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

Indialantic Elementary School

1050 N PALM AVE, Indialantic, FL 32903

<http://www.indialantic.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.

The Indialantic community inspires young people to cultivate a passion for learning, to reach well beyond the ordinary and to exemplify grit to meet high expectations in academics and never give up. Equally, students and teachers will ensure grace through taking responsibility for their own words and actions while exhibiting empathy, acceptance, and generosity. (Rev. 19/20)

Provide the school's vision statement.

To cultivate responsible and capable citizens that strive to grow and reach their academic and social emotional potential through grit & grace. (Rev. 19/20)

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
Lord, Colleen	Principal	Cultivate a positive school culture among the students, faculty, parents and community members. Ensure that a Standards-aligned curriculum drives instruction that supports students academic and social emotional success. Oversee professional growth to support teacher and staff development. Develop and monitor procedures to ensure a safe learning environment.
White, Stephanie	Assistant Principal	Assists with building the culture of our school, analyzes data to support SIP goals, provides professional development, and supports students social and academic needs.
Donovan, Kim	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach works with teachers to determine appropriate instructional strategies for classroom core instruction and targeted interventions. Attends parent conference, leadership team meetings, and participates on the MTSS team. Plans with teachers and leads focus team meetings and professional development.
Kublin, Mary	Teacher, K-12	5th grade Math and Social Studies teacher. Co-Chair of the School Improvement Committee. Assists with professional development to support academic and social needs of students.
Schneider, Julie	Teacher, K-12	5th grade English-Language Arts and Science teacher. Co-Chair of the School Improvement Committee. Assists with professional development to support academic and social needs of students.
Foster, Elizabeth	Other	Gifted enrichment instructor who serves on our leadership team. Provides professional development on technology, Math, ELA, instructional practices, and culture.
Spiker, Kathy	Other	Mrs. Spiker is our guidance counselor. She heads our Conscious Discipline and Trauma Informed Classroom professional development. She leads the MTSS team/ IPST to ensure all students academic and social needs are met.

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.

The SIP is developed using input from the stakeholders in the form of a start of the year survey, input from the leadership team on the goals and strategies, and the School Advisory Council provides input and approves the plan.

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 SIP will be monitored and reviewed each month with the School Advisory Council. Progress monitoring data, including subgroups, will be used to monitor student achievement in identified areas. Teachers will review the plan and revise in the Academic Leadership Teams as appropriate.

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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	22%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	22%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	N/A
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) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	6	11	11	5	12	9	9	0	0	63
One or more suspensions	1	1	3	0	5	1	2	0	0	13
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	0	2	7	0	0	10
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	6	2	2	0	0	11
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	7	6	16	10	4	18	7	0	0	68

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	2	2	0	0	3	4	4	0	0	15

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	11	11	5	0	1	6	0	0	34
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3
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	0	2	7	7	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	8	9	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	2	1	0	3	2	0	0	8

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	0	0	0	4	5	0	0	10

The number of students identified retained:

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

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	11	11	5	0	1	6	0	0	34
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3
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	0	2	7	7	0	0	16
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	8	9	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	2	1	0	3	2	0	0	8

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	0	0	0	4	5	0	0	10

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

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

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

Accountability Component	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	83	61	56	79	62	57
ELA Learning Gains	64	63	61	61	60	58
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	57	54	52	51	57	53
Math Achievement*	80	60	60	78	63	63
Math Learning Gains	78	64	64	68	65	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	63	55	55	60	53	51
Science Achievement*	73	56	51	87	57	53
Social Studies Achievement*		0	50		0	
Middle School Acceleration						
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress						

* 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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	71
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	498
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	45			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	73			
MUL	70			
PAC				
WHT	73			
FRL	61			

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	83	64	57	80	78	63	73					
SWD	57	43	39	51	55	38	31					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	86	61		75	70							
MUL	86	55		57	82							
PAC												
WHT	82	66	56	83	79	67	75					
FRL	73	53	55	63	70	46	67					

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	82	73	63	78	69	63	77					
SWD	63	82	71	59	68	55	57					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	74	55		59	73							
MUL	80			60								
PAC												
WHT	83	75	65	81	68	60	76					
FRL	68	64	36	58	56	50	68					

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	79	61	51	78	68	60	87					
SWD	65	51	40	61	61	72	56					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	85	62		67	67							
MUL	94	62		94	100							
PAC												
WHT	78	61	52	78	66	58	85					
FRL	66	51	41	61	55	46	71					

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	76%	59%	17%	54%	22%
04	2023 - Spring	90%	61%	29%	58%	32%
06	2023 - Spring	79%	61%	18%	47%	32%
03	2023 - Spring	75%	56%	19%	50%	25%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	80%	67%	13%	54%	26%
03	2023 - Spring	75%	60%	15%	59%	16%
04	2023 - Spring	88%	61%	27%	61%	27%
05	2023 - Spring	78%	55%	23%	55%	23%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	82%	57%	25%	51%	31%

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.

Indialantic Elementary consistently scored above the District and State in FAST ELA in Spring 2023. Indialantic students scored: 75% percent of Grade 3, 88% of Grade 4, 86% of Grade 5, and 79% of grade 6 scored at Level 3 or higher on the Spring 2023 ELA FAST. The Math Spring FAST Test 2023 had the following scores: Grade 3 74 at Level 3 or higher, Grade 4 88% at Level 3 or higher, Grade 5 80% at Level 3 or higher, and Grade 6 79% at Level 3 or higher. The Grade 3 students scoring 75% or higher at Level 3 or higher on the FAST ELA is the lowest achievement level on ELA and Math. One class had a change in teacher and a long-term substitute teacher. This may have been a contributing factor.

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

ELA learning gains declined from 73% in 2021 to 64% in 2022 on the FSA. Comparative results for FAST are not available as 2023 was the first year of administering the assessment. However, comparing

cohorts with previous FSA assessment scores, the cohort of 4th grade 2022 (Math FSA 85% at 3 or higher) to 5th grade 2023 (FAST 80%) decreased in the number of students at Level 3 or higher. The factor contributing to this may be the difference in the testing and BEST standards.

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.

Indialantic scored above the state scale score in all subject areas and at every grade level.

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

The greatest increase occurred in Science Fifth Grade Assessment with an increase from 73% at Level 3 or higher on the 2022 FL Science Assessment to 82% at Level 3 or higher on 2023 FL Science Assessment. Penda was implemented in third through sixth grades. Fifth Grade was departmentalized for core subjects.

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

Students with 10% or more absences in First and Second grade is at 11 students in each grade. This is a significant number of students. As students are developing the early literacy skills, the attendance in the primary grades is critical.

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

1. Instructional Practice Specifically Relating to ELA
2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement
3. Positive Culture and Environment Specifically relating to Other
4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA
5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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 ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Early literacy skills, based on the Science of Reading, include Phonological Awareness, Decoding, and Phonics instruction. UFLI Foundations will be implemented for explicit and direct instruction of foundational skills for reading by kindergarten through second grade teachers.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Students in Kindergarten through Second Grade will increase their phonics and Phonemic Awareness on the STAR Early Literacy and Star Literacy Assessments from PM1 (40% on Level 3 or higher) to PM 3 (80% on Level 3 or higher).

Monitoring:

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

The implementation of UFLI Foundations will be monitored by classroom observations conducted by the Literacy Coach and administration.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kim Donovan (donovan.kimberly@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.)

UFLI Foundations, based on the Science of Reading, will be implemented by K-2 teachers to support phonics and phonemic awareness instruction. UFLI Foundations, an explicit and systematic program that teaches students the foundational skills necessary for proficient reading, will be used for instruction as core instruction, Tier 1, as well as for Tier 2 and Tier 3.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

UFLI Foundations is research-based. The program was developed to align with what decades of reading research has shown to be effective. UFLI Foundations incorporated findings from research on word reading development and effective instruction to build an explicit and systematic program for teaching children to read and spell words.

UFLI Foundations is also evidence-based. Before releasing the program, developers spent two full years creating and piloting each component. Most importantly, developers assessed student progress, and it was determined that students who received instruction using UFLI Foundations made significant gains in phonemic awareness, decoding, and oral reading fluency.

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.

Professional Development will be delivered by the literacy coach to all K-2 teachers on the implementation of UFL Foundations.

Person Responsible: Kim Donovan (donovan.kimberly@brevardschools.org)

By When: August 2023

Classroom modeling and co-teaching on the implementation of UFLI Foundations will occur by the Literacy Coach.

Person Responsible: Kim Donovan (donovan.kimberly@brevardschools.org)

By When: October 2023

Follow up professional development for K-2 teachers will occur during designated PD days.

Person Responsible: Kim Donovan (donovan.kimberly@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing in 2023-24

Monitoring of UFL Foundations implementation in the classroom will occur through classroom walkthroughs with administration and literacy coach.

Person Responsible: Colleen Lord (lord.colleen@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing in 2023-24

Corrective feedback will be provided to teachers individually to support professional development.

Person Responsible: Kim Donovan (donovan.kimberly@brevardschools.org)

By When: May 2024

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Student Engagement

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.

Students in the lowest 25% continue to be a focus for academic improvement. Indialantic Elementary has a significant number of students who are at or above grade level, and continuing to challenge the students is critical to their academic growth. Through the use of engagement strategies, all students will increase their levels of achievement.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May 2024, 80% of the classroom walk throughs will document evidence of engagement strategies used in the classroom.

Monitoring:

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

Classroom walk throughs will be conducted in Kindergarten through sixth grade for student engagement strategies. The trend to see growth in student engagement strategies will be monitored. The growth from PM1 to PM2 at each grade level for ELA and Math will measure academic growth.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Colleen Lord (lord.colleen@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.)

Cooperative learning will be used to increase student engagement in the classroom. Additional engagement strategies will be shared in faculty meetings and professional development.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Coopertive learning, as described by Robert Marzano and John Hatti, has a statistically significant impact on student achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

Professional development of the principles of cooperative learning/engagement strategies and structures for the classroom instruction in all content areas will be delivered to all staff members.

Person Responsible: Colleen Lord (lord.colleen@brevardschools.org)

By When: August 2023

Monitoring of the implementation of engagement strategies will occur weekly for all classrooms.

Person Responsible: Colleen Lord (lord.colleen@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing 2023-24

Ongoing professional development will focus on specific content areas and teachers will share their successes at implementing the strategies.

Person Responsible: Colleen Lord (lord.colleen@brevardschools.org)

By When: August 2023

Monitoring of the implementation of engagement strategies will occur weekly through classroom walkthroughs.

Person Responsible: Colleen Lord (lord.colleen@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing 2023-24

Monitoring with feedback will be conducted for professional development

Person Responsible: Colleen Lord (lord.colleen@brevardschools.org)

By When: May 2024

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Parent involvement in learning experiences for both the student and parent/guardian will be incorporated each semester.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Parent surveys will indicate a high rating for opportunities to be involved in their child's education on the Annual Climate Survey.

Monitoring:

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

The Indialantic Elementary parents will attend sessions, as evidenced by sign in sheets, focused on literacy, math and science.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Colleen Lord (lord.colleen@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.)

Impactful parent-student nights will increase parent participation and support for their child's achievement in ELA, Math and Science.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Parental involvement in the student learning experiences will increase student achievement and attendance. Research findings have demonstrated a positive association between parental involvement in education and academic achievement (Pérez Sánchez et al., 2013; Tárraga et al., 2017), improving children's self-esteem and their academic performance (Garbacz et al., 2017) as well as school retention and attendance (Ross, 2016).

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.

A Literacy Night will be developed with the Academic Literacy Team to support ELA Standards at K-6th Grade.

Person Responsible: Kim Donovan (donovan.kimberly@brevardschools.org)

By When: December 2023

A STEAM Night will be developed by the Math and Science Academic Leadership Teams.

Person Responsible: Colleen Lord (lord.colleen@brevardschools.org)

By When: The STEAM Night for students and parents will occur by March 28, 2024.

FAST Night will be developed and implemented for parents and students to understand the progress monitoring and how they can assist their child. Testing anxiety will also be discussed and tips to support their child during the assessments.

Person Responsible: Colleen Lord (lord.colleen@brevardschools.org)

By When: The FAST Night for K-6 grade will occur by January 31, 2024.

Volunteers will be identified for the events and stations planned with teachers.

Person Responsible: Kim Donovan (donovan.kimberly@brevardschools.org)

By When: December 2023

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

Based on i-Ready results from the 2022-2023 school year, the area of need in all grades levels (3-6) is Vocabulary development. In order to increase student performance on vocabulary assessments, a schoolwide emphasis on vocabulary development will be implemented. Teachers will systematically and explicitly teach vocabulary in all content areas.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We expect an increase on the i-Ready Vocabulary domain Mid or Above Grade Level/Early On Grade Level from D1 to D2 to increase:

Third Grade from 69% to 80%

Fourth Grade From 60% to 80%

Fifth Grade from 66% to 80%

Sixth Grade from 63% to 80%

Monitoring:

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

Grade level teams will meet in PLCs to discuss district ELA pacing and sequencing specific to morphology and vocabulary instruction to continue to improve vocabulary instruction. Additionally, research-based vocabulary practices introduced during pre-planning will be implemented in classroom instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephanie White (white.stephanie@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.)

Based on i-Ready data at the school and district level, there is a need for explicit Tier 1 vocabulary instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Hairrell, Rupley, and Simmons engaged in a systematic review of vocabulary research and determined that targeted vocabulary instruction leads to increased word knowledge for elementary students [21]. The authors described three of the most common strategies to build vocabulary reported in empirical research: (1) contextual analysis, (2) semantic strategies, and (3) repeated exposure. Marzano also found vocabulary instruction had a statistically significant impact on student achievement.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Continue to review data (class, grade level, and school) to monitor and support instruction.

Person Responsible: Stephanie White (white.stephanie@brevardschools.org)

By When: Each nine weeks

2. Support teachers in monthly meetings with reviewing student performance and Benchmark curriculum to support instruction that is aligned with research-based practices.

Person Responsible: Stephanie White (white.stephanie@brevardschools.org)

By When: Monthly

3. Teachers will share vocabulary strategies with other grade levels at faculty meetings to increase teacher use of research-based strategies (Hattie & Marzano).

Person Responsible: Stephanie White (white.stephanie@brevardschools.org)

By When: Monthly

4. Teachers will use repeated exposure to support the mastery of new vocabulary words.

Person Responsible: Stephanie White (white.stephanie@brevardschools.org)

By When: May 2024

Students will use their vocabulary words in authentic writing experiences and rich conversations to increase mastery.

Person Responsible: Stephanie White (white.stephanie@brevardschools.org)

By When: May 2024

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

The FAST Mathematics Assessments 2023 results included: Grade 3- 76% at Level 3 or higher; Grade 4- 88% at Level 3 or Higher; and Grade 5-80% or Level 3 or higher. In alignment with the 2023-24 BPS Elementary Instructional Agreements, the Tier One instruction will be provided for all students, with the addition of small group instruction daily for mathematics.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Eighty-five percent of the students in 4th to 6 Grade will show a learning gain in mathematics on the FAST Assessment 2024. In addition, 85% of the students in 3rd to 6th Grade will be proficient at Level 3 or higher on the FAST Assessment, increasing proficiency rate from 80% at Level 3 or higher on the FAST Mathematics.

Monitoring:

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

The i-Ready Diagnostic data D2 & D3, FAST Progress Monitoring 1 & 2 data will be used to measure student progress towards the goals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephanie White (white.stephanie@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.)

Students who scored in the lowest 25% in Math on the 2023 FAST Assessment will be provided additional support through small group instruction in the classroom, as well as instructional supports through i-Ready. Additionally, students who scored above grade level will receive challenging instruction through iReady at their instructional level.

The students at Level 1 or 2 on the FAST 2023 will be provided with additional supports for math fluency and problem solving.

A strong Tier 1 instruction will focus on mastery for all students (BPS Instructional Agreements (2023-24) and Small group instruction will occur daily in Math (BPS Instructional Agreements (2023-24).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Small group instruction focused on intentional learning goals is known to have a positive impact on student achievement. Standards based instruction is known to positively impact student achievement for all students (Marzano, 2010)

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.

Students will be identified from i-Ready Diagnostic, FAST data and classroom assessments as needing additional supports to meet mastery of BEST Standards.

Person Responsible: Stephanie White (white.stephanie@brevardschools.org)

By When: Data will be analyzed at the bi-weekly data chats with each grade level. Data chats will be ongoing; students will be initially identified in the 1st Quarter.

Teachers will utilize the data to determine the domains students are struggling with and set small group instruction to address needs.

Person Responsible: Stephanie White (white.stephanie@brevardschools.org)

By When: This is ongoing throughout the year so adjustments can be made as needed.

Teachers will provide Tier One Instruction to all students on Math BEST Standards. Small group instruction will support Tier One Math instruction and focus on specific skills identified for students.

Person Responsible: Stephanie White (white.stephanie@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year.

Professional development, conducted by the Math Coach, will be provided with a focus on math manipulatives and the adopted Reveal/Savvas math curriculum.

Person Responsible: Stephanie White (white.stephanie@brevardschools.org)

By When: May 2024