoa, FL 32927

<http://www.fairglen.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.

We will do whatever it takes to ensure success for all students.

Provide the school's vision statement.

To empower students to achieve their full potential.

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
Meraz, Christy	Principal	School Leadership Team, Monitoring Progress Monitoring, Data Collection, Data Analysis, ESSA Subgroups Data Identification and collection, Instructional Coaching, Professional Development, and Collaborative Planning
Sauerman, Elaine	Assistant Principal	Discipline Data and Intervention, Professional Development, Instructional Coaching, Subgroup Data Monitoring, School Leadership, ESOL Contact, and Collaborative Planning
Mark, Diane	Reading Coach	Instructional Coaching, Professional Development, School Leadership Team, Data Monitoring, Intervention Assistance and Design, and Collaborative Planning
Walker, Colleen	Instructional Coach	Instructional Coaching, Professional Development, School Leadership Team, Data Monitoring, Intervention Assistance and Design
Delida, Laurie	Instructional Coach	PBIS Coach/ESE Team Lead: Assists with data tracking for discipline, serves as LEA, assists teachers with BIP Creation and Intervention, School Leadership Team, Mentoring and Data Monitoring

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.

Stakeholders are involved in the SIP involvement process through multiple avenues.

The Comprehensive Needs Assessment was completed by a team consisting of Administration, Staff Members, and Parent. The School Leadership Team consisting of Administration, Teacher on Assignment, Literacy Coach, PBIS Coach, Title 1, ESE Contact, Primary Teacher, and Intermediate Teacher collaborated to put procedures in place based on CNA results.

Parent Surveys are conducted throughout the school year and feedback is used towards informing CNA Team and making school improvement action steps. Additionally, student and staff surveys are used to also inform and create implementation steps towards improving student achievement, to include improving our climate and culture. For example, in the Youth Truth Survey one of the lowest rated themes was Culture. Therefore, action steps are being implemented to address and improve this concern.

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))

Effective implementation monitoring:

The School Leadership Team consisting of Administration, Teacher on Assignment, Literacy Coach, PBIS Coach, Title 1, ESE Contact, Primary Teacher, and Intermediate

Impact on Student Achievement:

Teacher will meet bi-weekly to discuss the progress of School Improvement Goals (Core, Conduct, and Culture). Data will be analyzed to determine on-going actions steps to reach SIP Goals:

- * FAST ELA/MATH PM 1, PM 2, and PM 3

- * PENDA REPORTS (Monthly)

- * ELA BENCHMARK

- * MATH ASSESSMENTS

- * DISCIPLINE REFERRALS (Monthly)

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	28%
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: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 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	64	76	81	81	52	68	80	0	0	502	
One or more suspensions	0	2	11	16	6	16	16	0	0	67	
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	12	17	24	33	0	0	86	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	5	21	33	0	0	59	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	7	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	7	10	7	16	28	0	0	68

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	3	5	2	12	0	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	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	18	38	20	25	23	24	30	0	0	178	
One or more suspensions	0	3	2	7	3	7	7	0	0	29	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	4	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	4	3	1	0	0	8	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	28	36	31	34	0	0	129	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	36	39	44	28	0	0	147	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	65	37	38	13	17	15	0	0	185	

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	5	4	4	6	0	0	22

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	9	4	5	3	1	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	2	1	5	4	4	6	0	0	22

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	18	38	20	25	23	24	30	0	0	178	
One or more suspensions	0	3	2	7	3	7	7	0	0	29	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	4	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	4	3	1	0	0	8	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	28	36	31	34	0	0	129	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	36	39	44	28	0	0	147	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	65	37	38	13	17	15	0	0	185	

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	5	4	4	6	0	0	22

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	9	4	5	3	1	0	0	0	0	22
Students retained two or more times	0	2	1	5	4	4	6	0	0	22

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*	31	58	53	32	61	56	38		
ELA Learning Gains				42			60		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				32			44		
Math Achievement*	31	58	59	35	49	50	35		
Math Learning Gains				55			54		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				51			38		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	22	58	54	41	60	59	29		
Social Studies Achievement*					64	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					56	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		54	59				50		

* 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	29
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	115
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	41
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	288
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	13	Yes	4	2
ELL	10	Yes	2	1
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	10	Yes	3	2
HSP	29	Yes	4	1
MUL	45			
PAC				
WHT	31	Yes	1	1
FRL	26	Yes	2	1

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	26	Yes	3	1
ELL	36	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	26	Yes	2	1
HSP	40	Yes	3	
MUL	46			
PAC				
WHT	41			
FRL	37	Yes	1	

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	31			31			22					
SWD	12			17			10				4	
ELL	0			20							2	
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	15			5							2	
HSP	28			30							2	
MUL	52			37							2	
PAC												
WHT	31			33			25				4	
FRL	25			27			26				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	32	42	32	35	55	51	41					
SWD	9	33	32	16	42	39	14					
ELL	21	25		21	75							
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25	42		13	25							
HSP	28	30		32	67		45					
MUL	39	40		48	55		50					
PAC												
WHT	32	44	30	35	55	50	41					
FRL	30	39	30	32	54	44	33					

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	38	60	44	35	54	38	29					50
SWD	17	47	42	17	41	27	24					
ELL	23			38								50

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	29	46		29	62							
HSP	33	67		41	53							
MUL	38			33								
PAC												
WHT	39	58	60	35	51	32	28					
FRL	31	58	50	29	53	42	24					

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	28%	59%	-31%	54%	-26%
04	2023 - Spring	35%	61%	-26%	58%	-23%
06	2023 - Spring	37%	61%	-24%	47%	-10%
03	2023 - Spring	30%	56%	-26%	50%	-20%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	52%	67%	-15%	54%	-2%
03	2023 - Spring	27%	60%	-33%	59%	-32%
04	2023 - Spring	34%	61%	-27%	61%	-27%
05	2023 - Spring	19%	55%	-36%	55%	-36%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	19%	57%	-38%	51%	-32%

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.

ELA Proficiency is the lowest performance overall and including these 5 subgroups:

SWD, ELL, BLK, HSP, and FRL

These scores can be attributed to: Increase in behavior, class size, teacher turnover

PM 3 Data from 2022-2023 SY shows the following percent per grade level:

Student ELA proficiency scores:

School/District/State - We scored below district and state averages.

3rd Grade Reading: 30%/56%/50%

4th Grade Reading: 35%/61%/58%

5th Grade Reading: 29%/59%/54%

6th Grade Reading: 37%/61%/47%

Subgroup Data: Below grade level proficiency

5 subgroups: SWD, ELL, BLK, HSP, and FRL

3rd Grade: SWD 100% ELL 50% BLK 29% HSP 29% FRL 16%

4th Grade: SWD 75% ELL 33% BLK 83% HSP 29% FRL 58%

5th Grade: SWD 72% ELL 100% BLK 100% HSP 73% FRL 63%

6th Grade: SWD 81% ELL 67% BLK 67% HSP 44% FRL 65%

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

Science and Math had the greatest decline from the prior year.

These scores can be attributed to: Increase in behavior, class size, and teacher turnover

5th Grade Science showed the greatest decline from the prior year:

2021-2022 -----41% Proficient

2022-2023 -----19% Proficient

We are below average compared to district (57%) and state (54%) averages.

Student Math proficiency rates per grade level:

3rd Grade Math - 28%

4th Grade Math - 34%

5th Grade Math - 19%

6th Grade Math - 52% (Students went up in the area from 16% Proficient in PM1 to 52% Proficient in PM3)

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 had the greatest gap when compared to the state average.

These scores can be attributed to: Increase in behavior, class size, and teacher turnover

Student Math proficiency scores:

School/District/State

3rd Grade Math - 28%/60%/59%

4th Grade Math - 34%/61%/61%

5th Grade Math - 19%/55%/55%

6th Grade Math - 52%/67%/54%

(Students went up in the area from 16% Proficient in PM1 to 52% Proficient in PM3)

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

6th Grade Math showed the greatest improvement from PM1 (16% proficient) to PM 3 (52% proficient)

Focused on Tier 1 instruction, habits of discussion, and small group instruction

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

EWS data identifies discipline data as a concern.

Discipline Data

PK: 1 Referral

Kindergarten: 77 Referrals

1st Grade: 129 Referrals

2nd Grade: 225 Referrals

3rd Grade: 123 Referrals

4th Grade: 166 Referrals

5th Grade: 184 Referrals

6th Grade: 112 Referrals

Total of 1,017 Referrals

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

1) Strengthen Tier 1 (Core) Instruction in Math, Science, and ELA: Explicit and Systematic Instruction, Weekly Collaborative Planning, Focus Boards, Data Binders, Targeted Professional Development, Walkthroughs with Immediate Feedback, Coaching Cycle, and Habits of Discussion

2) Decrease Discipline Referral Rates (Conduct): PBIS incentives; Professional Development, Mentoring, Resiliency, Restorative Circles/Practices, Consistent Procedures and School-Wide Expectations

3) Increase Family Involvement and Student Engagement (Culture): Family Engagement Evening Events, Increase stakeholder input, Celebrations, and Communication

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.

Discipline Data

PK: 1 Referral

Kindergarten: 77 Referrals

1st Grade: 129 Referrals

2nd Grade: 225 Referrals

3rd Grade: 123 Referrals

4th Grade: 166 Referrals

5th Grade: 184 Referrals

6th Grade: 112 Referrals

Total of 1,017 Referrals

Youth Truth Survey 2023 Compared to other participating elementary schools, Fairglen Elementary's Highest Rated Themes were:

- Belonging
- Engagement

Lowest Rated Themes were:

- Culture
- Instructional Methods

Teacher Survey Winter 2023 - School Index Score

Peer Culture 5.1

School Operations 2.7

Learning Environment 2.4

Support Staff Survey Winter 2023 - School Index Score

School Operations 2.2

Learning Environment 2.5

Engagement 3.7

Parent Survey:

Do you feel welcome at your child's school? 81.71% yes 18.29% no

How often did you attend a parent meeting or event at your child's school that supported your child's academic success? Never 20.55% Monthly 23.29% Once or Twice a Year 56.16%

Measurable Outcome:

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

During the 2023-2024 school year, we will decrease the amount of office referrals by 60% from a total of 1017 referrals to 610 referrals.

Monitoring:

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

Data analysis

Classroom Walkthroughs/Feedback

Grade Level Meetings

Monitor Reports (Discipline, Risk Ratio, ESSA Subgroups)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christy Meraz (meraz.christy@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.)

Positive Behavior Intervention Supports (PBIS) is an evidence-based framework used to create a safe and positive learning environment for all students.

Restorative Practices/Circles, when implemented effectively, can lead to decreased behavioral needs and a more positive learning environment.

MTSS: Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS) helps schools organize and leverage their resources to meet the needs of all students, including behavioral needs.

Teach Like a Champion is a proven way for teachers to access effective teaching techniques which are proactive in behavior management.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Student behavior impacts all students in the classroom. In order to improve the achievement of all students,, we must work to improve behaviors that impact the environment. "With an overarching emphasis on using data to determine the effectiveness of its techniques, PBIS reflects the application of explicit values and evidence-based practices to build a MTSS that is practical, durable, and available to all." (Florida PBIS Project) Studies show that Restorative Practices and Circles strengthen relationships between individuals as well as develop connections within communities.

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.

Conduct PBIS Team Meetings monthly, to include Grade Level Representatives, to discuss Tier 1, Tier 2 (Teacher/Student Mentoring Program), and Tier 3 (Behavior Intervention Plans) implementation and data/ Graph and monitor data

Person Responsible: Laurie Delida (delida.laurie@brevardschools.org)

By When: by the end of each month for the 2023-2024 school year

PBIS Team will provide professional development for staff during pre-planning and as needed throughout the school year that aligns with school-wide expectations and teaching and reinforcing expectations in common areas around campus

Person Responsible: Laurie Delida (delida.laurie@brevardschools.org)

By When: on-going during the 2023-2024 school year

Teachers will participate in professional development trainings to become more aware of reactions and approaches to behavior (Teach Like a Champion and Restorative Circles/Practices Title 1: Purchased Materials)

Person Responsible: Christy Meraz (meraz.christy@brevardschools.org)

By When: on-going during the 2023-2024 school year

Teachers will work with Administration and teams to create Behavior Intervention Plans as soon as behaviors are identified to track data and implement interventions to address individual behavioral needs.

Person Responsible: Christy Meraz (meraz.christy@brevardschools.org)

By When: on-going during the 2023-2024 school year

Conduct Leadership Team meetings bi-weekly to monitor ESSA Subgroups, Risk Ratio, and discipline data

Person Responsible: Christy Meraz (meraz.christy@brevardschools.org)

By When: by the end of each month for the 2023-2024 school year

Conduct MTSS (behavior) Monthly Grade Level Meetings to monitor reports and complete data analysis forms

Person Responsible: Christy Meraz (meraz.christy@brevardschools.org)

By When: by the end of each month for the 2023-2024 school year

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

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

Student proficiency rates per grade level:

3rd Grade Math - 28%

4th Grade Math - 34%

5th Grade Math - 19%

6th Grade Math - 52%

Subgroup Data: Below grade level proficiency

5 subgroups: SWD, ELL, BLK, HSP, and FRL

3rd Grade: SWD 20% ELL 50% BLK 29% HSP 29% FRL 17%

4th Grade: SWD 75% ELL 33% BLK 67% HSP 43% FRL 61%

5th Grade: SWD 61% ELL 100% BLK 100% HSP 64% FRL 63%

6th Grade: SWD 87% ELL 67% BLK 100% HSP 67% FRL 80%

School/District/State Averages:

3rd Grade Math - 28%/60%/59%

4th Grade Math - 34%/61%/61%

5th Grade Math - 19%/55%/55%

6th Grade Math - 52%/67%/54%

(Students went up in the area from 16% Proficient in PM1 to 52% Proficient in PM3)

Measurable Outcome:

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

During the 2023-2024 school year, we will increase Math Proficiency across grade levels 3rd-6th on the FAST PM3 to 60% proficient.

Monitoring:

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

Classroom Walkthroughs/Feedback

Collaborative Planning

Data Analysis (Monitor Reports)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Elaine Sauerman (sauerman.elaine@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.)

Reveal Math, used for core instruction, meets the recommendations for ESSA evidence Tier 4. (from reveal math website)

Evidence-based strategies embedded in this curriculum include metacognition, sense-making, use of manipulatives/visual representations, development of problem solving skills, classroom discourse, productive struggle, fluency and clear instructional routines.

Teachers will meet weekly to collaboratively plan to strengthen instruction.

For intervention teachers will focus on:

Explicit systematic instruction

Use of manipulatives and visual representations

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Working in our Grade Level Teams, taking a PLC Approach, our leadership teams is utilizing research from Amplify Your Impact: Coaching Collaborative Teams in PLCs at Work. "High achieving schools build a school environment where working together to solve problems and to learn from each other become cultural norms." (Westwood 2000 Teachers who learn, kids who achieve; A look at schools with model professional development) "The likelihood of using new learning and sharing responsibility rises when colleagues guided by a coach, work together, and hold each other accountable for improved teaching and learning." (Annenberg Institute for School Reform, 2004)

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

During monthly Grade Level Meetings, teams will evaluate student data to determine the effectiveness of explicit and systematic Tier 1 instruction.

Person Responsible: Elaine Sauerman (sauerman.elaine@brevardschools.org)

By When: on-going during the 2023-2024 school year

School-based leadership will collaborate monthly to analyze data and monitor subgroup data.

Person Responsible: Elaine Sauerman (sauerman.elaine@brevardschools.org)

By When: on-going during the 2023-2024 school year

School leadership will facilitate classroom walkthroughs to observe focus boards, Tier 1 instruction, and implementation of grade level collaborative plans and instructional supports. Walkthrough data will be utilized to create targeted professional development.

Person Responsible: Elaine Sauerman (sauerman.elaine@brevardschools.org)

By When: on-going during the 2023-2024 school year

Students will take ownership of math data and set goals quarterly through data chats with teachers (Data Binder)

Person Responsible: Elaine Sauerman (sauerman.elaine@brevardschools.org)

By When: on-going during the 2023-2024 school year

During weekly collaborative planning, teachers will use core instructional materials to design high quality lesson plans to implement.

Person Responsible: Elaine Sauerman (sauerman.elaine@brevardschools.org)

By When: on-going during the 2023-2024 school year

Data will drive small group intervention needs of students during Math Block

Person Responsible: Elaine Sauerman (sauerman.elaine@brevardschools.org)

By When: on-going during the 2023-2024 school year

#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.

5th Grade Science showed the greatest decline from the prior year:

2021-2022 -----41% Proficient

2022-2023 -----19% Proficient

We are below average compared to district (57%) and state (54%) averages.

Subgroup Data: Below grade level proficiency

5 subgroups: SWD, ELL, BLK, HSP, and FRL

5th Grade: SWD 94% ELL 67 % BLK 100% HSP 66% FRL 75%

Measurable Outcome:

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

Science Proficiency for fifth grade students will increase from 19% to 50% based on the end of the year Florida Standards NGSSS.

Monitoring:

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

Data Analysis (Monitor Reports and Assessments -- PENDA progress monitoring)

Classroom Walkthroughs/Feedback

Grade Level Meetings

Collaborative Planning

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Christy Meraz (meraz.christy@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.)

STEMSCOPES is a high quality science curriculum which uses CER (Claim, Evidence, Reasoning) as a classroom technique to engage with science concepts. PENDA is a game-based learning platform with evidence-based educational practices aligned to science standards that increases student engagement.

Grade level teams will be focused on collaborative planning, utilizing complex grade level material, evaluating aligned tasks, writing to the text, student supports for skill deficits, common assessments, and analyzing data. Teams will consist of the grade level teachers, Title 1 supports (Teacher and IA), ESE Teachers, Literacy Coach, and Administration.

Through our PLCs, we will focus on the following influences on student achievement from

John Hattie's work:

Teacher Clarity - 0.75 effect size

Teacher Estimates of Achievement: 1.44 ES

Comprehensive instructional programs for teachers - 0.72 ES

Scaffolding - 0.58 ES

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Working in our Grade Level Teams, taking a PLC Approach, our leadership team is utilizing research from Amplify You Impact: Coaching Collaborative Teams in PLCs at Work.

"High achieving schools build a school environment where working together to solve problems and to learn from each other become cultural norms." {Westwood 2000 Teachers who learn, kids who achieve; A look at schools with model professional development}

"The likelihood of using new learning and sharing responsibility rises when colleagues guided by a coach, work together and hold each other accountable for improved teaching and learning." {Annenberg Institute for School Reform, 2004}

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.

Grade level teams will meet during pre-planning and monthly to create long range plans to ensure grade level alignment.

Grade Level Teams will utilize STEM SCOPES and PENDA for instruction

Person Responsible: Christy Meraz (meraz.christy@brevardschools.org)

By When: on-going during the 2023-2024 school year

School leadership will facilitate classroom walkthroughs to observe instruction and implementation of collaborative plans and instructional supports. Walkthrough data will be utilized to create "next steps" plans to ensure we are meeting the targeted school initiatives.

Person Responsible: Christy Meraz (meraz.christy@brevardschools.org)

By When: on-going during the 2023-2024 school year

School leadership will monitor monthly reports on PENDA mastery of content.

Person Responsible: Christy Meraz (meraz.christy@brevardschools.org)

By When: on-going during the 2023-2024 school year

Students will take ownership of science data using PENDA reports on mastery of content and set goals via quarterly data chats with teachers.

Person Responsible: Christy Meraz (meraz.christy@brevardschools.org)

By When: on-going during the 2023-2024 school year

School leadership will monitor specific subgroup data.

Person Responsible: Christy Meraz (meraz.christy@brevardschools.org)

By When: on-going during the 2023-2024 school year

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).

District support. Listed below describes how those funds and personnel are used.

PERSONNEL:

DISTRICT MATH COACHES

ASSISTANT PRINCIPAL - One district level 12M assistant principal will be hired to support Title I schools with implementing classroom management and school wide structures/processes to address student behaviors.

MENTAL HEALTH RELATED PERSONNEL - Brevard Public Schools received a mental health assistance allocation to expand school-based mental health care. With these funds, four Title I schools have a fulltime social worker and thirteen Title I schools have a part-time (20 hour) social worker to assist and support students and families with social, emotional, and mental health needs to enhance and maximize student success.

INSTRUCTIONAL:

SMALL GROUP INSTRUCTION - Title I Part A funds will be used to support core instruction through reading instructional support and professional development (focused on standards-aligned instruction, student engagement, and instructional strategies) to include the support of a Literacy Coach. Training will continue to be provided to our Title I schools with an emphasis on small group instruction utilizing on grade level text and the scaffolding of grade level benchmarks

ACADEMIC SUPPORT PROGRAM (ASP) - ASP allocations and ESSER funds are provided to all elementary schools to provide instructional support with priority given to students in Grade 3. Title I funds are used to supplement ASP funds so that instruction can be more intensive with smaller groups and more time.

SUMMER READING CAMP is offered to those third-grade students who score a Level 1 on their ELA FSA. Twelve sites located across the district house the program, and student transportation is provided for Title I students. Small group instruction focuses on phonics and vocabulary to help struggling readers further develop comprehension. Additionally, ESSER funds will be used to support a summer acceleration program for grade 1-5 students in reading and mathematics for the month of June (22 days; 110 hours).

SUMMER SCHOOL - allocated using Title 1 Funds

CURRICULUM:

Purchase and support of LEXIA implementation

Purchase and support of Magnetic Reader implementation

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

Spring 2023 Early Literacy or STAR Reading data shows that over 50% of students in grades K-2 are not on track to score on grade level.

% of Kindergartners Scoring Below 40th Percentile: 59%

% of 1st Grade Scoring Below 40th Percentile in Early Literacy or STAR Reading: 69%

% of 2nd Grade Scoring Below 40th Percentile in Early Literacy or STAR Reading: 66%

Areas of concern:

Phonological Awareness

Phonics

Decoding

* Collaborative Planning sessions need to have a clear structure to focus on the alignment of benchmarks, resources, student tasks, assessments, and the transfer to instruction. Additionally, better understanding of the science of reading is warranted.

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

FAST English Language Arts data shows that over 50% of students in grades 3-5 are not on track to score on grade level.

% of 3rd Grade Scoring Below Level 3: 70%

% of 4th Grade Scoring Below Level 3: 67%

% of 5th Grade Scoring Below Level 3: 71%

Subgroup Data: Below grade level proficiency

5 subgroups: SWD, ELL, BLK, HSP, and FRL

3rd Grade: SWD 100% ELL 50% BLK 29% HSP 29% FRL 16%

4th Grade: SWD 75% ELL 33% BLK 83% HSP 29% FRL 58%

5th Grade: SWD 72% ELL 100% BLK 100% HSP 73% FRL 63%

6th Grade: SWD 81% ELL 67% BLK 67% HSP 44% FRL 65%

Therefore we believe that increasing grades 3 to 5 literacy achievement at during Tier 1 (Core) Instruction will help ensure that these gaps will not be as prominent in future years.

The Focus Areas:

Comprehension
Vocabulary
Multi-Syllabic Words
Morphology

* Collaborative Planning sessions need to have a clear structure to focus on the alignment of benchmarks, resources, student tasks, assessments, and the transfer to instruction. Additionally, better understanding of the science of reading is warranted. Additionally, adherence to the core BENCHMARK Advance curriculum will be a key lever for 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

By the Spring 2024, Early Literacy or STAR Reading data will demonstrate over 50% of students in grades K-2 are on grade level.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

By the Spring 2024 FAST PM3, ELA Proficiency rates in Grades 3-6 will increase to 60% of all students on grade level.

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.

PM 1, PM 2, FAST PM3
i-Ready D1 and D2
Walkthroughs with Feedback - monthly
Benchmark Advance Assessments
Intervention Data - Intervention instruction to specifically target identified gaps - daily

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Meraz, Christy, meraz.christy@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 - Frequent opportunities for guided/independent practice

Systematic instruction - Opportunities for students to practice previous content to progress toward learning goals

Scaffolded instruction - Gradual release until student(s) can perform independently

Lexia - Aligns with PA, Phonics, Fluency B.E.S.T. Standards/Systematic and structured approach to the six

critical areas for reading

95% Group - Systematic and explicit instructional on foundational skills utilizing evidence-based practices

Corrective Feedback- Provides student opportunity for self-correction

Collaborative Planning - Supports implementation of Benchmark Advance

iReady - The approach helps accelerate grown and grade-level learning

Benchmark Advance - Aligned/Focus on systematic, explicitness of instruction and reinforcing the "Why"

-

Science of Reading

John Hattie's: 1.57

Teacher Clarity - 0.75 effect size

Teacher Estimates of Achievement: 1.44 ES

Comprehensive instructional programs for teachers - 0.72 ES

Phonics Instruction - 0.60 ES

Writing Program - 0.46 ES

Response to Intervention - 1.09 ES

Scaffolding - 0.58 ES

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 programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population as they are:

* B.E.S.T. Standards Aligned

- * Aligned with the Brevard K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-Based Reading Plan
- * Systematic and/or Explicit
- * 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
Grade level teams will meet during pre-planning and participate in collaborative planning weekly to ensure grade level alignment. Plans will include learning cycles to ensure assessment match the expectations of the benchmark. Grade Level Teams will utilize Benchmark Advance Units and Savvas Units developed at the district level to ensure alignment, pacing, and scaffolding. Title 1: Literacy Coach	Meraz, Christy, meraz.christy@brevardschools.org
Literacy Coach and School Leadership will facilitate Professional Development on Shifting the Balance, Science of Reading, and TLAC Strategies. (Title I: Purchase Teach Like a Champion)	Mark, Diane, mark.diane@brevardschools.org
K-2 will instruct an additional 30 minutes of foundational skills each day utilizing i-Ready Magnetic Reading Curriculum. (Title I: i-Ready Magnetic Reading Curriculum)	Mark, Diane, mark.diane@brevardschools.org
Students will take ownership of reading data and set goals via quarterly data chats with teachers.	Meraz, Christy, meraz.christy@brevardschools.org

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.

(All have the availability for translations)

Website: <https://www.brevardschools.org/domain/5905>

Pushed out to stakeholder via Focus

Monthly SAC Meetings

Newsletters

Copy in the front office

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))

Family Engagement Events

Community Business Partners

Weekly/Monthly Newsletters

Events with Eckerd Connects

SAC Meetings

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) Strengthen Tier 1 (Core) Instruction in all academic areas: Explicit and Systematic Instruction, Weekly Collaborative Planning, Focus Boards, Data Binders, Targeted Professional Development, Walkthroughs with Immediate Feedback, Coaching Cycle, and Habits of Discussion
- 2) Decrease Discipline Referral Rates (Conduct): PBIS incentives; Professional Development, Mentoring, Resiliency, Restorative Circles/Practices, Consistent Procedures and School-Wide Expectations
- 3) Increase Family Involvement and Student Engagement (Culture): Family Engagement Evening Events, Increase stakeholder input, Celebrations, and Communication

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))

N/A