Coquina Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Coquina Elementary School

850 KNOX MCRAE DR, Titusville, FL 32780

http://www.coquina.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.

All students will succeed. (Revised 2023-24)

Provide the school's vision statement.

Coquina Elementary School will encourage students to achieve personal academic success through collaboration and goal setting. (Revised 2023-24)

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
Lovelace, Blair	Principal	Supervise the operation and management of all activities and functions within the school setting. Provide leadership, delegate leadership responsibilities, and promote team decision making within the professional learning community of Coquina. Analyze performance data and current educational research to provide standards based instruction along with character education instruction. Gather feedback and input from students, staff members, parents and community members to make decisions that improve instructional delivery, student mastery of standards and the social well-being of the Coquina community. Create a school culture that values problem-solving, discussion and transparency to solve underlying barriers that may arise. Manage all aspects of a healthy campus, through fiscal responsible decisions, campus safety measures, hiring new employees, retaining highly qualified teachers, and ensure a clean well-maintained campus. Monitor classroom instructional practices through observations, timely feedback, and conversations to develop highly-qualified instructors.
Hoggatt, Nichole	Assistant Principal	Delivery of instructional guidance by providing research based curriculum materials. Analyzing data while guiding instructional staff to understand and adapt instruction based on performance data. Observing and providing feedback to improve instructional delivery. Assist classroom teachers when implementing school-wide initiatives and provide support to ensure all stakeholders consistently utilize instructional and character curriculum. Oversee ESOL, scheduling, state/district testing and the mentor teacher program for new hires.
Stanton, Carissa	Reading Coach	Provide English Language Arts professional development to instructional staff to address the needs of all learners. Facilitate discussions that analyze data and drive instructional delivery to meet the standards. Utilize the coaching cycle to observe and provide feedback to instructional staff. Provide input in the MTSS process to ensure fidelity of strategies for at risk students.
Robb, Vanessa	Math Coach	Provide Mathematics professional development to instructional staff to address the needs of all learners. Facilitate discussions that analyze data and drive instructional delivery to meet the standards. Utilize the coaching cycle to observe and provide feedback to instructional staff. Provide input in the MTSS process to ensure fidelity of strategies for at risk students.
McMahon, Alicia	Dean	Provide Character Education professional development to instructional staff to address the needs of all learners. Facilitate discussions that analyze data and incorporate preventive measures to ensure safety and improve school culture and climate. Utilize the coaching cycle to observe and provide feedback to instructional staff. Provide input in the MTSS process to ensure fidelity of strategies for at risk students.

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.

Data taken from INSIGHT Survey(staff input), YOUTHTRUTH Survey(students 3-6 input) and parent surveys was collected and analyzed by the Comprehensive Needs Assessment Committee. Recommendations are created and submitted to the SIP planning team. Recommendations are shared with SAC and input is solicited from the SAC.

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))

Monthly leadership team meetings to progress monitor implementation. Monthly updates to SAC to monitor implementation. Quarterly leadership team meetings to analyze current performance data and adjust plans for improvement if necessary.

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	49%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Identification	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: B 2019-20: 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	3	13	7	8	4	6	12	0	0	53
One or more suspensions	1	3	9	4	8	9	10	0	0	44
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	4	5	12	6	5	1	2	0	0	35
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	6	12	20	20	0	0	58
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	16	18	18	0	0	55
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	2	3	12	15	12	0	0	46

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	6	11	3	6	1	0	0	0	0	27
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	13	19	19	5	16	19	22	0	0	113
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	22	7	6	1	2	2	0	0	40
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	14	15	20	0	0	54
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	14	19	26	0	0	63
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	22	7	5	14	15	20	0	0	83

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	3	1	3	3	6	8	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	7	22	7	6	1	2	2	0	0	47
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	4	0	2	5	0	0	11

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	13	19	19	5	16	19	22	0	0	113
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	0	22	7	6	1	2	2	0	0	40
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	14	15	20	0	0	54
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	14	19	26	0	0	63
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	22	7	5	14	15	20	0	0	83

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	3	1	3	3	6	8	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	7	22	7	6	1	2	2	0	0	47
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	4	0	2	5	0	0	11

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*	50	61	56	45	62	57
ELA Learning Gains	62	63	61	51	60	58
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	57	54	52	51	57	53
Math Achievement*	50	60	60	42	63	63
Math Learning Gains	69	64	64	61	65	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	58	55	55	56	53	51
Science Achievement*	41	56	51	35	57	53
Social Studies Achievement*		0	50		0	
Middle School Acceleration						
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress	50					

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	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	437
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	33	Yes	3	
ELL	42			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	52			
HSP	54			
MUL	55			
PAC				
WHT	60			
FRL	58			

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	50	62	57	50	69	58	41					50

| 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
SWD	13	49	35	20	53	48	15					
ELL	50			25								50
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	42	54	50	44	77	67	33					
HSP	50	61		42	64							
MUL	42	63		50	65							
PAC												
WHT	55	65	67	56	69	61	48					
FRL	50	67	61	50	71	63	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	45	52	50	37	44	23	53					
SWD	23	29	20	16	25	13	30					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	41	33		20	29							
HSP	40	60		38	50		53					
MUL	39			33								
PAC												
WHT	49	54	48	43	43	13	53					
FRL	45	59	56	38	45	19	53					

| 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	45	51	51	42	61	56	35					
SWD	18	43	45	16	51	50	20					
ELL												
AMI												

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
ASN												
BLK	37	37	36	39	66	77	38					
HSP	56	63		34	47							
MUL	57	35		48	65							
PAC												
WHT	42	57	54	44	61	43	41					
FRL	42	54	53	37	58	54	35					

2018-19 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

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	46%	59%	-13%	54%	-8%
04	2023 - Spring	38%	61%	-23%	58%	-20%
06	2023 - Spring	45%	61%	-16%	47%	-2%
03	2023 - Spring	40%	56%	-16%	50%	-10%

MATH

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	50%	67%	-17%	54%	-4%
03	2023 - Spring	38%	60%	-22%	59%	-21%
04	2023 - Spring	45%	61%	-16%	61%	-16%
05	2023 - Spring	49%	55%	-6%	55%	-6%

SCIENCE

Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	46%	57%	-11%	51%	-5%

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

ELA lowest performance groups were 1st and 4th grade.

47% of Students in Kindergarten Scoring Below 40th Percentile
75% of Students in 1st Grade Scoring Below 40th Percentile
49% of Students in 2nd Grade Scoring Below 40th Percentile
57% of Students in 3rd Grade Scoring Below Level 3
61% of Students in 4th Grade Scoring Below Level 3
51% of Students in 5th Grade Scoring Below Level 3

Contributing factors include 14 instructional vacancies, all coaches were classroom teachers and inexperience of newly hired teachers and substitutes.

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

Grade 4 ELA showed the greatest decline with a 11% drop and Grade 6 ELA declined with an 10% drop.
Major contributing factor was inexperienced work force.
Grade 4 ELA teacher was alternative certificated teacher with minimal opportunity for utilizing the coaching cycle.
Grade 6 ELA teacher was out on extensive leave and multiple substitutes were utilized.

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.

Third Grade had the greatest gap(21%) when compared to the state average in mathematics.
38% of Students in 3rd Grade Scoring a Level 3 or above as compared to the State average of 59%.
Teacher vacancies along with inexperienced teachers without support through the coaching cycle contributed to this decline.

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

46% of Students in 5th Grade Scored a Level 3 or higher on Florida Standards Assessment. The gap between Coquina and the state average was 8% points. Science achievement increased by 5% from the previous year.
Actions taken were to hire a veteran science teacher into the position, provide after school academic support for students needing remedial support and the utilization of PENDA.

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

Stakeholders have identified out of school suspensions and absenteeism as two potential factors that could benefit student's academic performance. When school culture and climate improves, students will want to come to school and be engaged in learning. Also, when at risk behaviors decease less classroom disruptions will effect learning and students will not miss academic instructional due to in-school or out of school suspensions.

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

1. School culture and climate.
2. Planning with collaborative learning communities to develop targeted lessons aligned with the state standards and benchmarks.
3. Coaching cycles with ELA, Math, Science, and Character Education.

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

#1. 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.

Area of focus will be on student engagement to decrease out of school suspensions and absenteeism while increasing student performance. When students feel safe and engaged in learning, less acting out behaviors and absenteeism will occur.
Early Warning Systems data, staff survey data(INSIGHT), student survey data (YOUTHTRUTH) and teacher retention data indicate targeted focus on school culture and climate as the priority area of focus for the 2023-24 school year. 135 out of 421 students returning to Coquina for the 2023-24 school year had one or more referrals for the 2022-23 school year. 4 of 5 students with 50+ referrals with out of school suspensions were ESE. 1,199 referrals were written for currently enrolled students. YouthTruth survey data indicated students feel their peers do not respect their teacher as well as INSIGHT data indicated that students are disrespectful to each other and adults. (Hattie: Teacher-Student Relationships.72, Student expectations of self 1.44)

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

Student referrals will decrease by 20%. Coquina will decrease referrals from 1,199 to 960 or less referrals to increase instructional delivery time for all students.

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

Students identified as ESE with previous referrals will be monitored weekly to ensure BIPs are being implemented with fidelity.
Student expectations of self(Hattie 1.44)will be clearly defined quarterly to monitor progress through data notebooks.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Alicia McMahon (mcmahon.alicia@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.)

Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) is an evidence-based, tiered framework for supporting students' behavioral, academic, social, emotional, and mental health.
Zones of Regulation methodology and teaching approach is built upon leading neuroscience and cognitive theories, integrating evidence-based practices.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

PBIS and Zones of Regulation strategies will provide students the opportunity to build productive habits with decision-making, self-regulation and productivity. Zones provides regulation strategies to monitor emotions and develop practices to regulate. While PBIS provides a reward system for appropriate school based actions that lead to a productive and safe learning environment.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

Provide professional development (PD), coaching, modeling, collaborative planning and progress monitoring data analysis to all instructional staff using Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports and Zones of Regulation.
Increase PBIS rewards and incentives.
Increase collaborative walkthroughs and timely feedback.
Ongoing PD based on teacher and/or grade level need based on Tier 1 Classroom Management Observational Checklist. (Hattie, Classroom Behavioral .80)

Person Responsible: Alicia McMahon (mcmahon.alicia@brevardschools.org)

By When: By the end of Semester 1, data will show a 10% decrease in number of student referrals, suspensions, and absenteeism. By the end of Semester 2, 20% decrease.

Provide professional development to staff members on Kagan cooperative learning structures (T) to increase student engagement during learning. (Hattie, Cooperative vs. individualistic learning .59)

Person Responsible: Blair Lovelace (lovelace.blair@brevardschools.org)

By When: May 2024

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned 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.

Targeted focus on improving instructional practices in the areas of ELA, Math and Science to ensure Benchmark-aligned instruction is being delivered systematically throughout all grade levels will improve students performance. Data indicates this is a priority goal.
English Language Arts
47% of Students in Kindergarten Scoring Below 40th Percentile
75% of Students in 1st Grade Scoring Below 40th Percentile
49% of Students in 2nd Grade Scoring Below 40th Percentile
60% of Students in 3rd Grade Scoring Below Level 3
62% of Students in 4th Grade Scoring Below Level 3
54% of Students in 5th Grade Scoring Below Level 3
Mathematics
62% of Students in 3rd Grade Scoring Below Level 3
55% of Students in 4th Grade Scoring Below Level 3
51% of Students in 5th Grade Scoring Below Level 3
Science
54% of Students in 5th Grade Scoring Below Level 3

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

As a result of implementation of evidence based strategies and curriculum,
Florida Benchmark Advance 2023, myPerspectives, Reveal, EdGems, district provided curriculum in science including StemScopes, iReady, and 95 Percent Group interventions (HB7011), Coquina will increase grade level proficiency on state-wide assessments (F.A.S.T.).
Grade K- 55% OGL F.A.S.T. end of year assessment.
Grade 1- 55% OGL F.A.S.T. end of year assessment.
Grade 2- 55% OGL F.A.S.T. end of year assessment.
Grade 3- 55% OGL F.A.S.T. end of year assessment.
Grade 4- 55% OGL F.A.S.T. end of year assessment.
Grade 5- 55% OGL F.A.S.T. end of year assessment.
Grade 6- 55% OGL F.A.S.T. end of year assessment.

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

Targeted acceleration, through Florida Benchmark Advance 2023, myPerspectives, Reveal, EdGems, district provided curriculum in science including StemScopes, iReady, and 95 Percent Group interventions (HB 7011), will be provided to all underperforming ESSA sub groups with specific attention to students with disabilities and
English language learners.
1. Monthly data meetings will be held with grade level teachers, literacy coach, math coach, and administration to monitor student progress and ensure implementation of evidence based strategies and curriculum.
2. Classroom walk throughs by administration and coaches will be implemented frequently to ensure best practices are consistent with BPS pacing guides and Decision Trees.
3. Monthly MTSS meetings will be held to monitor Tier 2 & 3 students and intervention effectiveness.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nichole Hoggatt (hoggatt.nichole@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.)

1. Comprehensive instructional program for teachers (effect size .72),
Deliberate practice (effect size .79). Implementation of Tier 1 Core ELA, math, and science curriculum, Florida Benchmark Advance 2023, myPerspectives, Reveal, EdGems, district provided curriculum in science including StemScopes, iReady, and 95 Percent Group interventions (HB7011).
2. MTSS/RTI (effect size 1.29), Interventions for students with learning needs
(effect size .77), vocabulary programs (effect size .62). Implementation of iReady instructional tools, 95 Percent Group interventions, Penda, and strategic math series (HB7011).

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

INSIGHT data from Winter 2023 indicated that teachers felt
students in their class could master grade level standards by the end of the
year. Based on teacher input and the disparity of students performance data, more
time and collaborative planning during implementation of Florida Benchmark Advance 2023,
myPerspectives, Reveal, EdGems, district provided curriculum in science including StemScopes, iReady, and 95 Percent Group interventions (HB7011) needs to occur to build understanding of how research evidence based strategies impact student learning.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

Provide professional development (PD), coaching, modeling, collaborative planning and progress monitoring data analysis to all instructional staff using Florida Benchmark Advance 2023, myPerspectives, Reveal, EdGems, district provided curriculum in science including StemScopes, iReady, and 95 Percent Group interventions (6). (HB7011)

Person Responsible: Blair Lovelace (lovelace.blair@brevardschools.org)

By When: Progress monitoring end of term 1 and term 3.

Provide PD to all instructional staff on iReady and iReady Magnectic Reading (K-2)
Monitor use of iReady and instructional teaching of iReady toolbox.
Facilitate data discussions on iReady data for acceleration.

Person Responsible: Carissa Stanton (stanton.carissa@brevardschools.org)

By When: PD By the end of first semester and the monitoring and data discussions are weekly and ongoing.

Monitor weekly assessment data of Benchmark Advance formative assessments and facilitate data analysis with grade levels.

Person Responsible: Blair Lovelace (lovelace.blair@brevardschools.org)

By When: Weekly ongoing

Utilize the coaching cycle with instructional staff to improve delivery of ELA instruction.(T)

Person Responsible: Carissa Stanton (stanton.carissa@brevardschools.org)

By When: Weekly ongoing

Academic Support Program (ASP) funds will be utilized to provide targeted interventions for acceleration.

Person Responsible: Nichole Hoggatt (hoggatt.nichole@brevardschools.org)

By When: Quarterly monitoring of students in need.

Utilize Title I funds for materials and supplies needed to implement Florida Benchmark Advance and myPerspectives. Quarterly purchases (T)

Person Responsible: Blair Lovelace (lovelace.blair@brevardschools.org)

By When: Quarterly

Hire instructional assistants to support Tier 2 students with assistance with academics. (T).
K-6 IAs - 5

Person Responsible: Blair Lovelace (lovelace.blair@brevardschools.org)

By When: August 2023 and ongoing

Plan parent engagement opportunities to support literacy development and understanding of the BEST standards. (T)

Person Responsible: Carissa Stanton (stanton.carissa@brevardschools.org)

By When: January 2024

Design and schedule within the master schedule time to maximize staff implementation of Tier 2 & 3 interventions in ELA. (August 2023)

Person Responsible: Nichole Hoggatt (hoggatt.nichole@brevardschools.org)

By When: August 2023 and ongoing daily

Analyze data and progress monitor with grade level teams bi-monthly through math data talks and MTSS.

Person Responsible: Vanessa Robb (robb.vanessa@brevardschools.org)

By When: Bi-monthly

Provide Professional Development to all instructional staff on Reveal and EDGEMS.

Person Responsible: Vanessa Robb (robb.vanessa@brevardschools.org)

By When: On-going training monthly

Implement collaborative planning to ensure understanding of BEST standards and instructional delivery of Reveal and EDGEMS.

Person Responsible: Vanessa Robb (robb.vanessa@brevardschools.org)

By When: Weekly

Purchase materials and supplies(T) needed to deliver explicit, systematic instruction.

Person Responsible: Blair Lovelace (lovelace.blair@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing as needed

Purchased supplemental materials and supplies to support hands on science instruction.

Person Responsible: Blair Lovelace (lovelace.blair@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing as needed

Provide modeling, coaching and feedback to K-6 grade teachers in the area of science.

Person Responsible: Carissa Stanton (stanton.carissa@brevardschools.org)

By When: Monthly

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).

Funds are allocated to support students in need of additional supports beyond Tier 1 instruction.
1. Academic Support Programs (ESSER & Count Funds) target Tier 2 & 3 students will additional help in ELA, Math and Science.
2. Lexia will support Tier 2 students in need of foundational skills in ELA.
3. 95% Group Materials are utilized to support foundational skills for students in ELA.
4. Funds are spent to increase hand-on engagement with science materials.
5. Funds are allocated for supplies and materials that are consumable or need replacing for State and District adopted programs.
6. Funds are allocated for professional development to promote learning communities that address the needs of all students.
7. Funds are allocated for professional development to promote student engagement.

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

1. Diagnostic 3 iReady data from 2022-23 indicates that 53% of current second graders are not on track to demonstrate OGL proficiency on statewide F.A.S.T. end of year assessment.
2. Diagnostic 3 iReady data from 2022-23 indicates that 52% of current third graders are on track to demonstrate grade level proficiency on statewide F.A.S.T. end of year assessments. Planning sessions need to have a clear structure to focus on alignment of benchmarks, resources, student tasks, assessments and the transfer to instruction.

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

1. 2022-23 FSA Data indicates 60% of current fifth graders and 59% of current fourth graders scored below grade level. (Levels 1 & 2)
2. Current third grade students 48% scored below grade level based on iReady end of year diagnostic.

Planning sessions need to have a clear structure to focus on alignment of benchmarks, resources, student tasks, assessments and the transfer to instruction.
Increased Primary Literacy Achievement so that gaps will not be as prominent in grades 3rd-5th.

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

F.A.S.T. Data PM3 2023
47% of Students in Kindergarten Scoring Below 40th Percentile
75% of Students in 1st Grade Scoring Below 40th Percentile
49% of Students in 2nd Grade Scoring Below 40th Percentile
Students in 2nd grade will be increase by 5% towards above the 40th percentile mark on each progress monitoring assessment from PM1, PM2 and PM3.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

F.A.S.T. Data PM3 2023
57% of Students in 3rd Grade Scoring Below Level 3
61% of Students in 4th Grade Scoring Below Level 3
51% of Students in 5th Grade Scoring Below Level 3
Students in 3rd- 6th grade will be increase by 5% towards on grade level, Level 3 or above, on each progress monitoring assessment from PM1, PM2 and PM3.

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.

1. Bi-Monthly data meetings will be held with the principal and Literacy Coach to monitor student performance and growth. Tracking will include: F.A.S.T. data, iReady progress monitoring data, Accelerated Reading data (Grades 2-6) and 100 Book Challenge Reading Log progression (K-2).
2. Intervention data impacting SWD priorities. 95% Group Materials and Lexia. (T)

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Lovelace, Blair, lovelace.blair@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?

1. iReady is supported by promising evidence according to Evidence for ESSA.
2. Deliberate practices (Hattie, .79), utilizing explicit, systematic instruction using Reveal, Ed Gems and Benchmark.
3. Lexia is supported by strong level of evidence.
4. 95% Group Materials is supported by strong level of evidence.

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?

The IRIS Center at Vanderbilt University documents explicit, systematic instruction as a high yield strategy when taught. The strategy is shown to be effective across all grade levels and for diverse groups of students, including students with disabilities and ELLs.

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

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Literacy Leadership 1. Define roles and responsibilities of team members for common planning sessions. 2. Develop content area planning protocols that will delineate expectations for benchmark-aligned instructional practices. 3. Clearly communicate planning expectations to all staff members. 4. Collaborate with content coaches before/after each planning sessions. 5. Meet regularly with Literacy Leadership Team to refine practices and provide feedback.	Lovelace, Blair, lovelace.blair@brevardschools.org
Literacy Coaching 1. Lesson planning with teachers, modeling, co-teaching, engaging in reflective conversations and engaging in data chats. 2. Identify and plan for the supports that teachers need to plan and deliver instruction.	Stanton, Carissa, stanton.carissa@brevardschools.org
Assessment 1. Train teachers on assessments. Administration, analysis, action steps. 2. Meet bi-monthly with principal to have data chats around Benchmark Advance, iReady, F.A.S.T. and intervention.	
Professional Learning 1. Provide professional development targeted to support Tier 1,2 &3 strategies. 2. Identify mentor teachers and establish model classrooms to observe. 3. Maximize time for PD by infusing small chunks of information.	Stanton, Carissa, stanton.carissa@brevardschools.org

Title I Requirements

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

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

SIP is shared with stakeholders through multiple communication links.
1. Presented to SAC committee.
2. Paper hard copies are placed in a binder house in the front office for review and suggestions.
3. Parent surveys are collected multiple time per year. i.e. Title I Annual Meeting, Title I evaluation meeting, and all parent engagement events.
4. CNA is formed with teachers, parents and community members to review and provide input.
5. Blackboard message through FOCUS is sent to all parents.
6. School website houses an electronic copy.

7. Shared on social media on the multiple ways that parents can access the SIP.
8. Grade level meetings discuss SIP goals bi-monthly.

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))

1. Parent engagement events collect input from parents.
2. Title I Binder houses the PFEP.
3. Teacher training on parent engagement occurs at the beginning of school.

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))

Area of Focus: Instructional practice specifically related to Benchmark aligned instruction.
1. Bi-weekly extended planning focuses on Benchmark Standards to ensure fidelity of instruction.
2. All meetings begin with guiding four questions: What do students need to know? How will we know when they have learned it? What will we do to support students who have not learned it? How will we provide acceleration to students who know it?
3. Master schedule developed to provide target Tiered 2 & 3 interventions.
4. An ELA Plus time is integrated to support foundational skills in K-3.

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))

The PFEP provides specific details on how Coquina will support diverse students.
1. Eckerd Connects Grant for drug prevention.
2. Head Start wrap around services for 3 and 4 year old's.
3. Dental sealant program for 2nd graders.
4. Wellness Policy and Procedures are followed.
5. Hired diverse staff to communicate with parents that needs translation.
6. Community Title I school where all students receive free and reduces lunch.
7. Partnership with the Hunger Project to provide weekend meals.