

Brevard Public Schools

Devereux Hospital 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	19
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Devereux Hospital

8000 DEVEREUX DR, Viera, FL 32940

[no web address on file]

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.

Devereux changes lives and nurtures human potential. We inspire hope, ensure well-being and promote meaningful life choices. Our mission is achieved through a wide range of services and supports for individuals and their families.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Devereux, we dream of new tomorrows and realities for the individuals we serve. We know that every person, regardless of disability, has the potential and the right to lead a life of fulfillment and accomplishment.

The Devereux School firmly believes that all students have the ability to achieve academic success. Students are paired with 21st century technology and highly qualified educators to ensure academic excellence. In addition, students will gain skills in self-determination and independent living.

Core Values

We support a respectful and integrated team approach
 We foster personal and professional growth of our staff
 We develop innovative and effective solutions
 We partner with families and communities

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
Kenney, Pamela	Principal	Oversee all aspects of the educational program including supervision of teachers, curriculum, discipline, budget, etc.
Frame, Tricia	Assistant Principal	Provide supervision and support to new teachers enrolled in the induction program. Supporting the alignment of curriculum to FL BEST Standards, quality control for teacher documentation (such as treatment team summaries, educational assessments, etc.) and completing the scoring of educational and behavioral assessments required for IEPs and special education eligibility. Processing IEP-driven 1:1 logs for revenue and School administrator for day school students, supervising issues that arise from that unique population (buses, treatment team, parent notifications, etc).

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.

Stakeholder Involvement:

Devereux wants very much to involve family members and guardians in their child's treatment.

For the benefit of both child and family, we invite family members and guardians to participate in family therapy sessions. Every effort is made to schedule therapy and visits at dates and times convenient for everyone involved.

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))

Classroom walkthroughs

Student Achievement data review

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)	Special Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	30%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	28%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	CSI
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)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* White Students (WHT)*
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	
School Improvement Rating History	2021-22: MAINTAINING 2018-19: MAINTAINING

	2017-18: UNSATISFACTORY
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	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	2	4	
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	1	1	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	1	5	4	9	6	27	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	1	5	4	9	6	27	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	2	1	5	4	9	6	27	

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	1	0	1	2	4

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	2	0	1	0	1	2	6
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	0	0	1	1	0	2	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	3	3	25	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	3	3	22	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	5	

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	0	0	1	0	1

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	0	4	3	3		11
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	3	6	3	3		16
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0		5

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	0	0	1	0	1

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	0	0	

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review**ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	16	58	53	17	63	55	19		
ELA Learning Gains				40			26		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile									
Math Achievement*	13	62	55	4	40	42	10		
Math Learning Gains				48					
Math Lowest 25th Percentile									
Science Achievement*	25	61	52	8	64	54			
Social Studies Achievement*		72	68		61	59	9		
Middle School Acceleration		70	70		51	51			
Graduation Rate		87	74		62	50			
College and Career Acceleration		75	53		76	70			
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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	18
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	54
Total Components for the Federal Index	3
Percent Tested	92
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	23
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	Yes
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	117
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	91
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	18	Yes	4	4
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	18	Yes	2	1

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
FRL	25	Yes	1	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	23	Yes	3	3
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	20	Yes	1	1
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	33	Yes	1	
FRL				

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	16			13			25					
SWD	16			13			25				3	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
PAC												
WHT	22			13							2	
FRL	25										1	

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	17	40		4	48		8					
SWD	17	40		4	48		8					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	20											
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	19	50		7	54							
FRL												

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	19	26		10				9				
SWD	19	26		10				9				
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	18											
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	18	25		17								
FRL												

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	*	54%	*	50%	*
05	2023 - Spring	*	59%	*	54%	*
07	2023 - Spring	*	53%	*	47%	*
08	2023 - Spring	*	52%	*	47%	*
09	2023 - Spring	*	56%	*	48%	*
04	2023 - Spring	*	61%	*	58%	*
06	2023 - Spring	*	61%	*	47%	*
03	2023 - Spring	*	56%	*	50%	*

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	*	67%	*	54%	*
07	2023 - Spring	*	58%	*	48%	*
03	2023 - Spring	*	60%	*	59%	*
04	2023 - Spring	*	61%	*	61%	*
08	2023 - Spring	*	38%	*	55%	*
05	2023 - Spring	*	55%	*	55%	*

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2023 - Spring	*	48%	*	44%	*
05	2023 - Spring	*	57%	*	51%	*

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

GEOMETRY

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

BIOLOGY

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	61%	*	63%	*

CIVICS

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	69%	*	66%	*

HISTORY

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
N/A	2023 - Spring	*	62%	*	63%	*

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.

Students with disabilities. It's impossible to compare one school year to another as the student population changes and the data is not reflective of the same students.

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

There is not sufficient data to analyze or identify trends across grade levels.

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.

Devereux students are not from the local community. Parents are not available to visit the school on a regular basis. Additionally, the relationship between schools and parents have been strained due to the route a student takes to require this level of restrictiveness. Devereux teachers will reach out to parents/guardians a minimum of two times per month for the purpose of sharing "good news" about their child

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

To increase learning gains and narrow the achievement gap with our ESE and other subgroups, we utilized the following high yield strategies:

ESE

- Built a culture of collaboration between professionals (ESE and non-ESE) that increased student success
- Explicitly taught students to maintain and generalize new learning across time and settings
- Built up our system of how we analyzed data, analyzed instructional practices, and made necessary adjustments that improved student outcomes
- Developed and implemented a system of teaching social behaviors
- Used as many mediums as possible to convey information: oral, written, videos, teacher demonstration, student demonstration, etc.
- Used Pictures and Realia Manipulatives.
- Used gestures and facial expression.

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

n/a

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

1. The efforts of the I/DD Program are aimed at providing the support, training and skills essential in attaining treatment outcomes for individuals who display a wide range of challenging behaviors including aggression, property destruction, severe tantrum behavior, self-injurious behavior, run away problems and difficulty following directions reliably. The individuals admitted to the program display clear deficits in adaptive and social functioning. Treatment focuses on increasing independence in all settings using positive approaches.
2. Improving/maintaining behavior management. Each treatment unit on the Viera Campus provides a Board Certified Behavior Analyst who provides individualized behavior assessments, programming, and supervision of implemented behavioral interventions targeted at decreasing maladaptive/dangerous/ social inappropriate behaviors. Our behavioral analysts also provide interventions targeted at increasing functionally equivalent skills to these maladaptive behaviors across all settings each individual encounters.

Area of Focus

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**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 Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities (I/DD) Program provides services for individuals between the ages of 5 to 19. This program provides services for individuals who have the existence of both intellectual/developmental disabilities and mental illness.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Monitoring:

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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.

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

#2. 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.

The school's focus is culture and environment. We integrated and monitored resources and strategies that strengthened a culture for social and emotional learning to grow every student academically, socially, and emotionally. The rationale is that academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject materials. By strengthening our school's culture for social and emotional learning, we will address the following school needs:

- Self-management

We will continue to focus on increasing student awareness in social and emotional learning in the competency of Self-Management.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of 2022-2023, Devereux students will reflect a 3% increase in the competency of Self-Management.

Monitoring:

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

This area of focus will be monitored through classroom walkthroughs and observations, coaching logs, data discussions with students, professional development trainings and support from Guidance Counselors and ESE team leads with an intense focus on students in need of SEL support

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Pamela Kenney (pkenney@devereaux.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.)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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.

- * Establish a common language to support a culture of social and emotional learning at school with adults and students
- * Use a process to examine the current school climate and culture
- * Determine relevant strategies to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration across the school
- * Implement strategies for social and emotional learning with adults and students to positively impact school climate and culture

- * Understand the connections between social and emotional learning and instructional strategies
- * Use cycles of professional learning that integrate academics and social and emotional learning
- * Monitor, measure, and modify cycles of professional learning that support data-based instructional decisions that enhance school improvement efforts.

Person Responsible: Pamela Kenney (pkenney@devereaux.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)).

Devereaux completes a needs assessment annually to determine resource alignment to needs. One of our primary needs is teacher retention and recruitment funding beyond what we are allocated from ESSER/ARP. IDEA funding is used to secure positions, such as behavior analysts, behavior technicians, and teachers in high needs areas when we are unable to secure through district funding. From district support/ capital outlay furniture has been purchased that supports the sensory and instructional needs of all subgroups including students with disabilities.