

Brevard Public Schools

University Park Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	10
III. Planning for Improvement	14
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	23
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	23
VI. Title I Requirements	27
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

University Park Elementary School

500 W UNIVERSITY BLVD, Melbourne, FL 32901

<http://www.upark.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.

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

* Reviewed with staff during preplanning of August 2023.

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 2023.

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
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. Create a common understanding of where we are and where we want to be as it relates to student learning. Recruit, retain and develop a quality work force.
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.
Young, Carrie	School Counselor	IPST facilitator ESOL contact ESE contact Student small groups.
Dutill, Kristin	Reading Coach	
White, Shari	Attendance/ Social Work	Attendance and Truancy Social work, Student in Transition contact

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.

All stakeholders were involved in the development of SIP. School data was presented to all stakeholders and based on the data and input the school improvement plan for 2023-2024 was developed

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))

The PLCs meet during weekly Strategy Action Meetings to review data related to adult actions, processes and impact student achievement. The School Advisory Council meets monthly and reviews progress of goals and strategies. The staff self monitors and work as a team to monitor their progress towards goals.

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: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level								Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7		8
Absent 10% or more days	26	20	15	20	9	8	15	0	0	113
One or more suspensions	8	3	5	3	4	15	12	0	0	50
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	1	0	3	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	9	13	19	0	0	45
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	19	16	29	0	0	68
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	8	17	10	21	9	10	18	0	0	93

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	8	6	6	14	9	10	18	0	0	71

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	5	4	1	5	1	0	2	0	0	18
Students retained two or more times	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	3

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	16	14	18	10	10	18	13	0	0	99
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	4	2	6	0	0	12
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	15	16	14	15	0	0	60
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	28	28	17	30	0	0	103
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	10	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	1	4	7	4	2	2	5	0	0	25

The number of students identified retained:

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

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	16	14	18	10	10	18	13	0	0	99
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	4	2	6	0	0	12
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	15	16	14	15	0	0	60
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	28	28	17	30	0	0	103
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	10	12	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	32

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	1	4	7	4	2	2	5	0	0	25

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	2	6	2	13	1	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2

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*	40	61	56	41	62	57
ELA Learning Gains	51	63	61	45	60	58
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	39	54	52	59	57	53
Math Achievement*	41	60	60	35	63	63
Math Learning Gains	57	64	64	49	65	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	54	55	55	38	53	51
Science Achievement*	34	56	51	35	57	53
Social Studies Achievement*		0	50		0	
Middle School Acceleration						
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress	53			76		

* 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	46
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	369
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	37	Yes	3	
ELL	45			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	36	Yes	3	
HSP	38	Yes	1	
MUL	40	Yes	1	
PAC				
WHT	54			
FRL	43			

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	40	51	39	41	57	54	34					53
SWD	11	40	47	22	59	45						
ELL	25	44		29	58	60						53
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	31	44		29	54		23					
HSP	25	40		31	63							33
MUL	30			50								
PAC												
WHT	51	58	43	48	58	54	48					71
FRL	36	47	45	36	55	52	32					43

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	37	44	25	26	35	20	35					48
SWD	18	30	21	6	18	18	17					
ELL	34	57		38	31							48
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	19	27	25	19	24	10	7					
HSP	37			21								30
MUL	45			36								
PAC												
WHT	48	56		31	36		48					65
FRL	34	37	24	23	31	18	33					29

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	41	45	59	35	49	38	35					76
SWD	12	27	37	21	37	33	14					
ELL	32	48		32	57							76
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25	45	69	21	42	37	19					
HSP	29	38		25	38							83
MUL	44	54		25	46							
PAC												
WHT	52	42	50	48	56	20	58					78
FRL	38	44	60	33	49	39	30					76

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	27%	59%	-32%	54%	-27%
04	2023 - Spring	51%	61%	-10%	58%	-7%
06	2023 - Spring	48%	61%	-13%	47%	1%
03	2023 - Spring	30%	56%	-26%	50%	-20%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	49%	67%	-18%	54%	-5%
03	2023 - Spring	37%	60%	-23%	59%	-22%
04	2023 - Spring	51%	61%	-10%	61%	-10%
05	2023 - Spring	27%	55%	-28%	55%	-28%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	22%	57%	-35%	51%	-29%

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.

When looking at grade level ELA data for grades 3-6, 5th grade showed the lowest performance with a 30% proficiency rate. This was 25% lower than the state average of 55%, and 28% lower than the district average of 58%.

When looking at grade level Math data for grades 3-6, 5th grade, overall proficiency increased from 17% in PM2 to 28% in PM3, the increase was not significant when compared the to state and district average of 55%.

When looking at Science scores for 2023, Science proficiency declined from 34% in 2022 to 22% in 2023 in 5th grade. Overall, ELA , Math and Science data highlight 5th grade as the lowest academic performance in the school.

The 5th grade team was disjointed from the start. One teacher was new and lacked the experience needed to work with a challenging demographic and manage the content. The other teacher lacked

commitment and left mid-year. Both teachers struggled to follow the curriculum guidelines set by the district. Lack of fidelity of lesson planning and implementation along with a difficulty to understand the content were contributing factors to the low performance.

Subgroup data for ELA in grades 3-6 shows the lowest performance among Hispanic students and Students with Disabilities. Hispanic students showed 26% proficiency, while SWD showed 31% proficiency which is below our overall school score of 42%.

Subgroup data for Math in grades 3-6 shows the lowest performance was on English Language Learners and Students with Disabilities. ELL students showed 26% proficiency, while SWD showed 10% proficiency which is below our overall school score of 43%.

When looking at STAR Early Literacy and STAR Reading data for K -2 , Kindergarten showed the lowest performance, with a 32% proficiency rate. This was a deficit of 23% when compared to the district average of 55%.

Based on the STAR Math assessment data for grades K-2, Kindergarten proficiency was the lowest compared to grades 1 and 2. Even though the percentage of proficiency increased from 28% to 38% the increase was not significant enough as compared to the district average of 56%.

The Kindergarten team was new to our school this year. The teachers struggled with using the district curriculum with fidelity as well as setting clear expectations and procedures for their students.

English Language Learners in grades K – 2 demonstrate less success than their peers in Math. Overall Math proficiency was 50% for ELL learners, an increase of 7% from PM2 and increase of 8% from PM1.

The proficiency rate did not increase significantly as compared to the district rate of 62%

Diving deeper into the ELA subgroup data for K-2, Hispanic/Latin students proficiency decreased significantly from a 53% in PM1 to 50% in PM2 and 41% in PM3.

Black students proficiency rate decreased from a 40% in PM1 to 38% in PM2, 41% black students were proficient in PM3.

Student with disabilities showed growth from 10% to 35%, however no students with disabilities scored a proficiency level on the FAST assessments.

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

Overall, there was no major decline in proficiency from PM1 to PM3 in ELA.

After looking at subgroup data from STAR Reading (1st and 2nd grades), it shows that Hispanic students declined by 15% from PM2 (37%) to PM3 (22%) and Black students declined by 16% from PM2 (37%) to PM3 (26%).

Overall comparison of data across grade levels in Math did not show any decline in proficiency rate but diving deeper in subgroup data students in grades K-2 showed the greatest decline from PM1 to PM3 is the Hispanic subgroup, which are most of our ELL students from 53% in PM1 to a 41% PM3.

One of the contributing factor was new Non English speakers students who belonged to the Hispanic subgroup came in after the PM2 testing.

ELL teacher and assistants need to create a schedule to support Tier 1 math instructions by pushing into the classroom. A collaborative co-teaching model needs to be adopted by the ELL team and classroom teachers.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

ELA scores in 5th grade showed the greatest gap when compared to the state average:

Lack of fidelity of implementation of lessons, inconsistent classroom management strategies, increase in discipline referrals, and student attendance contributed to the large gap in achievement.

The greatest gap in proficiency rate as compared to state average was 5th grade. PM3 data showed a

proficiency rate of 28% as compared to the state average of 55%.

Lack of classroom management strategies consistently implemented across grade level, increase in discipline referrals and student attendance contributed to low student achievement in grade 5.

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

ELA scores in 4th grade showed the most improvement, increasing from 17% proficiency on PM1 to 48% proficiency on PM3.

Proficiency rate in 4th grade Math showed the highest improvement from 8% in PM1 to 51% in PM3.

Several factors contributed to this improvement including: strong teacher/student relationships, clear classroom expectations and management strategies, strong knowledge of ELA and Math content, implementing instruction with fidelity (including small group instruction), use of data to strategically plan lessons and manage small groups.

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

Student attendance is the biggest concern. Average daily attendance rate is 91% and 30% of the students in the school had chronic attendance.(more than 10 days absent)

Subgroup data: ELL and Black students proficiency rate decreased.

Student with disability not making significant growth.

Kindergarten teachers had the highest discipline referral of a total 184 referrals during the school year as compared to other grade levels in the school. Classroom observations, revealed a clarity with establishing expectations, rules, and routines to create a conducive learning environment on part of the teachers. Kindergarten also struggled with attendance. A concerning 59% % of kindergartners were absent for more than 10 days during the school year. Kindergarten had the highest absent rate in the school. As research shows school attendance is closely linked to student achievement, and low attendance has a significant negative impact on students' academic performance.

Both teachers in 5th grade struggled to provide clear expectations, rules, and routines to create a conducive learning environment. The discipline data showed an increase on student referrals from by 25% from the first quarter to third quarter. Fifth grade had the second highest discipline referrals, with a total of 125 referrals in the school year. The lack of high expectations in the classroom led to low student achievement. Another contributing factor to low student achievement is attendance. A total of 34 % of 5th graders were absent for more than 10 days for the entire school year.

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

All the data was distributed to Stakeholders for review and feedback. There is correlation between classrooms/grade levels with high absenteeism, high discipline referrals and low student performance. In classrooms where student performed at high levels, the behavior, and attendance were under control. Based on data from FAST in ELA , Math and Science, our biggest 3 needs to address in the upcoming school year is

1. Lack of benchmark alignment during small group instruction (focus on independent work)
2. Teacher clarity – Intentional well planned lessons based on BEST standards along with implantation of the lessons in the classroom
3. Attendance- Lack of instruction/Intervention due to tardiness and absenteeism

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 Small Group Instruction

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.

FAST assessment data in grades 3-6 results, student achievement in Math and science proficiency as compared for FSA 2022 data decreased from 41% to 39% in Math and from 34% to 22% in Science significantly lower than the state and district average of 61% and 57% respectively in math and 59% in Science. There was an increase in proficiency by 20% from PM1 to PM3 , but the students in Tier 2, Tier 3 did not make significant growth to achieve proficiency.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By focusing on small group instruction aligned to BEST standards, students who are level 2 and below will be able to grow by 20% from PM1 to PM3 and will be able to close the learning gaps, which will help them be proficient by the end of the school year.

Monitoring:

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

Math scores will be monitored 3 times a year with FAST assessments. Based on the results of FAST scores, teachers will adjust their small group lessons based on the individual student score. Science scores will be monitored using Penda Science Mini Assessments based on standards. ELA scores will be monitored 3 times a year with FAST assessments. Based on the results of FAST scores, teachers will adjust their small group lessons based on the individual student score.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sejal Shah (shah.sejal@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Overall math proficiency will be 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 all Level 2 and below 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.
5. Walk-throughs will be focused on looking for implementation of B.E.S.T. standards in small group instruction, 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. Intentional Collaborative planning session with planning protocol tool.(T)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific 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.

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.

Develop a planning protocol that includes intentional expectations of student tasks/activities.

Person Responsible: Kristin Dutill (dutill.kristinl@brevardschools.org)

By When: September 2023

Strong planning protocol will be implemented based on the district small group planning tools. The teacher will be using grade-level specific benchmark curriculum aligned to BEST standards.

Person Responsible: Kristin Dutill (dutill.kristinl@brevardschools.org)

By When: August Strategy action meeting and support will be ongoing based on grade-level specific needs.

Small group hands-on activity in the science lab will be conducted by the science lab teacher.

This activity will focus on grade level specific standards.

5th grade students will work in small groups based on the 5th grade standards

Penda Science will be utilized by the students. Teachers will monitor student progress weekly and make sure a goal of 80% and 2-3 activities is met by every students. Teachers will reassign lesson for students not meeting goals. Admin will monitor progress bi-weekly

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

By When: Ongoing through out the year.

Math small group schedule will be created by the District math coach based on PM1 data . These groups will be based on the skills the students lack to achieve grade level proficiency for a particular standard.

ASP (after school program) will also pull students for small group math instructions.

The school will make sure there is 30 minute Math small group lesson block for each grade level.

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

By When: On going through the year

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning

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.

Teachers will clarify the intended learning before, during and at the end of the lesson to all students using academic language and checking for understanding aligned to benchmark standards.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Overall student proficiency will increase by 10% in state assessments ELA, math and science.

Monitoring:

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

Student progress will be monitored using FAST PM1 , PM2 and PM3 data. Walkthrough data be used with constructive feedback to the teachers. This will help determine coaching cycles needed for teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kristin Dutil (dutil.kristin@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:

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

Teachers need to clarify the intended learning before, after and during lesson using language focused on BEST standards and grade-level specific
Teachers will use benchmark curriculum, iready lessons to reteach concepts or skills students have gaps in.
Intentional planning of small group lessons during weekly planning, iReady lessons will be used to teach/ reteach skills.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Curriculum is aligned to state standards, grade level specific materials are used in small groups and is aligned. In ELA materials used for independent work is not consistently aligned. Many teachers lack confidence with use of academic vocabulary and allowing for academic discourse in both ELA and Math.

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.

ELA, Math and Science Walkthrough tool will be used to monitor teacher clarity, student engagement and use of academic language in the classrooms.

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

By When: On going

Quarterly Collaborative planning and PLC will help teachers look at the lesson plans closely focusing on student engagement, questioning, teacher clarity and small group on instruction in both ELA and Math

Person Responsible: Kristin Dutill (dutill.kristin@brevardschools.org)

By When: On going - once in every quarter (collaborative planning)

Professional development using the book teach like a champion will focus on strategies to enhance teacher clarity and small group instructions

Person Responsible: Kristin Dutill (dutill.kristin@brevardschools.org)

By When: Once a month - PD

Update Walkthrough tool to include benchmark aligned independent tasks.

Develop a planning protocol that intends intentional expectations of student task/activity that is standards aligned in ELA and math.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

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.

Attendance is grades K-2 is chronic, 39% if students are missing intervention block and are checkout early. Parents lack awareness of the impact on learning.
Increase unified understanding of the POWER expectations and improve the PBIS program.

Measurable Outcome:

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

1. Information will be shared with parents on the importance of attendance via newsletter, messages and during conferences.
2. Social Worker will work with teachers to track students with 3 or more consecutive days out without an excuse and connect families to knowledge and resources.
3. Students with excellent attendance (in school and on time 95% of the time) will be rewarded every nine weeks.
4. Classrooms with 100% of students in class on time, will be announced at end of day and class with highest monthly percentage will be recognized.
5. Administration will work with transportation to ensure adequate bus routes and drivers to get all students to school every day on time.
6. Rtl teachers will report students no receiving adequate support due to attendance and parents will be called in for meetings.

Monitoring:

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

Social worker will monitor attendance data and share information with administrators and teachers. Literacy Coach will monitor student attendance during Rtl checking student attendance and will inform social worker.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kristin Dutil (dutil.kristin@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.)

Monitoring for implementation and impact is the most important evidence based strategy the team will use in order to ensure sub groups are making adequate gains as a result of adults doing a great job with small group instruction and all ESE and ELL support pushing into the basic classroom to support small groups.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Supporting and monitoring that the intended learning is planned for based on benchmarks and that the delivery of instruction (teacher practice) is happening as planned, is critical when ensuring all groups have access and the students are positively impacted by the teaching.

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.

POWER expectations lesson plans will be created to ensure students have same understanding of expectations.

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

By When: During preplanning teachers will be provided with a brief overview and with the lesson plans. Teachers will implement lessons.

Tier 2 and Tier 3 behavior strategies will be utilized by the teachers to support students in classroom. District MTSS website will be used to share tier 1, 2 and 3 strategies with teachers.

Person Responsible: Carrie Young (young.carriem@brevardschools.org)

By When: On going

Common area expectations will be reviewed once in every semester and teachers will be able review the lesson plans with students as needed.

Person Responsible: Carrie Young (young.carriem@brevardschools.org)

By When: on going

School wide PBIS events will be created by the PBIS team. Class room PBIS incentives shared with teachers.

Person Responsible: Carrie Young (young.carriem@brevardschools.org)

By When: On going

School Social worker to monitor Attendance and create a monthly attendance report. Parent will be contacted for more than 2 days.

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

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).

University Park's leadership team meets at the start of the school year to review the master schedule and personnel schedules, instructional materials, and technology resources to ensure alignment with the needs of IEP's and Gen Ed students. The schedule of both ESE and Gen Ed teachers are aligned to ensure students get the highest quality of support. This includes scheduling for collaborative planning, core instruction, intervention and time on technology with support programs. Additionally, the following items are also aligned to support all students:

Reading Coach .5 (T)

Reading interventionist

Science Teacher .5 (T)

Guidance Counselor (T)

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

PM 3 data from the 22-23 school year shows that 57 % 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- 43%, 1st- 39% and 2nd- 45%.

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.

Implement the use of Magnetic Reading in grades K-3 to enhance Tier 1 instruction.

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

In grades 3-5, the 22-23 FAST PM 3 data showed 70% of 3rd graders, 49% of 4th graders and 72% 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 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 short term goal for ELA in grades K-2 is a 10% increase in literacy achievement from PM1 to PM2. The long term goal for ELA in grades K-2 is a 20% increase in literacy achievement by PM3 (Spring 2024).

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

The short term goal for ELA in grades 3-5 is a 10% increase in literacy achievement from PM1 to PM2. The long term goal for ELA in grades 3-5 is a 20% increase in literacy achievement by PM3 (Spring 2024).

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.

We will monitor student achievement outcomes using the following:

FAST PM1, PM2, PM3

STAR Early literacy and STAR Reading

iReady diagnostic data

Walkthroughs and feedback

Benchmark Advance Assessments

Ongoing Progress Monitoring (OPM): Intervention data

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Diaz, Ana, diaz.ana@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?

We will use the following evidence-based practices to achieve the measurable outcomes:

Magnetic reading (K-2) to build foundational phonics skills in the primary grades.

Collaborative planning to support consistent, high-quality implementation of Benchmark Advance and research-based materials aligned to the B.E.S.T. standards. Weekly and quarterly

Build teacher capacity through professional development, coaching cycles, and observation and feedback on: explicit instruction, scaffolded instruction, and small group instruction.

Differentiate instruction through small groups during the ELA block as well as individualized access to iReady lessons. These lessons will be based on diagnostic assessments, Response to Intervention instruction and data.

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

All evidence-based practices 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: Events to communicate grade level standards and expectations will be provided. (T) School Calendar will provide a list of schoolwide events.(T) Academic Parent Teacher Teams will increase continue and include 1st and 5th grade. (T)</p>	<p>Dutill, Kristin, dutill.kristinl@brevardschools.org</p>
<p>Collaborative Planning: 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) 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, dutill.kristinl@brevardschools.org</p>
<p>Professional Learning: Literacy coach will provide job-embedded PD and side by side coaching. (T) Teachers will receive and reflect on feedback provided by administration and instructional coaches. Observation and feedback will focus on rigorous standards-aligned instruction, scaffolding, and acceleration strategies, and student engagement to support student success. (T) Coaches will provide and organize PD to build teacher capacity on opportunities for students to engagement increasing discourse and collaboration. (T) Provide professional development using resources such as Brevard’s Vision for Excellent Instruction and Kagan structures to support students with active engagement and higher order thinking about complex content. (T)</p>	<p>Dutill, Kristin, dutill.kristinl@brevardschools.org</p>
<p>Assessment Data chats will occur regularly during Strategy Action Meetings (SAMs) around Benchmark Advance Assessments, iReady diagnostic assessments, FAST data, and intervention OPM data. (T) 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) Daily exit tickets and other formative assessments are used to determine what scaffolds or reteaching is needed. (T)</p>	<p>Dutill, Kristin, dutill.kristinl@brevardschools.org</p>

Title I Requirements

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

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

Data will be distributed to all stakeholders for review and feedback will be collected. Most parents responding to the parent survey prefer to attend school events. We will continue to improve our home-school connection by increasing the number of grade level involved in academic parent teacher nights. We will focus on Title I nights based on skills parents can teach at home.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Family Title I Nights - engage families in understanding expectations and teach strategies families can use at home.

Family Home Connection Nights- provide families with opportunities to find out where their child falls in a specific academic area and what they can do at home to help.

Families will receive monthly communication from teacher on their child's academic status and growth.

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)

University Park has numerous plans to strengthen the academic program, increase the amount and quality of learning time, and help provide enriched and accelerated curriculum. Tier 2 and Tier 3 Interventions are delivered in a consistent manner with weekly progress monitoring. Our Guidance Counselor continues to reach out to parents to identify any barriers to attendance. ESSA groups and Tier 2 and 3 students will be monitored and addressed weekly at grade-level meetings. Grade-level meetings will also target the MTSS process, data chats, and professional development to address students scoring below grade level. The Literacy Coach will conduct coaching cycles with teachers.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

This plan addresses programs supported under ESSA by increasing student achievement consistent with the B.E.S.T. benchmarks utilizing the MTSS process including T2 and T3 interventions with the Walk to Intervention model. ESSA groups will be monitored and addressed monthly at grade-level meetings.