

Brevard Public Schools

# University Park Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>5</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

# University Park Elementary School

500 W UNIVERSITY BLVD, Melbourne, FL 32901

<http://www.upark.brevard.k12.fl.us>

## Demographics

**Principal: Ana Diaz**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/15/2017

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-6  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2021-22 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%   |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students*<br>Multiracial Students*<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2021-22: C (45%)<br>2020-21: (32%)<br>2018-19: C (43%)<br>2017-18: C (43%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | TS&I   |

\* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard County School Board.

## SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at [www.floridacims.org](http://www.floridacims.org).

## 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 Florida Department of Education 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.

## Part I: School Information

### School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement.**

To empower students with a love for learning in a safe and caring learning environment.

\* Reviewed with staff during preplanning of August 2022.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

All students making a year's worth of learning gains in a year's worth of time.

\* Reviewed with staff during preplanning of August 2022.

### School Leadership Team

**Membership**

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.:

| Name              | Position Title      | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|-------------------|---------------------|--|
| Diaz, Ana         | Principal           | Design systems and structures that support our vision for excellent instruction for ALL students. Ensure that all stakeholders are provided opportunity and encouraged to be involved in the decision making process. Align resources to support the strategies to support the plan. Lead creation, implementation and evaluation of the plan.   |
| Shah, Sejal       | Assistant Principal | Assists the Principal to provide instructional leadership to staff including: curriculum planning, review and implementation; and professional development. Assists in the day to day building administration and the safety and welfare of students, staff, volunteers, and activities. Leads the staff in the implementation of quality instruction. Ensures a safe, pleasant and effective educational atmosphere, provides discipline as necessary and enforces school policy. Assists the Principal to manage employees in the elementary school. Supports the Principal in setting the overall direction, coordination and evaluation of the staff within the school. Carries out supervisory responsibilities in accordance with the organization's policies and applicable laws. Responsible for interviewing, making recommendations for hiring, and training employees; planning, assigning, and directing work; appraising performance; addressing complaints and resolving problems. |
| Lavelle, Danielle | Other               | Teacher On Assignment  |
| Beard, Jessika    | Math Coach          | Oversees all Tier I, II, III supports related to student behavior, school culture. Coordinates volunteers, collaborates in coordination of mentoring and Partners In Education programs. Serves as the school contact for ELL program and the Lead Mentor teacher.<br><br>Support implementation of School Improvement Plan with math coaching and math interventions. Support teachers with collaborative planning and implementation of Florida B.E.S.T standards with fidelity. Provide teachers support that will improve instructional practices and collective efficacy including teaching strategies and analyzing student data to identify student strengths and needs, etc. Provides information and guidance regarding a range of effective and innovative instructional math practices through various activities such as: individual discussions (informal and formal), coaching sessions, model lessons with pre- and post-   |

| Name            | Position Title     | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|-----------------|--------------------|--|
| Dutill, Kristin | Reading Coach      | <p>discussion, study groups, staff meetings, and professional development. Assist in identifying appropriate instructional strategies and interventions to improve student math achievement for all students. Co-champion for APTT grant.</p> <p>Implement coaching cycles to provide teachers with individualized, classroom-based support which will include modeling best teaching practices.</p> <p>Coordinates and facilitates various professional development opportunities to meet the curriculum needs of teachers.</p> <p>Guide teachers to collect and analyze data and develop action plans in response to determined student needs.</p> <p>Facilitating collaborative planning among teachers.</p> <p>Co-champion for APTT grant.</p>   |
| Hecko, Cynthia  | Science Coach      | <p>Work with assigned classroom teachers and curriculum coaches to plan and deliver hands-on instruction. Instruct all third through sixth grade students in the STEM Lab bi-weekly.</p> <p>Work with assigned classroom teachers and curriculum coaches to plan and deliver instruction to students. Provide instructional support for teachers or groups of teachers as they implement the district curriculum and digital resources. Assess needs of individual students and use the data and information to determine a plan to best meet each child's individual needs.</p> <p>Support the implementation of 21st Century Learning such as STEM and the Four C's of 21st Century Education. Coordinate educational field trips and extracurricular activities to enhance Science education. Monitor PENDA usage and passing rate.</p> <p>Serve as PENDA Champion.</p> |
| Small, Jackie   | Guidance Counselor | <p>Assists and provides support for students' concerns about academic, emotional or social problems; helps students process their problems, plan goals and action steps; facilitates mediation and conflict between students; improves parent/teacher relationships; organizes and facilitates peer counseling groups; and refers students to psychologists and other mental health resources.</p>   |
| Brown, Homer    | Guidance Counselor | <p>Dr. Brown serves as the MTSS co-facilitator, the ESE and 504 contact person, and the IPST (academic and behavioral) co-coordinator for University Park Elementary. He is responsible for managing meeting schedules and documentations to assist teachers with documenting student's needs, collaborating on evidence-based solutions, and implementing plans to address student's academic, behavioral, or social emotional needs.</p> <p>Additionally, Dr. Brown works in partnership with the school's social emotional team, guidance team, mental health group,</p>  |

| Name  | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|---|----------------|---------------------------------|
| and positive behavior intervention support team to address student's environmental and interpersonal needs. |                |                                 |

**Demographic Information**

**Principal start date**

Thursday 6/15/2017, Ana Diaz

**Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

3

**Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

6

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

47

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

464

**Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.**

11

**Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.**

13

**Demographic Data**

**Early Warning Systems**

**Using prior year's 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 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 58          | 64 | 52 | 47 | 50 | 62 | 51 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 384   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 16          | 14 | 18 | 10 | 10 | 18 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 99    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 4  | 2  | 6  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 12    |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 15 | 16 | 14 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 60    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 28 | 28 | 17 | 30 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 103   |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 10          | 12 | 10 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 32    |

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

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 1           | 4 | 7 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 25    |

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 4           | 5 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 12    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 2     |

Date this data was collected or last updated  
Tuesday 7/12/2022

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

| Indicator  | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|  | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 65          | 60 | 57 | 43 | 42 | 48 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 374   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 8           | 16 | 16 | 15 | 7  | 11 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 89    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 2           | 2  | 0  | 3  | 5  | 3  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 19    |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0  | 2  | 4  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6     |
| LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA ELA                                  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 2  | 13 | 19 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 52    |
| LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA MATH                                 | 0           | 0  | 0  | 2  | 19 | 25 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 74    |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 1 | 0 | 5 | 15 | 23 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 68    |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 3           | 7 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 19    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 7     |

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

| Indicator  | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|  | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Number of students enrolled                              | 65          | 60 | 57 | 43 | 42 | 48 | 59 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 374   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 8           | 16 | 16 | 15 | 7  | 11 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 89    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 2           | 2  | 0  | 3  | 5  | 3  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 19    |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0  | 2  | 4  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 6     |
| LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA ELA                                  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 2  | 13 | 19 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 52    |
| LEVEL 1 ON 2021 FSA MATH                                 | 0           | 0  | 0  | 2  | 19 | 25 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 74    |

**The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:**

| Indicator                            | Grade Level |   |   |   |    |    |    |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                      | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0           | 1 | 0 | 5 | 15 | 23 | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 68    |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 3           | 7 | 4 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 19    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 7     |

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis**

**School Data Review**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

| School Grade Component      | 2022   |          |       | 2021   |          |       | 2019   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 40%    | 61%      | 56%   | 37%    |          |       | 41%    | 62%      | 57%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 51%    | 63%      | 61%   | 44%    |          |       | 45%    | 60%      | 58%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 39%    | 54%      | 52%   | 25%    |          |       | 59%    | 57%      | 53%   |
| Math Achievement            | 41%    | 60%      | 60%   | 26%    |          |       | 35%    | 63%      | 63%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 57%    | 64%      | 64%   | 35%    |          |       | 49%    | 65%      | 62%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 54%    | 55%      | 55%   | 20%    |          |       | 38%    | 53%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 34%    | 56%      | 51%   | 35%    |          |       | 35%    | 57%      | 53%   |

**Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments**

**NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.**

| ELA               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 01                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 02                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 03                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 40%    | 64%      | -24%                       | 58%   | -18%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 38%    | 61%      | -23%                       | 58%   | -20%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -40%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 36%    | 60%      | -24%                       | 56%   | -20%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -38%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 06                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 31%    | 60%      | -29%                       | 54%   | -23%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -36%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 01                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 02                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 03                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 20%    | 61%      | -41%                       | 62%   | -42%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 39%    | 64%      | -25%                       | 64%   | -25%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -20%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 37%    | 60%      | -23%                       | 60%   | -23%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -39%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 06                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 33%    | 67%      | -34%                       | 55%   | -22%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -37%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 35%    | 56%      | -21%                       | 53%   | -18%                    |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 06                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -35%   |          |                            |       |                         |

**Subgroup Data Review**

| 2022 SCHOOL GRADE 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 |
| SWD                                       | 11       | 40     | 47          | 22        | 59      | 45           |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 25       | 44     |             | 29        | 58      | 60           |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 31       | 44     |             | 29        | 54      |              | 23       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 25       | 40     |             | 31        | 63      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 30       |        |             | 50        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 51       | 58     | 43          | 48        | 58      | 54           | 48       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 36       | 47     | 45          | 36        | 55      | 52           | 32       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 2021 SCHOOL GRADE 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 |
| SWD                                       | 18       | 30     | 21          | 6         | 18      | 18           | 17       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 34       | 57     |             | 38        | 31      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 19       | 27     | 25          | 19        | 24      | 10           | 7        |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 37       |        |             | 21        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 45       |        |             | 36        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 48       | 56     |             | 31        | 36      |              | 48       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 34       | 37     | 24          | 23        | 31      | 18           | 33       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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 |
| SWD                                       | 12       | 27     | 37          | 21        | 37      | 33           | 14       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 32       | 48     |             | 32        | 57      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 25       | 45     | 69          | 21        | 42      | 37           | 19       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 29       | 38     |             | 25        | 38      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 44       | 54     |             | 25        | 46      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 52       | 42     | 50          | 48        | 56      | 20           | 58       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 38       | 44     | 60          | 33        | 49      | 39           | 30       |         |           |                   |                     |

**ESSA Data Review**

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

| <b>ESSA Federal Index</b>   |      |
|---|------|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)  | TS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 46   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 4    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 53   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 369  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8    |
| Percent Tested  | 99%  |
| <b>Subgroup Data</b>  |      |
| <b>Students With Disabilities</b>   |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 37   |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       | 0    |
| <b>English Language Learners</b>  |      |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                       | 45   |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | NO   |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%        | 0    |
| <b>Asian Students</b>   |      |
| Federal Index - Asian Students  |      |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                          | N/A  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                   | 0    |
| <b>Black/African American Students</b>  |      |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                 | 36   |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?         | YES  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%  | 0    |
| <b>Hispanic Students</b>  |      |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students   | 38   |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                       | YES  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%                | 0    |
| <b>Multiracial Students</b>   |      |
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students  | 40   |

| Multiracial Students   |     |
|--|-----|
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                       | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%                | 0   |
| Native American Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Native American Students   |     |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%            | 0   |
| Pacific Islander Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students  |     |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                  | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%           | 0   |
| White Students   |     |
| Federal Index - White Students   | 54  |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                             | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%                      | 0   |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students                                | 43  |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Data Analysis**  
 Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

**What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?**

In looking at the 2021-2022 FSA results, student achievement in ELA and Mathematics increased from previous year. The percentage of students who scored a Level 3 or above on ELA FSA was 40%, an increase of 3%. A total of 41% of students scored a Level 3 or above on Math FSA, an increase of 15%. When looking at grade level data, the majority of grade levels increased proficiency in ELA and Math, except for 6th grade in ELA that decreased from 35% from 34%. Overall, University Park has accelerated student learning in ELA and Math as shown by the FSA Reading and Math Learning Gains. ELA Learning Gains increased from 44% to 51%, and Math increased from 35% to 57%. The Learning Gain data from FSA correlates with the i-Ready data for our school. All grade levels K-6 showed an increase of tier 1 students in ELA and Math. Students with disabilities and English Language Learners demonstrate less success than their peers in ELA. In Math, students with disabilities and English Language Learners were less proficient than their peers but made tremendous learning gains. Students

with disabilities is our lowest subgroup in proficiency for both ELA (11%) and Math (22%). FSA Science decreased by 1% from 35% to 34%. A total of four ESSA subgroups missed the target of 42%; Students With Disabilities (SWD) 37%, Black students 36%; Hispanic 38%, Multiracial 40%.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?**

When looking at the data components from progress monitoring and our 2022 assessments, the greatest need for improvement was in Science. University Park spent a total of 1,315 hours on PENDA Science. 3rd and 4th grades' combined PENDA usage was 98 hours total, with the remaining hours in 5th grade. 5th grades' passing rate for passing PENDA lessons was 64%, which does not match our proficiency in FSA Science. FSA Science proficiency was 34% for 5th grade, which is a decrease from the previous year.

University Park also needs to focus on our ESSA subgroups: ESE and ELL students, as they demonstrated less success than their peers in ELA and Math. ELA proficiency for University Park was at 40%. However, when looking at subgroup data, students with disabilities were only at 11% proficiency, and ELL students were at 25% for the 2021-2022 school year. ELA Learning Gains for the school was at 51%, while students with disabilities were at 40%, and English Language Learners were at 44%. In Math, University Park overall was at 41% proficiency. However, students with disabilities were at 22% proficiency, and English Language Learners were at 29%.

**What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?**

For the school year of 2021-2022, University Park was a tier 3 school with strong district support to improve student achievement in ELA and Math. As a school, we were adjusting to new standards, new curriculum, and an extended day schedule. Classroom teachers focused on acceleration the foundational skills of ELA and math. Student attendance and teacher attendance also impacted consistency in learning. Limited resources available to cover teacher shortages initiated a change of placement for our science resource teacher, negatively impacting the support for teachers for science instruction. However, the increases in student achievement in ELA and Math should influence science achievement, as those foundational skills are needed to comprehend science content and concepts. In addition, we have a new science resource teacher who will be supporting teachers to provide standards-aligned instruction in science.

Teachers struggled to implement collaborative structures as they tried to protect students from spreading the virus. During walkthroughs, we observed a decrease in opportunities for student discourse and collaboration. This effected the student growth and proficiency of our lowest 25%, which included both ESE and ELL subgroups. Additionally, home and school communication practices in place in the past, became less consistent due to COVID restrictions. This school year, we will combine the efforts by creating opportunities for all students to set clear goals and communicate progress goals and progress towards those goals.

**What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?**

For the 2021-2022 school year, Math showed the most improvement. Grade levels 3-6 showed increased proficiency and learning gains on the FSA Math assessment. Overall, University Park increased proficiency by 15%, from 26% to 41%. Learning Gains for the year increased from 35% to 57%, with our lowest 25th percentile increasing gains from 20% to 54%. Fourth grade proficiency increased from 24% to 54% and Learning Gains increased from 25% to 69%. Fourth graders had the most improvement in math.

Overall, University Park increased in ELA proficiency and Learning Gains. ELA Proficiency increased from 37% to 40%. Learning Gains for the school increased from 25% to 39%. Students in 5th grade showed the greatest improvement in ELA proficiency and Learning Gains on the FSA ELA assessment.



Proficiency increased by 15 percentage points, from 39% to 57% proficiency. Learning gains for 5th grade increased 41%, from 22% to 63%.

**What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?**

In math, we focused on analyzing student data to identify student needs and providing targeted small group instruction to accelerate student learning. It is very evident that teachers in grades 3-6 embraced this focus, with the support of the instructional coach and district support, as they had the highest student growth and proficiency on the FSA math assessment and i-Ready progress monitoring. Additional support was provided by the school and district math coaches, and ASP teachers for grades 3-6 to meet student needs in math interventions.

In ELA, our school had an extra hour of instruction to ensure all students had access to tier 2 and tier 3 interventions and acceleration in K-6. Extra time to build foundational skills allowed students to fill instructional gaps and increase success with grade level content.

**What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?**

1. Continue the additional hour of instruction to ensure all students have access to Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention and acceleration.
2. Continue collaborative planning structure to support implementation of ELA (year 2) and new Math curriculum to ensure alignment of instruction to B/E.S.T. standards.
3. Frequent teacher observations with immediate feedback.
4. Response to Intervention with two additional interventionists
5. Carefully planned small group instruction based on student data
6. Data monitoring and problem solving, to include ESSA subgroups.
7. Goal setting with teachers and students in grades K-6.
8. Saturday and during school acceleration opportunities with ESSER funds.
9. Building teacher capacity through PD and coaching cycle on student discourse and collaborative practices.

**Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.**

During the month of July, most teachers participated in training on the new Math curriculum and standards. Additional support and professional development will be needed to implement the new curriculum and standards with fidelity. Professional development will be needed to support teachers in goal setting, monitoring student growth and achievement and analyzing student data to make instructional decisions in all content areas. Professional development will be embedded into coaching cycles, weekly Strategy Action Meetings (SAMS), weekly collaborative planning, and quarterly planning sessions. Individual support will be provided through the coach cycle for new teachers and teachers who are identified as needing additional support in lesson delivery or classroom management. Professional development using Teach Like a Champion and Kagan resources will also be provided to build teacher capacity on effective student engagement practices to increase opportunity for student discourse and collaboration.

**Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.**

Additional services and support to help our students achieve at higher levels are:

Guidance Counselor to strengthen the MTSS process and provide social emotional support to students.

(T)

Acquire new technology to support assessments needs

Acquire resources to implement Positive Behavior Support System

Acquire resources to enhance safety

Attendance Parent Liaison to address Early Warning Indicators by educating families on the importance of attendance; organizing incentives for attendance and serving as a liaison between home and school and school and district to improve student attendance.

Social Worker to address increased impact of COVID on food and housing insecurity, as well as mental health needs of students.

**Areas of Focus**

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities 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 critical need from the data reviewed.** I-Ready math data from the Spring of 2022 shows that 39% of students in grades K-6 at University Park are proficient in math. The 2021-22 FSA Math data results, indicate that 41% of students in grades 3-6 are performing at proficiency (3+) compared to the state average 55% and district average 56%. According to the 21-22 end of school year iReady Math Diagnostic, 37% of Kindergarten, 27% of 1st grade, and 30% of 2nd grade are proficient in math. This is indicative that we still have a lot of room for improvement in core instruction. FAST Assessment data for grades 3-6 from PM1 showed 4% of students are level 3, 18% are level 2, and 78% are level 1 in current grade level standards. 96% of students are not meeting grade level standards on FAST PM1.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

By focusing on standard-aligned instruction, student FAST proficiency levels will increase by 20% in all subject areas. Student proficiency (scoring level 3 or above) will increase from 4% to 40%. Students not meeting grade level expectations (level 2 or below) will decrease from 96% to 60%.

**Monitoring:**

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

Math will be measured twice a year through i-Ready diagnostics (Mid-year, EOY) and three times a year through FAST. Teachers will utilize i-Ready data, FAST PM1 and PM2, and Curriculum Readiness Assessments, and exit tickets to provide small group and individual support .

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Sejal Shah (shah.sejal@brevardschools.org)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

**Describe the evidence-based strategy being**

Overall math proficiency will improved through implementation of the following evidence-based strategies:

1. Assessment driven instruction using summative (End of Unit Assessments) and formative (i-Ready diagnostic assessments, Curriculum Readiness Assessments, and Curriculum Exit Tickets) data from to plan effective instruction.
2. Small Group Instruction for most at risk students that is based on student data.
3. Use of acceleration strategies to increase achievement for our most at risk students.
4. Bi-weekly walk-throughs by administration and coaches will be followed by monthly

debrief sessions to determine trends, professional development needs, and coaching cycle focus.

**implemented for this Area of Focus.**

- 5. Walk-throughs will be focused on looking for implementation of B.E.S.T. standards, student discourse and collaboration opportunities, small group instruction using curriculum differentiation lessons or i-Ready lessons , teacher clarity, use of academic vocabulary and manipulatives by teacher and students.
- 6. Teachers and students setting and monitoring goals for improvement.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.**

Increasing effectiveness of standards-aligned instruction through the use of new math curriculum (Reveal k-5, Ed Gems 6) will help improve student proficiency in math. Teachers need to use student assessment data to drive instruction. Teachers need to provide rigorous instruction to reach the full intent of the standards. When teachers use student data to purposefully plan for targeted small group instruction, it will allow more students to master grade level math content. Standards-based accelerated learning strategies taught during whole and small group instruction will decrease learning gaps and allow students to be successful with grade level content. Additionally, increasing teacher capacity on high yield instructional strategies such as: teacher clarity, student discourse, collaboration, use of academic language and goal setting will increase proficiency for all students and help our ESSA subgroups, which includes our most at risk students, meet the targets.

**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.

**Build Teacher Capacity:**

Teachers will engage in PD on B.E.S.T and MTR standards, and new math curriculum (Reveal and EdGems). (T)

Professional Development will be provided to improved core instruction centered on strategies from Teach Like a Champion, KAGAN and Brevard's Vision for Excellent Instruction. (T)

The coaching cycle will be based on walkthrough data and observations as differentiated support. (T)

**Person Responsible** Jessika Beard (beard.jessika@brevardschools.org)

**Collaborative Planning and Instructional Implementation:**

Teachers will collaboratively plan weekly and quarterly using BPS Reveal and EdGems pacing guides. K- 5 teachers will use the Reveal Lesson Block components daily. Teachers will embed the MTRs into daily lessons as evidence in lesson plans.

Opportunities for student discourse, scaffolding, check for understanding, math manipulative use, and acceleration and enrichment strategies will be incorporated into daily lesson plans. (T)

Teachers will plan small group instruction based on student data and observations to determine skills for reteaching and/or acceleration strategies. (T)

**Person Responsible** Jessika Beard (beard.jessika@brevardschools.org)

**Data Monitoring:**

Teachers will monitor i-Ready usage and passing rates. Incentives will be in place (T)

Teachers, with the support of instructional coaches will analyze student data after formative assessments (PM1, PM2, i-Ready Diagnostics) to monitor student achievement and make instructional decisions, with heightened focus on ESSA subgroups and our most at risk students. (T)

Small group instruction, ASP and additional supports will be based on exit tickets and progress monitoring

data for our most at risk students. (T)

State Assessment progress monitoring data will be reviewed for goal setting by teachers and students. (T)

**Person Responsible** Jessika Beard (beard.jessika@brevardschools.org)

**Goal Setting:**

Every teacher will set goals for class' academic achievement and professional growth based on data. (T)

Every teacher will meet with administration and/or coach to monitor progress towards goals three times per year and establish next steps. (T)

Every student will set goals for self improvement based on data.

Every student will conference with teacher to discuss improvement towards goals and next steps.

**Person Responsible** Jessika Beard (beard.jessika@brevardschools.org)

**Parent/Family Engagement:**

Academic Family Engagement events (Open House, Math Night) to communicate grade level levels standards and expectations in Math will be provided. (T)

Teachers will share students' progress with families during conferences to discuss Progress Monitoring Plan.

Students, with teacher guidance, will share their goals and efforts towards achievement with families.

**Person Responsible** Jessika Beard (beard.jessika@brevardschools.org)

**Addressing ESSA Sub groups gaps:**

Coaching for Equity by Elena Aguilar book study with leadership team. (T) Coaches, administration and members of the guidance team, will engage in an in depth study of the book Coaching For Equity in order to build their personal growth so that they can better coach, support and guide teachers and staff on how to ensure all students have access to rigor, engagement and belonging.

New teachers will be led in a book study of the book Culturally Responsive Teaching and The Brain by Zaretta Hammond. (T) This will help build their capacity on understanding students from diverse cultural and linguistical backgrounds and provide strategies for increase belonging, engagement and access to rigor.

**Person Responsible** Ana Diaz (diaz.ana@brevardschools.org)

## #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

### Area of Focus

#### Description and

#### Rationale:

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

According to the 2021-2022 SSA science proficiency was at 34% , one point below the proficiency from 2020-2021 SSA result. This is also below the District average of (55%) and state average (48%)

#### Measurable Outcome:

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

By focusing on standard-aligned instruction in grades 3-5, proficiency will increase to 42% or more in the SSA 2022-2023 school year.

#### Monitoring:

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

District pre and post assessment data will be used to monitor student progress in assessed standards in grade 3 to 5.

PENDA science Progress Monitoring activities will be given three times during the school year: September, December, and May in grades 3- 6.

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Cynthia Hecko (hecko.cynthia@brevardschools.org)

#### Evidence-based Strategy:

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

All teacher in grades 3-5 will be focus on teaching the Science standards using the 5E model.

Teachers will use data from assessments to plan instruction and incorporate standards-based accelerated learning strategies into whole group and small group instruction.

Students will be engaged in the exploration stage of the standards in the Stem Lab where they will engage in hands-on learning activities.

Students will complete PENDA Science activities with scoring 70% and up for each activities assigned through-out the week.

#### Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

The 5E Instructional Model brings coherence to different teaching strategies, provides connections among educational activities, and helps teachers make decisions about interactions with students. Students are led through five phases: Engage, Explore, Explain, Elaborate, and Evaluate. Teachers will follow the district lesson plans designed using the 5E model for all assessed standards in grade 5.

Science Lab will be used to engage students in hands on learning activities for grades 3-5

Penda Science will be used for all students weekly and student data will be monitored weekly by Science Title I teacher and administration. Teachers will adjust lessons based on students' weekly scores.

### 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.

Academic Family Engagement events (Title I Science Nights) to communicate grade level levels standards and expectations in Science will be provided and to model how learning science can be fun. (T)

#### Person Responsible

Jessika Beard (beard.jessika@brevardschools.org)

Teachers will ensure that students in grades 3-6 will engage in the use of an online science program, PENDA. Teachers, with the support of the science content specialist will monitor student usage and passing rate weekly with an opportunity for students to earn incentives. (T)

**Person Responsible** Cynthia Hecko (hecko.cynthia@brevardschools.org)

Super Science Saturdays will be scheduled to provide multiple opportunities to master the assessed standard using hands on activities for all students in grade 5 (T). Data from the assessments will be used to reteach these standards during Super Science Saturdays.

Students in grades 3-6 will be provided with Science enrichment activities such as Girls who STEM, Pandas who GAME, Destination Mars. These opportunities will help them enhance their background knowledge in science and enhance their learning skills.

**Person Responsible** Cynthia Hecko (hecko.cynthia@brevardschools.org)

Students in grades 3-6 will attend a STEM/Science Lab bi-weekly. This opportunity will engage in critical thinking and hands on learning. (T)

Students in Grades 4-6 will participate in Science Fair competition. This will help students explore while engaging them Physical Science Standards.

**Person Responsible** Cynthia Hecko (hecko.cynthia@brevardschools.org)

Administration and Science content specialist will work on building teacher capacity on effective teaching practices using the 5E model , including providing opportunities for students to engage in productive struggle and discourse.

Teachers will be provided professional development for using resources such as Brevard's Vision for Excellent Instruction, Teach Like a Champion, and Kagan structures to support students with active engagement and higher order thinking about complex content. (T)

These strategies will be integrated in their daily science lessons throughout the school year.

Classroom walkthroughs and feedback will ensure these best practices are a part of an effective science lesson.

**Person Responsible** Sejal Shah (shah.sejal@brevardschools.org)

## RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

**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**

D3 iReady data from 21-22 shows that 49% of students in grades K-2 are not on track to score grade level or above on the statewide ELA assessment. Proficiency levels by grade level are K at 59%, 1st at 32% and 2nd at 39%.

Collaborative planning sessions will have a clear structure that will focus on the alignment of benchmarks, resources, student tasks, assessments and the transfer of to instruction.

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

in grades 3-5, 21-22FSA data show 64% of 3rd graders, 63% of 4th graders and 43% of 5th graders scored below grade level. (Levels 1 and 2).

Increase Primary Literacy Achievement so that gaps will not be as prominent in grades 3-5.

Collaborative planning sessions will have a clear structure that will focus on the alignment of benchmarks, resources, student tasks, assessments and the transfer of to instruction.

**Measurable Outcomes:**

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new 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: Measureable Outcome(s)**

Short Term- From FADT PM1 to PM2, literacy achievement will increase by 10%.

Long Term- By Spring 2023, FAST literacy achievement levels will increase by 20%.

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

Short Term- From FADT PM1 to PM2, literacy achievement will increase by 10%.

Long Term- By Spring 2023, FAST literacy achievement levels will increase by 20%.



**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 take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

PM 1, PM2, FAST

iReady D1 and D2

Walkthroughs and feedback

Benchmarks Advance Assessments

Ongoing Progress Monitoring (OPM): Intervention Data and Intervention Instruction to specifically target identified gaps

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Diaz, Ana, [diaz.ana@brevardschools.org](mailto:diaz.ana@brevardschools.org)

**Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

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. Â§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?

Collaborative Planning to support consistent, high-quality implementation of Benchmarks Advance and research-based materials aligned to B.E.S.T. standards. Weekly and Quarterly Build teacher capacity through professional development, coaching cycle and observation and feedback on Explicit Instruction, Systematic Instruction, Scaffold Instruction and Corrective Feedback. Differentiate Instruction through small groups during ELA block, individualized access to Lexia and iReady lessons based on screeners and Response to Intervention Tier 2 and 3 instruction based on data

**Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific 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 practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

All evidence-based practices and programs listed above address the identified need that is improving primary literacy achievement. The identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population as they are:

B.E.S.T. Standards Aligned

Aligned with Brevard K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan

Meet Florida's definition of evidence-based

systemic and explicit Geared towards struggling readers with an emphasis on Foundational skills such as Phonological Awareness and Phonics

**Action Steps to Implement:**

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

| Action Step  | Person Responsible for Monitoring   |
|--|---|
| <p>Family Engagement:<br/>                     Events to communicate grade level standards and expectations will be provided.<br/>                     (T) School Calendar will provide a list of schoolwide events.(T)<br/>                     Grades 2,3 and 4 will participate in in Academic Parent-Teacher Teams to engage families more meaningfully in their students' academic success. (T)</p>   | <p>Dutill, Kristin,<br/>                     dutill.kristinl@brevardschools.org</p> |
| <p>Collaborative Planning:<br/>                     Teachers will collaboratively plan as a team weekly and quarterly led by instructional coaches. Collaborative planning will ensure that opportunities for student discourse, scaffolding, check for understanding, and acceleration strategies are incorporated into lesson plans. Brevard County Benchmark Advance/SAVVAS unit guides and the BEST spiral will be used to guide instructional decisions. (T)<br/>                     Teachers will collaborate to plan small group instruction based on student data analysis and teacher observations. Progress monitoring data (PASI, PSI, DORF, FAST, i-Ready diagnostic, Benchmark/SAVAAS unit assessment data) will be used and analyzed to determine skills for reteaching and/or determining acceleration strategies. (T)</p>   | <p>Dutill, Kristin,<br/>                     dutill.kristinl@brevardschools.org</p> |
| <p>Professional Learning:<br/>                     Literacy coach will provide job-embedded PD and side by side coaching. (T)<br/>                     Teachers will receive and reflect on feedback provided by administration and instructional coaches.<br/>                     Observation and feedback will focus on rigorous standards-aligned instruction, scaffolding, and acceleration strategies, and student engagement to support student success. (T)<br/>                     Coaches will provide and organize PD to build teacher capacity on opportunities for students to engagement increasing discourse and collaboration.<br/>                     Provide professional development using resources such as Brevard's Vision for Excellent Instruction, Teach Like a Champion, and Kagan structures to support students with active engagement and higher order thinking about complex content.<br/>                     (T)</p> | <p>Dutill, Kristin,<br/>                     dutill.kristinl@brevardschools.org</p> |
| <p>Assessment<br/>                     Data chats will occur regularly during Strategy Action Meetings (SAMs) around Benchmark Advance Assessments, i-Reay, FAST, and intervention OPM. (T)<br/>                     Teachers will progress monitor student achievement and growth, including subgroups, to provide necessary support and intervention to promote student success with grade level curriculum. (T)<br/>                     i-Ready usage and passing rates will be monitored. Incentives to improve participation and achievement will be in place. (T)<br/>                     Daily exits tickets and other formative assessments are used to determine what scaffolds or reteaching is needed. (T)</p>  | <p>Dutill, Kristin,<br/>                     dutill.kristinl@brevardschools.org</p> |

## Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students and families of students, volunteers and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services and business partners.

### Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Discipline data, Insight Survey, Youth Truth Survey and parent survey data, are carefully reviewed and reflected upon by team and transparently shared with all stakeholders. The information we gather along with the input of stakeholders, help us improve our practices to ensure a safe and caring environment. Parent survey indicates that more than 85% of our parents feel welcome at our school, that is a drop of 10% as compared to previous year. The distancing caused by COVID has created this unwanted divide and although 85% appears to be healthy, we need to go back to that 95%. Additionally, 74% of our families indicated on the survey that they wish to be more engaged in the school. More specifically, they want to know how to help their child. A total of 44% of parents say they want help with student behaviors at home. In response to their voiced needs, we will utilize Parent Tools on Conscious Discipline and provide a parent tip of the month, we will continue to provide Title I Nights and we will begin phase one of working with WestED and 2nd, 3rd and 4th grade teachers on Academic Parent-Teacher Teams.

Tier 1 support includes school wide PBIS (T), Conscious Discipline, Sanford Harmony, Zones of Regulation, Mindfulness lessons provided to Kindergarten students, and Hi-Five Program through Eckerd Connects for students in third through sixth grade. Tier 2 support includes, Restorative Practices, small group and individual lessons on coping skills and self-regulation, Check in-Check out intervention, and Peek-A-Boo mentoring program for Kindergarten students. Tier 3 includes Behavior Intervention Plans and social/emotional goals included in IEP's. Additional SEL/Life Skills supports include school-wide clubs and organizations such as Pretty Brown Girls and What it Take to Win. Continuing and enhancing processes that will provide a trusting and safe environment for all students through a trauma informed approach: a). Check-in/Check-out processes for students b). Mindfulness Strategies c). Safe Space in every classroom d). Counselor (T), Social Worker, and Eckerd Preventions will facilitate small groups targeting social emotional/ life skills concerns.

### Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive school culture and environment.

As teacher on assignment, Danielle Lavelle, oversees all programs supporting student behavior and coordinates our connections with local businesses, mentors and volunteers. Although other staff members will be involved, she will coordinate and lead all programs and structures related to culture under the guidance and leadership of the principal. Strategies that she will oversee to enhance classroom/school community and culture at a Tier I level are: a). Support 5th year implementation of Sanford Harmony for returning teachers. b). Support new teachers with role modeled lessons of a "morning meeting", monthly during Mentor Mondays. c). Enhance PBIS incentives monthly with direct student feedback.

Tier II supports will be provided with support of Eckerd Connects, the guidance counselors and the social worker: students will be provided with opportunities to connect with community members through programs such as: a). Aspiration Academy b). mentoring c). What it Takes to Win and Pretty Brown Girls d). Student

### Ambassador Program.

This team will also provide Tier III support with collaboration from district support, ESE Support Specialist, School Psychologist and Behavior analysts. This team will assist with creation and implementation of Tier 3 plans and strategies.

To create an environment for students to thrive, we will continue to build teacher capacity through new trainings, training for new staff and refresher to those who need it: a). CPI Training to focus on de-escalation strategies b). Students in Transition Training c). Provide a Title I/Eckerd Parent Night for Social/Emotional Development with a focus on: (T) a). Bully Identification and Prevention b). Substance Abuse c). Mental Health d). Self Regulating Strategies. e.) Book study for leadership team Coaching For Equity in first semester and for new teachers Culturally Responsive Classroom(T)