

Brevard Public Schools

Columbia 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	11
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	22
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	22
VI. Title I Requirements	27
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Columbia Elementary School

1225 WACO BLVD SE, Palm Bay, FL 32909

<http://www.columbia.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.

Empowering our students to dream, believe and achieve (Revised June 2022)

Provide the school's vision statement.

To inspire and cultivate a community of critical thinkers and accountable leaders (Revised June 2022)

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
Julian, Jennifer	Principal	Shaping a vision of academic success for all students. Creating a climate hospitable to education. Cultivating leadership in others. Improving instruction. Managing people, data and processes.
Parks, Nicole	Assistant Principal	Shaping a vision of academic success for all students. Creating a climate hospitable to education. Cultivating leadership in others. Improving instruction. Managing people, data and processes.
Hank, Yvette	Instructional Coach	Provide high-quality professional development around effective literacy practices and the foundations of reading. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide feedback, engage in one-on-one coaching, and model best practices. • Identify where high-quality curricula built-in supports are not being maximized. • Model and teach new quality literacy intervention activities. • Coach teachers on using high-quality, evidence-based assessments to determine the most effective interventions required. • Coordinate and implement high-quality reading curriculum • Facilitate professional development for teachers • Observe teachers, provide feedback, and identify next steps to improve instruction in core ELA instruction for the purpose of support and not evaluation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Monitor and coordinate interventions conducted by the classroom teacher • Model and teach exemplar lessons • Support lesson preparation using high-quality curriculum • Model and support high-quality interactions with students • Analyze data, identify trends, and support teachers to adjust instruction based on data • Support teachers with effective parent communication and family involvement • Communicate a belief in all students' abilities to become successful readers • Attend all required meetings and trainings • Communicate with leadership team on school-wide literacy progress

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.

Columbia engages ALL Stakeholders in the following ways:

- The school engages families, students, and all faculty in a shared understanding of academic and behavioral expectations as well as high-quality instruction.
- Teachers communicate high expectations for all students (e.g., "All students are able to meet grade level

expectations"). Teachers meet in PLCs bi-weekly to routinely examine disaggregated data to look for themes/patterns among student groups.

*The school provides orientation for new teachers and ongoing support from a mentor teacher. Teachers establish and practice clear expectations and classroom procedures, and provide frequent feedback to students, and encourage students to be caring and respectful to one another and teachers model such interactions in the classroom. The school's curriculum and teachers' lesson plans draw on the diverse interests and experiences of students.

- Leaders demonstrate how those beliefs manifest in the school building.
- Collaborative planning is solutions-oriented and based in disaggregated data
- The administration ensures that teachers have resources, training, and ongoing support to meet them and provides frequent, constructive feedback, and actively make themselves available to teachers and staff. The leadership team actively solicit staff feedback on school-wide procedures and create opportunities for teachers to assume leadership roles.

*A Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) team of stakeholders works together to disaggregate multiple data sources to draft the SIP.

Columbia seeks input from families on how the school can support students, and follow up with what's being done as a result. We also ensure that logistics of parent/teacher conferences and other school events enable all parents to participate (schedule to accommodate varied work hours, and offer translation). A Title 1 Compact is reviewed with parents. It is a priority for the school to intentionally engage with all families and receive stakeholder involvement.

A monthly School Advisory Council meeting is scheduled and help for all stakeholders to attend. Here, the School Improvement Plan is drafted, continuously reviewed and amended as needed to meet promote educational excellence.

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))

Columbia's SIP will be monitored by all stakeholders during monthly SAC meetings. The school SIP will also be monitored through our grade level, PLC (2x a month) and MTSS (1x a month) meetings with teachers. In addition, our district walkthrough team will provide feedback on SIP goals and implementation targets (at least 1x a month). Columbia's SIP will be revised, as necessary, based on qualitative and quantitative student data, instructional practices and observational walkthrough data (teacher and district learning walks.)

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	57%
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: C 2019-20: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: D
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	17	15	9	13	7	15	11	0	0	87	
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	3	1	2	1	0	0	10	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	4	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	17	17	21	0	0	60	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	10	19	40	0	0	72	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	2	5	4	11	0	0	22

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	1	6	3	5	1	0	2	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	3	1	1	0	0	0	5

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	20	35	28	27	27	31	28	0	0	196	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	5	
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	8	24	12	0	0	51	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	15	33	19	0	0	73	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	2	3	5	7	11	10	0	0	38	

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	4	6	7	8	15	30	23	0	0	93

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	8	2	8	2	0	1	0	0	26
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	20	35	28	27	27	31	28	0	0	196	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	5	
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	8	24	12	0	0	51	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	15	33	19	0	0	73	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	2	3	5	7	11	10	0	0	38	

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	4	6	7	8	15	30	23	0	0	93

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	8	2	8	2	0	1	0	0	26
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	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	49	61	56	51	62	57
ELA Learning Gains	56	63	61	69	60	58
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	48	54	52	58	57	53
Math Achievement*	43	60	60	47	63	63
Math Learning Gains	46	64	64	64	65	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	41	55	55	45	53	51

Accountability Component	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	57	56	51	49	57	53
Social Studies Achievement*		0	50		0	
Middle School Acceleration						
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress	38			63		

* 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	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	378
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97
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	31	Yes	3	1
ELL	46			
AMI				
ASN				

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%
BLK	46			
HSP	44			
MUL	42			
PAC				
WHT	50			
FRL	44			

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	49	56	48	43	46	41	57					38
SWD	23	50	46	21	29	18	27					
ELL	44	68		37	42							38
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	37	58		36	54							
HSP	56	65		42	42	20						40
MUL	50	40		36	40							
PAC												
WHT	52	54	43	47	45	50	61					
FRL	45	56	48	41	43	35	48					38

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
All Students	49	65	67	54	65	65	63					53
SWD	28	57		28	47							
ELL	50			50								53

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20	ELP Progress
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	46	67		46	67							
HSP	44	47		49	56							40
MUL	50			64								
PAC												
WHT	53	71		56	68		71					
FRL	48	76	67	51	67	69	56					54

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	51	69	58	47	64	45	49					63
SWD	15	55	47	19	56	53	23					
ELL	48	78		48	68							63
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	51	64		44	63	40	40					
HSP	42	72	62	34	56	40						69
MUL	59	73		41	60							
PAC												
WHT	51	71	53	54	70	56	61					
FRL	47	67	58	44	63	44	49					67

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	40%	59%	-19%	54%	-14%
04	2023 - Spring	56%	61%	-5%	58%	-2%
06	2023 - Spring	45%	61%	-16%	47%	-2%
03	2023 - Spring	34%	56%	-22%	50%	-16%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	59%	67%	-8%	54%	5%
03	2023 - Spring	41%	60%	-19%	59%	-18%
04	2023 - Spring	54%	61%	-7%	61%	-7%
05	2023 - Spring	19%	55%	-36%	55%	-36%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	41%	57%	-16%	51%	-10%

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 the Spring 2023 FAST, Columbia's 5th graders performed the lowest in mathematics with 19% proficiency. After researching this particular student group through the years, we believe that the contributing factor is the absence of a certified, highly-qualified teacher. Our 2022-23 5th grade students were impacted in 1st grade with teacher turnover and substitute teachers, 3rd grade with Covid (e-learning) and 5th grade with the loss of their mathematics teacher in October 2022. Even with galiant efforts from our district math coach (1x a week modeling/teaching the classes) and our Assistant Principal planned lessons/resources for the substitute teachers, it is evident that nothing can replace the value of a full-time, certified educator .

5th grade is also the grade level with the greatest amount of discipline referrals. Escalated behaviors were also due to the lack of teacher consistency and lack of substitute teacher's classroom management/engagement strategies. Student behavior was also a contributing factor to learning loss.

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

The greatest decline in student achievement from 2021-22 to 2022-23 FAST is 5th grade mathematics. Student proficiency dropped from 25% in Grade 4 to 19% in Grade 5. Factors that contributed to this decline in student's mathematical achievement are explained above.

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.

5th grade mathematics had the greatest gap.

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

The most improvement in student achievement came from our departmentalized, 6th grade mathematics class. 2021-22 FAST mathematics proficiency was 27% for our students in Grade 5 compared to 60% proficiency in Grade 6. This 33% increase in student's mathematical proficiency is contributed to a highly-qualified, mathematics educator. Columbia's 6th grade math teacher is a continuous learner that plans and prepares benchmark aligned math lessons with fidelity. She modifies lessons based on student results. Students receive small group and individualized teacher instruction.

During classroom walkthroughs, 6th grade students were consistently observed doing the mathematical thinking, engaged in mathematical discourse (including math academic vocabulary) and using the concrete-representational-abstract math model. During CRA, students work with hands-on materials that represent mathematics problems (concrete), pictorial representations of mathematics problems (representational), and mathematics problems with numbers and symbols (abstract). The teacher explicitly bridges the connection between the concrete, representational, and abstract representations of the mathematics problems.

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

- Improving attendance rates of our lowest 25% students
- Decreasing discipline referrals for our lowest 25% students

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

- Improving Tier 1 - Core instruction in reading, math and science
- Specifically designed Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention based on student's data/needs
- Increasing student engagement (mathematical discourse, math manipulatives, and students collaborative centers/work stations)
- Celebrate student success (iReady, Lexia, AR, and STAR/FAST)

Area of Focus

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

#1. 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.

Based on the decrease in student achievement in math, our school has identified math as an area of focus for student achievement.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

STAR Math data from 2022-23 indicates that 57% of Kindergarten students (38 students) are At/Above Benchmark, 18% (12 students) are On Watch, 16% (11 students) need Intervention and 9% (6 students) require Urgent Intervention.

STAR Math data from 2022-23 indicates that 77% of 1st grade students (58 students) are At/Above Benchmark, 12% (9 students) are On Watch, 4% (3 students) need Intervention and 7% (5 students) require Urgent Intervention.

STAR Math data from 2022-23 indicates that 71% of 2nd grade students (44 students) are At/Above Benchmark, 11% (7 students) are On Watch, 6% (4 students) need Intervention and 11% (7 students) require Urgent Intervention.

Grades 3-6: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

2022-23 Spring FSA data indicates that 41% (24 out of 59 students) of 3rd graders met proficiency (Level 3 or above) in math.

2022-23 Spring FSA data indicates that 55% (43 out of 79 students) of 4th graders met proficiency (Level 3 or above) in math.

2022-23 Spring FSA data indicates that 19% (15 out of 78 students) of 5th graders met proficiency (Level 3 or above) in math.

2022-23 Spring FSA data indicates that 60% (38 out of 64 students) of 6th graders met proficiency (Level 3 or above) in math.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Grade K STAR Math PM2 - 60% At/Above Benchmark

Grade 1 STAR Math PM2 - 60% At/Above Benchmark

Grade 2 STAR Math PM2 - 80% At/Above Benchmark

Grade 3 FAST Math PM2 - 75% At/Above Benchmark

Grade 4 FAST Math PM2 - 50% At/Above Benchmark

Grade 5 FAST Math PM2 - 60% At/Above Benchmark

Grade 6 FAST Math PM2 - 40% At/Above Benchmark

Monitoring:

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

GRADE K-6 Math

PM1, PM2, STAR, iReady D1 and D2, Walkthroughs with feedback, Reveal and Ed Gems math benchmark aligned planning PLCs and implementation, Intervention Data - Intervention instruction to specifically target identified gaps

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Yvette Hank (henk.yvette@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.)

- *Explicit and Systematic math instruction
- *Graphic Organizers
- *Hands on manipulatives, pictures, and models (visual representations)
- *Fluency Building
- *Solving word problems

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

- * BEST Math Benchmark Aligned
- * Meets Florida's definition of evidence-based
- * MTRs

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.

District math coach will collaborate with teachers to plan math benchmark aligned lessons, including small group instruction, during weekly and PLC meetings.

Person Responsible: Nicole Parks (parks.nicole@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing through May 2024

Teachers will evaluate student's exit ticket results to plan for re-teach, intervention or small group math instruction

Person Responsible: Nicole Parks (parks.nicole@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing through May 2024

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment**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.

Columbia is identified as an ATSI school based on student results. Therefore, a positive culture and environment Area of Focus is required. Columbia scored a 5.7 out of 10 on the Winter 2023 TNTP Teacher/Staff Survey. Columbia's goal is to recruit and retain highly-qualified teachers.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Columbia will score at or above a 7 out of 10 on the Winter 2024 TNTP Teacher/Staff Survey

Monitoring:

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

- *Teacher/Staff surveys
- *IPPAS observations and feedback
- *Conversations and observations

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jennifer Julian (julian.jennifer@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.)

According to the Safe and Supportive Schools Model, which was developed by a national panel of researchers and other experts, positive school climate involves:

- *Engagement. Strong relationships between students, teachers, families, and schools and strong connections between schools and the broader community.
- *Safety. Schools and school-related activities where students are safe from violence, bullying, harassment, and controlled-substance use.
- *Environment. Appropriate facilities, well-managed classrooms, available school-based health supports, and a clear, fair disciplinary policy

Columbia will participate in Educator's Thriving. This includes a teacher survey and specific professional learning on teacher well-being to reduce "burnout."

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Education has become increasing harder for educator. Educator's Thriving provides system (school leader) and educator supports based on survey data directly received from teachers at Columbia.

Educators Thriving offers research-based personal development to help educators achieve well-being. Through the program, participants learn concrete strategies to help them avoid and manage the most common pitfalls of the educator experience: being overwhelmed, personal neglect, struggling with a fixed mindset, unexpected challenges, and isolation

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

*Provide teachers with Educator's Thriving survey link

*Implement system and teacher supports as indicated by Educator's Thriving

Person Responsible: Jennifer Julian (julian.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing through May 2024

#3. 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.

Columbia's Students with Disabilities (SWD) scored below the Federal Index of 41% proficiency in Reading

Measurable Outcome:

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

SWD will score at or above 41% proficiency on the 2024 Spring STAR (K-2) and FAST (GR 3-6) PM#3 Reading

Monitoring:

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

- *iReady PM#1, 2, and 3 Reading - specifically SWD results
- *Intervention OPM data for SWD in Reading - PSI/PASI, DORF
- *STAR and FAST PM#1 and #2 Reading results

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.)

- *Multi-Tiered Systems of Support (MTSS)
- *SWD will receive ESE specifically designed instruction and an additional 30 minutes of Tier 2 or 3 intervention in reading.
- *IEP Goal data collection and review

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

MTSS and Rtl are two evidence based strategies to improve student achievement and to align student data in order to monitor progress towards proficiency per Rtl.org

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 2 - Moderate 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.

Develop a school wide MTSS framework based on BPS policies and procedures that focus on student's academic and behavior growth

Provide on-going professional learning on the MTSS framework system for teachers

Celebrate teacher's work and student success as a result of implementing the MTSS framework with fidelity

Person Responsible: Jennifer Julian (julian.jennifer@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing through May 2024

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)).

Columbia's Leadership Team, Comprehensive Needs Assessment Team (Title 1) and School Advisory Council continue to disaggregate multiple data sources to ensure resources are allocated based on needs. Examples include: support and instructional personnel (Title 1 budget), supplemental curriculum (95% Group Phonics, math manipulatives, iReady Magnetic,) parental resources to support learning at home (instructional family nights and summer workbooks- Title 1)

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

Grades K-2 teachers will actively participate in bi-weekly ELA PLCs that have a clear focus on the alignment of benchmarks, resources, student tasks, assessments and the transfer of instruction. A dedicated additional 30 minutes of phonics instruction (95% Group Phonics (T1) has been scheduled and will be implemented with fidelity.

Area of Focus for Reading/ELA, based on students results on 2023 STAR Early Literacy Reading and iReady Reading results is as follows:

Grade K - Writing across the curriculum, phonological awareness, phonics and word recognition

Grade 1 - Writing across the curriculum, phonics, word recognition and vocabulary

Grade 2 - Writing across the curriculum, phonics, vocabulary and oral language comprehension and text comprehension

Our primary grades K-2 areas of focus is based on the Science of Reading and Florida B.E.S.T. Reading Benchmarks. The goal is to build foundational knowledge to ensure proficient, on grade level student readers.

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

Grades K-2 teachers will actively participate in bi-weekly ELA PLCs that have a clear focus on the alignment of benchmarks, resources, student tasks, assessments and the transfer of instruction. Specifically designed interventions will be implemented and monitored throughout the year.

Area of Focus for Reading/ELA, based on students results on 2023 FAST Reading and iReady Reading results is as follows:

Grade 3 - Writing across the curriculum, reading prose and poetry, reading informational text, and reading across genres and vocabulary

Grade 4- Writing across the curriculum, reading across genres and vocabulary

Grade 5 - Writing across the curriculum, reading prose and poetry, reading informational text, and reading across genres and vocabulary

Grade 6 - Writing across the curriculum, reading prose and poetry, reading informational text, and reading across genres and vocabulary

Our intermediate grades 3-6 areas of focus is based on the Science of Reading and Florida B.E.S.T. Reading Benchmarks. The goal is to build proficient, on grade level student readers so that they may be college or career ready.

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

The following student data is reported from the 2023 Spring STAR Early Literacy Reading (statewide, standardized ELA assessment) Progress Monitoring #3 - End of Year. The goal is that all grades K-2 will reach 55% or more proficiency on the 2024 STAR PM#3

Grade K: 12% (8 students) Urgent Intervention (Level1), 22% (14 students) Intervention/On Watch (Level 2), 66% (43 students) At/Above Benchmark (Level 3 or above). Kindergarten is exceeding 50%.

Grade 1: 19% (14 students) Urgent Intervention (Level1), 28% (20 students) Intervention/On Watch (Level 2), 53% (39 students) At/Above Benchmark (Level 3 or above). First grade is exceeding 50%.

Grade 2: 18% (11 students) Urgent Intervention (Level1), 21% (13 students) Intervention/On Watch (Level 2), 61% (38 students) At/Above Benchmark (Level 3 or above). Second grade is exceeding 50%.

The following student data is reported from the 2023 Spring iReady Reading (districtwide, diagnostic ELA assessment) Diagnostic #3 - End of Year

Grade K: 0% (0 students) Urgent Intervention (Level1), 24% (14 students) Intervention/On Watch (Level 2), 76% (51 students) At/Above Benchmark (Level 3 or above). Kindergarten is exceeding 50%.

Grade 1: 0% (0 students) Urgent Intervention (Level1), 40% (27students) Intervention/On Watch (Level 2), 60% (46 students) At/Above Benchmark (Level 3 or above). First grade is exceeding 50%.

Grade 2: 3% (2 students) Urgent Intervention (Level1), 37% (22 students) Intervention/On Watch (Level 2), 60% (39 students) At/Above Benchmark (Level 3 or above). Second grade is exceeding 50%.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

The following student data is reported from the 2023 Spring FAST Reading (statewide, standardized ELA assessment) Progress Monitoring #3 - End of Year. The goal is that all grades 3-6 will reach 55% or more proficiency on the 2024 FAST PM#3.

Grade 3: 41% (24 students) Urgent Intervention (Level1), 25% (15 students) Intervention/On Watch (Level 2), 34% (20 students) At/Above Benchmark (Level 3 or above). Grade 3 is below 50%.

Grade 4: 23% (18 students) Urgent Intervention (Level1), 22% (17 students) Intervention/On Watch (Level 2), 56% (44 students) At/Above Benchmark (Level 3 or above). Grade 4 is exceeding 50%.

Grade 5: 33% (26 students) Urgent Intervention (Level1), 27% (21 students) Intervention/On Watch (Level 2), 40% (31 students) At/Above Benchmark (Level 3 or above). Grade 5 is below 50%.

Grade 6: 30% (19 students) Urgent Intervention (Level1), 25% (16 students) Intervention/On Watch (Level 2), 45% (29 students) At/Above Benchmark (Level 3 or above). Grade 6 is below 50%.

The following student data is reported from the 2023 Spring iReady Reading (districtwide, diagnostic ELA assessment) Diagnostic #3 - End of Year

Grade 3: 39% (23 students) Urgent Intervention (Level1), 23% (14 students) Intervention/On Watch (Level 2), 35% (22 students) At/Above Benchmark (Level 3 or above). Grade 3 is below 50%.

Grade 4: 6% (5 students) Urgent Intervention (Level1), 35% (28 students) Intervention/On Watch (Level 2), 58% (46 students) At/Above Benchmark (Level 3 or above). Grade 4 is exceeding 50%.

Grade 5: 27% (21 students) Urgent Intervention (Level1), 38% (30 students) Intervention/On Watch (Level 2), 35% (27 students) At/Above Benchmark (Level 3 or above). Grade 5 is below 50%.

Grade 6: 27% (17 students) Urgent Intervention (Level1), 29% (18 students) Intervention/On Watch (Level 2), 44% (29 students) At/Above Benchmark (Level 3 or above). Grade 6 is below 50%.

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.

K-2 STAR PM #1, 2 and 3

Grades 3-6 FAST PM #1, 2, and 3

iReady Diagnostics #1, 2, 3

Walkthrough data with teacher feedback

Benchmark Advance Quarterly Assessments

Intervention Data - Intervention instruction to specifically target identified gaps

Ongoing progress monitoring impacts student learning because teachers and administration can

evaluate each student's academic growth towards proficiency. Evaluating student growth and adjusting instructional learning plans will directly increase student achievement. Lesson planning must be aligned to benchmark mastery and student needs.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Hank, Yvette, henk.yvette@brevardschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida’s definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district’s K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Explicit Instruction

- * Introduces new content, concept, or skill clearly and directly
- * Models/demonstrates use of new or retaught content, concept or skill
- * Provides visual/auditory examples
- * Frequent opportunities for guided and independent practice

Systematic Instruction

- * Logical progression from simple to complex
- * Conducts a cumulative review (enables students to make connections)
- * Opportunities for students to practice content to progress towards learning goals

Lexia (T1)

- * Aligns with PA, Phonics, Fluency and BEST Benchmarks
- * Systematic and structured approach to the six critical areas of reading

95% Group Phonics (T1)

- * Aligns with BEST Benchmarks and the Foundational Benchmarks under PA
- * Instructional materials and processes are geared towards struggling readers and permit teachers to begin instruction at the student's lowest skill deficit, with a focus on PA and Phonics
- * Systematic and explicit instruction of foundational skills utilizing evidence-based practices as listed in the IES Practice Guides Assisting Students Struggling with Reading.
<https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/wwc/practiceguide/3>

Rewards (T1)

- * Aligns with BEST Benchmarks and the Foundational Benchmarks under PA, Phonics, Vocabulary and Comprehension
- * Instructional materials and processes are geared towards struggling readers and permit teachers to

begin instruction at the student's lowest skill deficit, with a focus on multi-syllabic words and comprehension

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?

*BEST Standards Benchmarks Aligned

*Aligned with the Brevard K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-Based Reading Plan

*Meets Florida's definition of evidence-based

*Systematic and/or Explicit

*Geared towards struggling readers with an emphasis on Foundational Skills such as Phonological Awareness (PA) and Phonics

Action Steps to Implement

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Literacy Literacy Coach (T1) will facilitate BEST benchmark-aligned planning and implementation during designated grade level and PLC meeting days. Teachers will plan benchmark-aligned lesson plans that indicate small group instruction to close achievement gaps. Leadership Team - Review and monitor student achievement, conduct classroom walk-throughs	Hank, Yvette, henk.yvette@brevardschools.org
<p>Literacy Coaching - Follow the coaching cycle based on teacher needs, implement the pillars of literacy excellence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Lesson planning with teachers during weekly grade level and PLC meetings. *Modeling, co-teaching, engaging in reflective conversations and data chats *Prepare for planning process and send teachers the agenda, items, tasks and other resources in advance for them to complete any pre-work *During planning sessions, focus on teacher clarity, instructional model, strategies, questioning and assessments that align to the benchmarks and support for the intended learning 	Hank, Yvette, henk.yvette@brevardschools.org
<p>Assessment - Implement formative and summative assessments and evaluate student results to drive instruction, intervention and acceleration.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *Teachers use foundational skills program assessments: DIBELS, PASI/PSI, Running Records to monitor reading skill development *Define performance criteria based on assessment data to design Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 intervention for our below grade level and substantially deficient students. *Data Chats (bi-weekly) around SAVVAS (6th grade) and Benchmark Advance Assessments (K-6), iReady, FAST, STAR and intervention OPM *iReady - universal screener data to start conversations, formative data used to differentiate instruction, and personalized student pathways to meet and/or exceed expected yearly growth and close achievement gaps. 	Parks, Nicole, parks.nicole@brevardschools.org
<p>Professional Learning</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *PLC bi-weekly lesson plan support and design. *Professional Learning based on walkthrough data to increase instructional strategies (SOR) and student engagement to promote positive ELA proficiency and learning gains. *Interventional material, per BPS Decision Tree, and instruction PL by Literacy Coach *5 Core Components: Explicit & Systematic Instruction, Corrective Feedback, Scaffolding and Differentiation 	Hank, Yvette, henk.yvette@brevardschools.org

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

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

The methods for dissemination of this SIP is through our School Advisory Council, Annual Title 1 Parent Meeting, Collaborative teacher/staff planning meetings, Professional Learning Communities, School and Classroom Newsletters to parents/Guardians/

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))

Columbia plans to build positive relationships with all stakeholders through our Family Nights including, but not limited to: Meet & Greet, Open House, Annual Title 1 Parent Meeting, Literacy Night, Science Fair Family Night Math/Science Family Night, Fall Festival, Kindergarten Orientation, Middle School Transition Night, and PIE (Partners in Education) Events.

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)

- Master schedule clearly identifies 90 minute reading block, 30 minute phonics block (K-3), 30 minute intervention/acceleration block, 60 minute mathematics block, and 30 minute science block. These core subjects are essential to student learning.
- Highly-qualified Literacy Coach (newly hired 2023-24) will meet weekly with all grade level teachers to review student data results and plan ELA lessons based on student need.
- Monthly MTSS meetings with teachers to evaluate Lowest 25% students (where are they in the MTSS process, intervention groups Tier 2 and Tier 3, open consent for formal evaluation, review annual IEP)
- Title 1 funded planning time for all classroom teachers (1x per 9 weeks) for classroom learning walks, and teacher planning based on student needs.
- Professional learning opportunities that align to teacher/student needs (technology integration, Science of Reading, Penda Science, and

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))

not applicable

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

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

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

Columbia's social worker meets regularly with students and families to provide mental health resources. She provides Life Skills training using Sanford Harmony.

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

Columbia 6th graders are participating in a Career and Educational Technology (CET) certification program. This will be presented by our media specialist.

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

Columbia has an MTSS Team that consists of the student, parent, teacher, administrators, school counselor, ESE team members, social worker, parent liaison, school psychologist and staffing specialist. Parents are welcome to invite anyone they choose to the meetings to positively impact student behavior and/or achievement.

Each Monday and Wednesday the following meetings take place: IPST, ESE Case Management, and IEP/EP meetings.

Once a month, MTSS team members meet with each grade level to review intervention/acceleration data as indicated on Form 7.

Our teams follow the FLDOE MTSS Problem-Solving Model. Tier 2, Tier 3 and Acceleration takes place during a specifically scheduled 30 minutes, each school day for Grades K-6. Intervention/acceleration cycles are up to 6 weeks and student data is evaluated to consistently ensure students are closing achievement gaps and/or accelerated for achievement growth.

Progress Monitoring Plans are created, reviewed and updated, as needed. Parents are informed during scheduled meetings of student progress.

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

- Science of Reading Training
- Collaborative planning/training sessions with Literacy Coach (use of data, assessments, curriculum/instructional strategies, interventions (per BPS Decision Tree / K-12 Reading Plan)
- Technology Training (Focus, Goggle, Promethean Board, Digital Tools like Learning Ally and translation)
- Math student discourse, effective use of math manipulatives
- Student engagement strategies

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

Columbia has a Kindergarten Orientation in the Spring. All local preschools receive a personal visit and flyers to attend our event. Columbia also has a Step-Fourward, VPK Blended and PREK ESE class. Flyers are sent home with these students inviting them to our Kindergarten Orientation event. The event is also listed on our school and district website and included in our weekly school newsletter.