

Brevard Public Schools

Port Malabar 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 | 14 |
| IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review | 24 |
| V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence | 24 |
| VI. Title I Requirements | 28 |
| VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus | 0 |

Port Malabar Elementary School

301 PIONEER AVE NE, Palm Bay, FL 32907

<http://www.portmalabar.es.brevard.k12.fl.us>

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), <https://www.floridacims.org>, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

| SIP Sections | Title I Schoolwide Program | Charter Schools |
|--|---|------------------------|
| I-A: School Mission/Vision | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1) |
| I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(2-3) | |
| I-E: Early Warning System | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-A-C: Data Review | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2) |
| II-F: Progress Monitoring | ESSA 1114(b)(3) | |
| III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection | ESSA 1114(b)(6) | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4) |
| III-B: Area(s) of Focus | ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii) | |
| III-C: Other SI Priorities | | 6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9) |
| VI: Title I Requirements | ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g) | |

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Our mission is to work together to build a safe, respectful and nurturing environment focused on maximizing each child's sense of well-being and acquisition of skills for life and learning.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The staff at Port Malabar Elementary School is dedicated to creating a school community where children feel safe, valued, and empowered to be lifelong learners.

Revised on 7/11/2023

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 |
|------------------|---------------------|--|
| Rubick, Gregory | Principal | Greg Rubick is the principal and serves as the instructional leader, overseeing all aspects of school improvement including personnel, student achievement, and school safety. He facilitates collaboration and problem solving among the staff to ensure the implementation of high quality instructional practices utilizing the MTSS process. Mr. Rubick is a member of the IPST, the School Advisory Council, and PTO where he communicates school-wide data involving all stakeholders. He also ensures that school safety is up to date. |
| Scott, Tera | Assistant Principal | Tera Scott is the assistant principal, and supports various aspects of school improvement including curriculum, assessments, student discipline, and facility security and safety. Additionally, she coordinates the Beginning Teacher Program, plans professional development, and serves as the school testing coordinator. She heads the guidance department and helps facilitate the IPST/MTSS meetings. She ensures teachers are closely monitoring student progress through data chat meetings. She is also the ESOL coordinator, oversees facilities, and monitors our at-risk students . |
| Kahler, Stefania | Other | Stefania Kahler is our Title I coordinator, ensuring Title I budget/framework is in compliance. She works with Tier 2 and Tier 3 instructional groups. She supports tiered interventions, data collection, and student progress monitoring. She co-facilitates the MTSS team and meets with teachers bi-weekly to monitor students who are academically at risk. Mrs. Kahler plans and organizes Family Involvement events, provides professional development, and is the Treasurer of the School Advisory Council. |
| King, Michelle | Reading Coach | Michelle King is our Literacy Coach and serves as a School Advisory Council member. She monitors instruction and student mastery of the BEST standards and oversees all Reading programs. Mrs. King meets weekly with teachers to plan and model standards based lessons and district initiatives. She co-facilitates bi-monthly data meetings to analyze student data and plan tiered instruction and acceleration. She plans professional development opportunities for teachers, leads the Literacy Leadership Team, and serves as a member of the MTSS team. |

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development

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

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

Teacher Survey data shows....

Student Survey data shows...

Parent Survey data shows....

CNA meeting minutes show a need for additional resources that support poetry instruction. Analysis of ELA data for students in grades 3-6 shows that BEST standards ELA.R.1.4 and ELA.V.1.3 were two

areas needing improvement. For students in K-2nd grade, Foundational Skills and Vocabulary were areas identified as needing improvement.

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))

Evidence of effective implementation will include, but not be limited to: classroom walkthroughs utilizing walkthrough tool, Leadership Team meetings, grade level data chats, and grade level collaborative planning.

Evidence of impact on student achievement will include, but not be limited to: FAST PM data, iReady diagnostic data, Lexia participation minutes and scores, Penda monitoring and usage reports, revisiting of SIP action steps through leadership team meetings, quarterly assessing action steps.

| Demographic Data | |
|--|---|
| 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 | 52% |
| 2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate | 100% |
| Charter School | No |
| RAISE School | Yes |
| 2021-22 ESSA Identification | 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 | 2021-22: B 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: C |
| School Improvement Rating History | |
| DJJ Accountability Rating History | |

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|---|----|----|----|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Absent 10% or more days | 6 | 10 | 9 | 7 | 5 | 4 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 50 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 4 | 5 | 9 | 3 | 6 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA) | 7 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 12 | 23 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 52 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 13 | 20 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 48 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 7 | 13 | 10 | 9 | 13 | 23 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 88 |
| | 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 | 2 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 9 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 42 |

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 | 7 | 7 | 2 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 |

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 | 12 | 18 | 17 | 24 | 13 | 18 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 126 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 7 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 17 | 21 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 64 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 20 | 20 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 69 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 1 | 8 | 11 | 15 | 12 | 17 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 79 |

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 | 6 | 7 | 10 | 16 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 56 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 1 | 6 | 5 | 9 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

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 | 12 | 18 | 17 | 24 | 13 | 18 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 126 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 4 | 7 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 17 | 21 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 64 |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 5 | 20 | 20 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 69 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 1 | 8 | 11 | 15 | 12 | 17 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 79 |

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 | 6 | 7 | 10 | 16 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 56 |

The number of students identified retained:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 1 | 6 | 5 | 9 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 |

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 | 2022 | | | 2019 | | |
|---------------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement* | 58 | 61 | 56 | 61 | 62 | 57 |
| ELA Learning Gains | 59 | 63 | 61 | 67 | 60 | 58 |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 43 | 54 | 52 | 68 | 57 | 53 |
| Math Achievement* | 56 | 60 | 60 | 58 | 63 | 63 |
| Math Learning Gains | 67 | 64 | 64 | 62 | 65 | 62 |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 58 | 55 | 55 | 50 | 53 | 51 |
| Science Achievement* | 55 | 56 | 51 | 47 | 57 | 53 |
| Social Studies Achievement* | | 0 | 50 | | 0 | |
| Middle School Acceleration | | | | | | |
| Graduation Rate | | | | | | |
| College and Career Acceleration | | | | | | |
| ELP Progress | 38 | | | 60 | | |

** 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 | 54 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 434 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 97 |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index | |
|----------------------------|--|
| Graduation Rate | |

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

| 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 | 37 | Yes | 1 | |
| ELL | 47 | | | |
| AMI | | | | |
| ASN | | | | |
| BLK | 50 | | | |
| HSP | 51 | | | |
| MUL | 64 | | | |
| PAC | | | | |
| WHT | 57 | | | |
| FRL | 47 | | | |

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)

| 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 | 58 | 59 | 43 | 56 | 67 | 58 | 55 | | | | | 38 |
| SWD | 35 | 40 | 33 | 35 | 56 | 55 | 23 | | | | | 20 |
| ELL | 41 | 64 | 60 | 47 | 59 | | 20 | | | | | 38 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 52 | 60 | 30 | 48 | 79 | | 33 | | | | | |
| HSP | 49 | 53 | 56 | 49 | 60 | 58 | 37 | | | | | 42 |
| MUL | 64 | 54 | | 61 | 75 | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| 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 |
| WHT | 64 | 61 | 44 | 62 | 64 | 56 | 63 | | | | | 40 |
| FRL | 50 | 53 | 38 | 50 | 61 | 53 | 39 | | | | | 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 | 59 | 62 | 66 | 48 | 52 | 45 | 48 | | | | | 76 |
| SWD | 40 | 62 | 60 | 19 | 42 | 38 | 25 | | | | | |
| ELL | 44 | 53 | | 41 | 60 | | | | | | | 76 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 38 | 52 | | 35 | 38 | | 55 | | | | | |
| HSP | 46 | 61 | 70 | 44 | 64 | | 50 | | | | | 80 |
| MUL | 52 | | | 45 | | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 71 | 62 | 58 | 54 | 51 | 33 | 46 | | | | | |
| FRL | 49 | 63 | 64 | 37 | 48 | 46 | 40 | | | | | 81 |

| 2018-19 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 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 | ELP Progress |
| All Students | 61 | 67 | 68 | 58 | 62 | 50 | 47 | | | | | 60 |
| SWD | 33 | 55 | 59 | 36 | 53 | 41 | 24 | | | | | |
| ELL | 52 | 57 | | 56 | 67 | | | | | | | 60 |
| AMI | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| ASN | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 42 | 63 | 82 | 41 | 57 | 61 | 30 | | | | | |
| HSP | 61 | 63 | 50 | 57 | 58 | 38 | 50 | | | | | 50 |
| MUL | 64 | 71 | | 63 | 67 | | | | | | | |
| PAC | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 66 | 69 | 67 | 63 | 64 | 47 | 55 | | | | | |
| FRL | 53 | 66 | 70 | 48 | 59 | 51 | 39 | | | | | 58 |

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 | 53% | 59% | -6% | 54% | -1% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 52% | 61% | -9% | 58% | -6% |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 57% | 61% | -4% | 47% | 10% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 53% | 56% | -3% | 50% | 3% |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 06 | 2023 - Spring | 63% | 67% | -4% | 54% | 9% |
| 03 | 2023 - Spring | 58% | 60% | -2% | 59% | -1% |
| 04 | 2023 - Spring | 55% | 61% | -6% | 61% | -6% |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 51% | 55% | -4% | 55% | -4% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2023 - Spring | 56% | 57% | -1% | 51% | 5% |

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Based on FAST, EWS, and subgroup data, we are seeing a downward trend in overall proficiency in ELA grades 3-6. We are also seeing a downward trend in our SWD subgroup with regards to ELA proficiency levels.

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

ELA over all proficiency and SWD subgroup ELA - both are downward trends, and increase in level 1s. in grades 3-6th we dropped by 3% in overall proficiency from 56% to 53% from 2022 to 2023. We also dropped in overall proficiency in our SWD subgroup grades 3-6th from 37% to 33%. We have had an increase in our SWD subgroup population, we have improved our system of identifying students with disabilities, and this has increased our numbers in that subgroup. We also need to continue working on our small group purposeful and targeted instruction.

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.

ELA proficiency levels in our SWD subgroup (37% to 33% grades 3-6), as well as our 6th graders, going from 71% proficient to 57% from 2022 to 2023. Our overall math proficiency scores also dropped in our 6th graders from 73% to 63% in overall proficiency.

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

Math proficiency levels and gains from 2023-2024, and within the year from PM2 to PM3. We believe that utilizing title I teachers to include providing math interventions to students, and not just ELA, helped our students be successful. We also increased our math block from 60 minutes to 90 minutes for every grade, giving more time for core instruction and also small group remediation. We also saw that grades 3-6 all increased in proficiency from PM2 to PM3 by at least 20% or more.

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

SWD - we continue to drop in ELA proficiency levels and are now in year 2 for being below the ESSA Federal Index threshold of 41% at 33%

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

SWD proficiency in ELA, and ELA over proficiency levels grades 3-6. As well as overall support in our primary grades in order for them to master fundamental skills to prepare them for reading comprehension.

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 Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Port Malabar was identified as being below the 41% threshold for Federal Percent of Index points in our SWD subgroup (33%), a drop of 4% from 2022. Not only does this make the second year we have fallen below 41%, but this also identifies us as an ATSI school.

Measurable Outcome:

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

The goal of Port Malabar Elementary School is to increase our overall ELA proficiency levels in our SWD subgroup, grades 3-6th from 33% to 41%, which will put us out of ATSI status.

Monitoring:

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

This will be monitored through benchmark assessments, iReady diagnostics, and FAST progress monitoring assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gregory Rubick (rubick.gregory@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.)

Our 3rd grade has a heavy SWD population. One of their activity wheels will be receiving intervention with a Title I teacher which will include students being pulled for small group direct instruction from this teacher, as well as working on Lexia and iReady instructional pathways. The students will also receive their daily Smart Time intervention/small group instruction, providing them with an extra intervention hour per week.

We will also continue our morning Jump Start program, which will include early morning, before-school, tutoring in one of our computer labs. We will target students working below proficiency levels in ELA/SWD subgroup and provide them with 20-30 minutes daily instruction in our labs with our Literacy Coach.

Using ASP funds, we will continue our afterschool tutoring program, targeting those students who are not performing at or above proficiency levels/SWD subgroup, this will provide an additional 30-45 per week of supported instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Research shows that programs like iReady and Lexia are not only engaging for students but improves their overall success in ELA.

Looking at trends over the past 2 years, we have seen overall proficiency improve when small group lessons are targeted and purposeful and small group instruction is implemented consistently with fidelity. This is why these students will receive multiple sessions per week of small group instruction, identifying specific deficiencies in our students so interventions are targeted and will be most impactful for student achievement.

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.

Using Performance Matters, we will identify our SWD subgroup who scored below grade level on FAST and/or iReady D3 from the 2022-2023 school year. We will dedicate purposeful time during grade level meetings to discuss and monitor these students through state/district assessments, and end of unit tests.

Person Responsible: Gregory Rubick (rubick.gregory@brevardschools.org)

By When: September 2023

We will target this group to provide additional instructional support through our Morning Jump Start program, focusing on ELA, as well as our after-school tutoring program provided with ESSER ASP funds. We will monitor their success rate through their iReady instructional pathway lessons and units passed in Lexia.

Person Responsible: Michelle King (king.michelle@brevardschools.org)

By When: school year

We will utilize an additional allocation this year, an ESE resource teacher that will strictly serve in a capacity of push-in/pull-out support to our gen. ed. classrooms to provide additional support to our SWD population. This person will collaborate with gen ed. teachers when planning best strategies for our SWD subgroup, as well as sit in all grade level meetings to provide additional input/feedback on student success in that particular subgroup.

Person Responsible: Tera Scott (scott.tera@brevardschools.org)

By When: school year

We will create a weekly walk-through schedule, with specific look-fors and tasks embedded within teacher instruction based on the RAISE Science of Reading trainings, that our Literacy Coach, Assistant Principal, and Principal will attend. Feedback will be provided to teachers based on classroom walkthroughs to improve core instruction.

Person Responsible: Gregory Rubick (rubick.gregory@brevardschools.org)

By When: school year

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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.

2022-2023 FAST ELA PM3 data shows that:
 60% of Kindergarten students met proficiency expectations,
 61% of First Grade students met proficiency expectations,
 74% of Second Grade students met proficiency expectations,
 55% of Third Grade students met proficiency expectations,
 50% of Fourth Grade students met proficiency expectations,
 53% of Fifth Grade students met proficiency expectations, and
 57% of Sixth Grade students met proficiency expectations.

When looking at this data with primary and intermediate stake holders, we broke this down to the student level. This means 146/228 K-2nd primary students scored proficiently on the PM3 assessment (64% of students).

175/326 of our 3rd-6th grade intermediate students scored at Levels 3+ on the FAST PM3 assessment (54% of students).

Grade 4 ELA data shows 50% of students performing at proficiency (Levels 3+) compared to district average of 61%. 54% of this cohort group of students scored proficiently in 2021-2022, so there was a decline in 4%. Because 4th Grade ELA proficiency scores are at 50%, Port Malabar is also identified as a "RAISE" school by the Florida Department of Education, meaning teachers will receive Professional Development on evidence-based strategies, assistance with implementing data-informed instruction, and training on using high-quality instructional materials and multi-tiered system of supports (MTSS) from the state. Port Malabar also remains below the 41% threshold of students scoring 3+ on FAST ELA in our SWD subgroup, at 33% Levels 3+ (a decline of 4% from 2021-22).

With only 321/554 of all students (58%) meeting proficiency expectations in ELA, we have identified ELA as a critical area of focus for our students during the 2023-2024 school year.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Overall proficiency (Grades K-6) will increase from 58% to 63% on the FAST ELA PM3 assessments.

We will monitor our SWD to make sure proficiency is improving at each FAST ELA PM assessment. SWD proficiency will improve from 33% to 41% on the 2023-2024 FAST ELA PM3.

Our cohort RASIE group of students (current 5th graders) will be monitored closely at each iReady Diagnostic, District QLA, and FAST PM assessment. Student proficiency will improve from 50% to 55%.

Monitoring:

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

Ongoing Progress Monitoring (OPM) will occur using the following measures:

- iReady Diagnostic Growth (D1, D2, and D3)
- FAST Progress Monitoring Assessments (PM1, PM2, and PM3)
- Benchmark/Savvas Weekly and Unit Assessments (Grades 1-6)
- Kindergarten Literacy Survey (Kindergarten students only, at the end of each quarter)
- DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency passages (for selected students Grades 1-6, as determined by the

Decision Trees)

PASI and PSI (for selected students Grades K-6, as determined by the Decision Trees)

District Required Quarterly Literacy Assessments (QLAs, at the end of each 9 weeks)

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tera Scott (scott.tera@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.)

Overall Tier 1 performance will improve when implementing and monitoring the following strategies:

All K-6 students will use the Lexia Core5 or PowerUp computer-based instruction/intervention programs and teachers will monitor students' pass rates and reteach lessons as needed (determined by students who are flagged in Lexia as "Needs Instruction")

Differentiated iReady lessons will be utilized, a minimum of 30 minutes per week per student

Targeted small group instruction will occur during the 90-minute block and also during intervention (30min/day, 4x week)

Classroom teachers and Title 1 intervention teachers will use evidence-based resources that are part of the BPS Decision Trees for intervention instruction and progress monitoring.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Tier 1, whole group instruction will allow for equal and consistent exposure to grade level curriculum and rigor for all students.

Small group reading instruction is an opportunity for differentiated grade-level groups each day. Teachers will expose all students to grade level BEST standards and scaffold the instruction as needed to provide students access to grade-level text. Text sets that accompany the new curriculum help to create an in-depth understanding of the topic and build vocabulary.

Nationwide data supports the use of Lexia and iReady instruction and progress monitoring tools as a research-based, rigorous resource for teachers to use to meet the requirements of the BEST ELA standards. Correlations between iReady data and 2023 FAST ELA scores for Port Malabar were very strong, indicating that when used with fidelity and monitored closely, iReady can be an effective tool used throughout all of our classrooms.

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.

The Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) will meet monthly to revisit ELA goals and discuss current data trends. Classroom walk-throughs will occur and teachers will be provided with feedback to improve instruction based on Science of Reading, BPS Instructional Agreements look-fors.

Walk-through data may also provide the LLT with coaching/mentoring needs for staff.

Person Responsible: Tera Scott (scott.tera@brevardschools.org)

By When: Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) will meet monthly Anything urgent can be discussed at weekly Leadership Team Meeting

Literacy Coach will meet with grade level teams to plan before each new unit of instruction. Collaborative planning will include: analyzing data of student mastery of individual BEST ELA standards, scaffolding for difficult skills or specific students, locating additional resources to support reteaching and review of certain standards (based on data), selecting read alouds that help build background knowledge and vocabulary, and reviewing assessments prior to administering to plan for student success.

Person Responsible: Michelle King (king.michelle@brevardschools.org)

By When: Intentional planning will occur before each new Unit of instruction. Dates will vary based on pacing set by district for each ELA unit.

Title I Coordinator will work with the Literacy Coach and the Media Specialist to plan family engagement nights that promote literacy and independent student reading. (T)

The Media Specialist will promote student reading daily and encourage participation by offering individual, class, and grade level incentives for meeting reading goals.

Person Responsible: Stefania Kahler (kahler.stefania@brevardschools.org)

By When: Family Involvement events will occur in Fall and Spring Individual student incentives will be daily as students complete tasks. Class incentives will be monthly for reading goals.(T)

After attending iReady and Lexia Professional Development sessions, teacher will be ready to implement these programs and use reports to monitor student progress.

Person Responsible: Michelle King (king.michelle@brevardschools.org)

By When: Lexia PD for Teachers- September 2023 iReady PD for Teachers- October 2023

Formative and summative data is analyzed to make acceleration or intervention decisions for students. Intervention and enrichment groups will change approximately every 6 weeks, based on the most recent assessment data available. 4 additional teachers will be used daily to support Lowest 25%. (T)

subgroup and students identified as struggling to meet grade level expectations. (T)

Students working below grade level, or students identified as "substantially deficient" will be progress monitored using grade level appropriate assessments from the BPS Decision Trees.

Person Responsible: Michelle King (king.michelle@brevardschools.org)

By When: every 6 weeks

iReady and Lexia usage and student pass rates will be monitored closely to ensure programs are being used with fidelity.

Literacy Coach and Assistant Principal will meet weekly to view reports. Feedback will be shared with teachers.

Person Responsible: Tera Scott (scott.tera@brevardschools.org)

By When: Weekly reports

Provide teachers and students with access to annual online subscriptions for Lexia, Accelerated Reader, Flocabulary, and Generation Genius to support ELA and Social Studies instruction.(T) Purchase recommended trade books to support, ELA instruction.

Person Responsible: Stefania Kahler (kahler.stefania@brevardschools.org)

By When: August 2023

#3. 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.

When looking at individual grades (3rd-6th) and their overall proficiency levels from 2022 to 2023, we noticed 3rd remained at 58%, 4th increased from 51% to 52%, 5th increased from 42% to 51%. 6th grade was the only grade that decreased from 73% to 63% to proficient.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Though we met most of our SIP goals from 2022, we want to continue the upward trend in all goals. Our goal is to go from 58% overall proficiency in grades 3-6, to 63%.

Monitoring:

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

Classroom walkthroughs - using walkthrough tool

iReady diagnostics

FAST PM1, PM2, PM3

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Gregory Rubick (rubick.gregory@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.)

The state has required a 30 minute intervention block for math, we already have that built in for each grade. Each grade will continue to have a 90 minute math block, with a focus on whole group instruction, and utilizing that additional time for small group instruction/intervention.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Studies have shown that small group instruction, with a focus and purposeful instruction has a great impact for those students struggling with mathematic concepts. Targeted instruction in small group has proven to close the achievement gap for students who score below proficiency levels, increasing their chances of being successful.

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.

Reserve early release Fridays and other professional development sessions for purposeful grade level planning and collaboration, with a focus on teaching to the standard, and purposeful planning for small group instruction.

Person Responsible: Gregory Rubick (rubick.gregory@brevardschools.org)

By When: school year

Continue to train teachers how to use iReady and Reveal/Edgem resources/reports to ensure small groups are created with targeted deficiencies so that the small groups are formed with purpose and therefore more impactful.

Person Responsible: Gregory Rubick (rubick.gregory@brevardschools.org)

By When: school year

Utilize Academic Support funds to hire a part-time certified teacher to provide intensive small group math instruction. Students will be identified using iReady diagnostic scores, and FAST progress monitoring assessments.

Person Responsible: Gregory Rubick (rubick.gregory@brevardschools.org)

By When: school year

Like last year, we will have access to a district math coach which will meet with administration and grade level teams to provide support and feedback during meetings regarding scaffolding to address instructional gaps, as well as support with core/standards-based instruction.

Person Responsible: Gregory Rubick (rubick.gregory@brevardschools.org)

By When: school year

There will be purposeful scheduled classroom walkthrough cycles, conducted by myself, Mrs. Scott, and our district assigned math coach to monitor classroom core/standards-based instruction, small group intervention, and meaningful feedback for teachers to improve overall classroom instruction.

Person Responsible: Gregory Rubick (rubick.gregory@brevardschools.org)

By When: school year

Title I will coordinate Parent and Family Engagement nights/activities to support academic success at home, through events such as Family Math Night, and by providing math materials and training to parents and families.

Person Responsible: Stefania Kahler (kahler.stefania@brevardschools.org)

By When: throughout the school year.

#4. 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.

With an increased focus in Science, Port Malabar Science proficiency scores increased by 3% percentage points in 2023 (53% to 56%), this increase put us 1% below the district average, but 5% above the state average. Our goal is to continue focusing on Science as an area that needs improvement, and continue this upward trend.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Overall Science Achievement (grade 5), will increase by 5% to 61% at or above proficiency, in the spring of 2024. This will continue to exceed the state proficiency level of 51%, and the district's proficiency level of 57%.

Monitoring:

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

OPM tool - Unify/Performance Matters Summative Assessments, PENDA Reports, classroom walkthroughs

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stefania Kahler (kahler.stefania@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Teachers will use Destination Science: The Quest for Quality Instruction, (the district curriculum materials) with an increased focus on the 5E Model of Unit Planning (Engage, Explore, Explain, Elaborate, and Evaluate). We will continue to collaborate with District Content Specialists, in order to assist teachers in planning and implementing an effective science curriculum. We will continue the use of PENDA (district provided) to provide students with supplemental Science instruction and practice, both in school and at home.

We will also put an exclusive science class on the wheel for 5th graders, exposing them to hands-on science activities, aligned with state standards, as well as utilizing PENDA for optimal instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

The Destination Science curriculum guides were developed using nationally based research and our district BSCS committee. Continuing to fully implement the program with fidelity and support will enhance core science instruction.

District-wide trends show that the use of PENDA with fidelity has greatly improved 5th science achievement.

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 monitor student science data through Performance Matters when students take formative and summative assessments, reflect on instructional practices through collaborative planning.

Person Responsible: Tera Scott (scott.tera@brevardschools.org)

By When: School year

Identify students in need of science support and create a plan for Science Academic Support Program for Spring of 2024, for selected students.

Person Responsible: Stefania Kahler (kahler.stefania@brevardschools.org)

By When: Spring 2024

Identify students in need of science support and create a plan for Science Academic Support Program for Spring of 2024, for selected students.

Person Responsible: Stefania Kahler (kahler.stefania@brevardschools.org)

By When: Spring 2024

Utilize Title I funds to support 4th grade science standards focused on Florida Ecosystems (T).

Person Responsible: Stefania Kahler (kahler.stefania@brevardschools.org)

By When: school year

Teachers in Grades 3-6 will continue PENDA training and utilization of the program for at least 30 minutes per week, A student/teacher incentive program will be put in place to monitor PENDA usage.

Person Responsible: Tera Scott (scott.tera@brevardschools.org)

By When: school year

Provide teachers access to Generation Genius and Brainpop to support science standards in grades K-6 (T).

Person Responsible: Stefania Kahler (kahler.stefania@brevardschools.org)

By When: school year

Participate in district funded hands-on science exploration experiences - Starbase Patrick Program for 5th grade; Destination Space for 6th grade. 4th Grade Lagoon Quest Field Trip (funded by Title I). (T)

Person Responsible: Tera Scott (scott.tera@brevardschools.org)

By When: August 2023

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 Content Resource Teacher participate in classroom walkthroughs

Work with Student Services to provide student engagement supports/resources specifically targeting SWD subgroup

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

We did not meet RAISE criteria for any grades K-2.

60% of Kindergarten students were proficient on the FAST PM3 assessment in 2022-2023.

61% of First Grade students were proficient on the FAST PM3 assessment in 2022-2023.

74% of Second Grade students were proficient on the FAST PM3 assessment in 2022-2023.

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

50% of 2022-2023 4th grade students scored below Level 3 on the FAST ELA assessment, identifying Port Malabar as a RAISE school for the 2023-2024 school year.

This cohort group of students is now in 5th grade, and is also one of our highest SWD populations, with 22% of students identified as a SWD.

ESE Teachers and Classroom Teachers will collaboratively plan with the Literacy Coach to ensure instruction is aligned to Florida BEST ELA benchmarks and that all students are receiving targeted intervention or enrichment to ensure learning gains for all.

Teachers will use data to form differentiated small groups and progress monitor to regroup students and change instruction as needed.

iReady will be used to support Tier 1 ELA instruction and Lexia will be utilized as an intervention tool to help close achievement gaps.

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

NA

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Our cohort RASIE group of students (current 5th graders) will be monitored closely at each iReady Diagnostic, District QLA, and FAST PM assessment. Student proficiency will improve from 50% to 55%.

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.

Ongoing Progress Monitoring (OPM) will occur using the following measures:

iReady Diagnostic Growth (D1, D2, and D3)

FAST Progress Monitoring Assessments (PM1, PM2, and PM3)

Benchmark Weekly and Unit Assessments

DIBELS Oral Reading Fluency passages

District Required Quarterly Literacy Assessments (QLAs, at the end of each 9 weeks)

Prior to each of the assessments, teachers will have goal-setting conversations with students. After testing, student conferencing will again occur so teachers can share results with their students. Parents will also be informed of assessment windows, and results will be shared promptly after testing is complete.

Any child not making adequate progress will receive interventions and monitored closely. MTSS/IPST meetings with families will be scheduled as needed.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Scott, Tera, scott.tera@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?

Port Malabar teachers use the Benchmark Advance and Savvas curricula for ELA Tier 1 instruction. We use iReady's instructional pathway in Reading to supplement Tier 1 instruction and reinforce skills, which has a "Moderate" rating from Evidence for ESSA. This is aligned to the district's K-12 CERP and to the Florida BEST ELA standards.

Port Malabar purchased Lexia as one of the tools to support intervention needs for our students. Lexia Core5 and Lexia PowerUp Literacy have both received "Strong" ratings from Evidence for ESSA. The ratings mean the programs meet the highest standard of evidence outlined by federal law under the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA). Both Lexia programs are also proven to support students with disabilities (SWD).

Intervention teachers also utilize 95 Percent Group's Phonics programs for primary students, which also have a "Strong" rating according to Evidence for ESSA.

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?

Port Malabar chose to purchase Lexia for all students during the 2023-2024 school year after seeing results from selected students who had use of the program in 2022-2023.

Last school year (2022-2023), our 5th grade students started the year at 49% proficiency, which put Port Malabar into RAISE status for the 2022-2023 school year. All of our 5th graders were given access to Lexia Core5 in January and 53% of students were proficient on the 2023 PM3 FAST ELA assessment, a gain of 4%. Those same students used Benchmark Advance and iReady the year before, but only 49% were proficient.

Benchmark Advance, iReady, and the 95 Percent Group programs are provided to all schools in Brevard.

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 |
|---|---|
| <p>The Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) will meet monthly to analyze iReady diagnostic data, iReady instructional pathway data (usage and success rate), and Lexia data (usage and success rate). The Literacy Leadership Team will triangulate iReady data with F.A.S.T. Progress monitoring data to have the most accurate picture of students, in order to provide the appropriate supports for ELA success.</p> | <p>Scott, Tera, scott.tera@brevardschools.org</p> |
| <p>The Literacy Coach will work with 5th grade teachers to ensure all ELA instruction is aligned to BEST ELA standards. The Literacy Coach will collaboratively plan with teachers to: analyze data of student mastery of individual BEST ELA standards, plan scaffolds for difficult skills, locate additional resources to support reteaching and review of certain standards (based on data), select read alouds that help build background knowledge and vocabulary, and review assessments prior to administering to plan for student success.</p> | <p>King, Michelle, king.michelle@brevardschools.org</p> |
| <p>Professional Learning opportunities will be offered to teachers and staff to support iReady and Lexia implementation. Literacy Coach and Assistant Principal will work to coordinate professional growth opportunities for Port Malabar teachers after meeting with company reps to determine the needs of staff. Trainings will be provided to teachers in September and October of 2023.</p> | <p>King, Michelle, king.michelle@brevardschools.org</p> |

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

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

The approved SIP is disseminated to all stakeholders via publishing on the school's website homepage. There are emails and text messages to all families, informing them in their home language, that the approved SIP is published on the school's website. We also display the message on our school marquee. During the Annual Title I meeting, families are notified that the SIP can be located on the school's website, and a paper copy in their home language can be obtained when requested. Stakeholders comprise both Port Malabar's School Advisory Council (SAC) and the Parent Teacher Organization (PTO). These groups are invited to participate in creating the SIP and are informed of the SIP. An open invitaion is also sent to all stakeholders, inviting them to attend our SAC meetings, as well as serveral meetings in which schol data is discussed, and the SIP is worked on. The approved SIP is shared with all faculty during a Faculty Meeting, and a link to the SIP is sent to all staff.

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))

Port Malabar Elementary builds positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders in a variety of ways. The Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) is located on the school's website and a summary of this plan is sent home with each student in their home language. (T) There is a Parent Family Engagement Event scheduled regularly, with topics that have been chosen based on parent feedback. Feedback is collected via exit slips from Parent Family Engagement Events, District parent surveys, in-person meetings, online surveys, school-based surveys. (T) The Annual Title I Meeting reviews student achievement data by subgroups. (T) Parents and Families receive Interims and Report Cards in paper form and electronically posted to FOCUS.

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)

Port Malabar has numerous plans to strengthen the academic program, increase the amount and quality of learning time, and help provide enriched and accelerated curriculum. Tier 2 and Tier 3 Interventions are delivered in a consistent manner with weekly progress monitoring. (T) Our Guidance Counselor continues to reach out to parents to identify any barriers to attendance. (T) ESSA groups and Tier 2 and 3 students will be monitored and addressed weekly at grade-level meetings. Grade-level meetings will also target the MTSS process, data chats, and professional development to address students scoring below grade level. The Literacy Coach will conduct coaching cycles with teachers. (T) Walk to Intervention for grades K-6 with all staff involved. Teachers will be the facilitators while students will show evidence of learning through rich discussions and peer collaboration.

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))

This plan addresses programs supported under ESSA by increasing student achievement consistent with the challenging B.E.S.T. benchmarks utilizing the MTSS process including T2 and T3 interventions with the Walk to Intervention model. ESSA groups will be monitored and addressed monthly at grade-level meetings. Head Start will be included in school wide activities and Parent Engagement events.