
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	21
VI. Title I Requirements	24
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Jupiter Elementary School

950 TUPELO RD SW, Palm Bay, FL 32908

<http://www.jupiter.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.

Reaching every child, every day. (Reviewed June 2023)

Provide the school's vision statement.

Jupiter Elementary School will challenge our diverse community of learners, establish a positive and productive school culture, set high expectations for achievement, and encourage independent, self-directed learning. (Reviewed June 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
Troisi, Sherie	Principal	As the instructional leader, Sherie Troisi provides vision and strategic focus for all stakeholders. She ensures high academic expectations for all students by holding teachers accountable through regular observations with feedback and individual teacher data chats, supervises curriculum and instruction and ensures weekly data analysis and progress monitoring are occurring. She facilitates weekly leadership team meetings to review student data (academic, behavioral and attendance) and current practices to determine professional development needs and/or additional supports for teachers and students.
Ouellette, Amber	Assistant Principal	Amber Ouellette supports classroom instruction by ensuring all teachers have the appropriate curriculum and instructional resources. She conducts regular classroom observations with feedback to improve instructional practices. Mrs. Ouellette oversees the implementation of our response to intervention and our academic support programs and oversees our new teacher mentor program. She organizes and facilitates professional development and coordinates all testing.
Bach, Rebecca	Teacher, K-12	Rebecca Bach coordinates our Title I program. She supports administration with discipline, maintains discipline records and oversees our Behavior Intervention Room. Mrs. Bach supports classroom teachers in the areas of classroom management and math instruction utilizing the coaching model and coordinates our new teacher program. Mrs. Bach provides Rtl instruction to students in need of academic support for 80% of her day.
Rice, Crystal	Instructional Coach	As our Literacy Coach, Crystal Rice supports classroom teachers with all aspects of reading instruction. She utilizes the coaching model to support reading instruction, coordinates implementation of iReady Reading and Lexia, mentors teachers and facilitates our weekly child chats.
Flanders, Rosangelica	Teacher, K-12	Rose Flanders provides Rtl instruction to students in need of academic support. She also serves as a mentor teacher and supports teachers through modeling best practices, observation of classroom instruction and providing feedback on effective instructional practices.

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.

To involve all stakeholders Jupiter Elementary conducted a Comprehensive Needs Assessment. This process began in May of 2023 with a faculty and staff meeting to review the current school documents and receive feedback. Each grade level/team provided valuable feedback. Also in May the same school documents were provided to the School Advisory Council to review and provide feedback. The School

Advisory Council is comprised of faculty, administration, parents and community members. In June of 2023 Jupiter hosted a three day CNA meeting to review school data and to determine areas of focus. This CNA meeting consisted of staff, parents and administration.

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 through regular classroom walkthroughs, specifically focused on small group instruction. During weekly data chats, student progress and data from iReady, FAST, and district assessments will be monitored and discussed to support student achievement. If revisions are necessary, action steps will be added to the specific areas of focus to ensure improvement. Revisions will be discussed and agreed upon by all appropriate stakeholders.

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	63%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
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) 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	20	32	26	23	19	13	21	0	0	154
One or more suspensions	1	6	7	6	8	15	19	0	0	62
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	4	3	1	0	0	0	8
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	1	3	2	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	40	18	23	13	0	0	94
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	35	28	44	15	0	0	122
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	13	24	14	21	13	22	7	0	0	114

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	1	1	2	6	7	14	24	0	0	55

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	8	1	14	1	1	0	0	0	31
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	3	3	3	1	0	0	10

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	11	30	20	21	16	15	13	0	0	126
One or more suspensions	0	6	9	5	4	5	12	0	0	41
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	17	19	10	0	0	60
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	12	18	22	24	0	0	76
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	9	8	23	6	5	7	0	0	62

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	0	0	3	4	3	7	0	0	17	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Retained Students: Current Year	8	16	3	15	0	0	1	0	0	43	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	0	5	

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	11	30	20	21	16	15	13	0	0	126	
One or more suspensions	0	6	9	5	4	5	12	0	0	41	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	14	17	19	10	0	0	60	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	12	18	22	24	0	0	76	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	4	9	8	23	6	5	7	0	0	62	

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	0	0	3	4	3	7	0	0	17	

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level										Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		
Retained Students: Current Year	8	16	3	15	0	0	1	0	0	43	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	2	0	0	3	0	0	5	

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*	52	61	56	47	62	57
ELA Learning Gains	67	63	61	57	60	58
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	67	54	52	66	57	53
Math Achievement*	58	60	60	48	63	63
Math Learning Gains	68	64	64	59	65	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	67	55	55	47	53	51
Science Achievement*	39	56	51	34	57	53
Social Studies Achievement*		0	50		0	
Middle School Acceleration						
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress	85			48		

** 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	63
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	503
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
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	52			
ELL	54			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	56			
HSP	64			
MUL	60			
PAC				
WHT	62			
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	52	67	67	58	68	67	39					85
SWD	30	60	67	40	68	70	27					
ELL	30	75	75	38	57		20					85
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	46	63	58	52	73	72	25					
HSP	48	76	86	52	64	70	29					85
MUL	49	68		55	69							
PAC												

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
WHT	60	65	64	64	66	55	58					
FRL	44	59	61	53	66	63	32					83

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	41	44	31	40	44	26	34					63
SWD	19	14	9	28	31	18	11					50
ELL	17	35		19	41							63
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	45	45	25	26	36	13	26					
HSP	28	31	36	26	42	20	7					69
MUL	34	29		49	43		42					
PAC												
WHT	48	54		54	52	42	44					
FRL	35	32	22	36	41	26	18					64

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	47	57	66	48	59	47	34					48
SWD	28	58	53	23	59	61						35
ELL	25	55		22	65							48
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	33	49	60	36	49	38	15					
HSP	50	67	69	47	63	50	36					42
MUL	52	58		67	72							
PAC												
WHT	53	57	81	53	61	53	48					
FRL	42	57	65	43	57	46	27					47

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	43%	59%	-16%	54%	-11%
04	2023 - Spring	55%	61%	-6%	58%	-3%
06	2023 - Spring	53%	61%	-8%	47%	6%
03	2023 - Spring	34%	56%	-22%	50%	-16%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	56%	67%	-11%	54%	2%
03	2023 - Spring	49%	60%	-11%	59%	-10%
04	2023 - Spring	48%	61%	-13%	61%	-13%
05	2023 - Spring	33%	55%	-22%	55%	-22%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	33%	57%	-24%	51%	-18%

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.

The 2022-2023 Statewide Science Assessment data shows that only 33% of Jupiter Elementary fifth graders scored at or above grade level, making this our lowest area of performance. Factors that could have contributed to the low performance include inconsistent use of Penda Science in grades 3-6 and lack of available progress monitoring assessments.

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

The 2022-2023 F.A.S.T. data shows the greatest decline at Jupiter Elementary was in math. In the 2021-2022 school year 58% of the students in grades 3-6 scored a level 3 or above, while in the 2022-2023 year only 47% of students scored a level 3 or above. Factors that could have contributed to this decline are; first year of adoption and implementation of new math curriculum and having teacher vacancies to begin the school year.

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.

The 2022-2023 Statewide Science Assessment data shows that the school's science scores had one of the greatest gaps when compared to the state average. The state average was 51% proficiency, however, Jupiter was 33% proficient. With this data component also showing the lowest performance, factors that could have contributed to gap include inconsistent use of Penda Science in grades 3-6 and lack of available progress monitoring assessments.

In addition, the state average for 5th grade math proficiency was 55%, whereas Jupiter's proficiency was 33%. Factors that could have contributed to this gap include first year of adoption and implementation of new math curriculum and having teacher vacancies to begin the school year.

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

Based on the 2022-23 data, all areas showed a decline and no improvement.

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

One area of concern is the amount of Level 1s on the end of year Progress Monitoring, particularly in 5th grade. 5th grade data showed 48% of students scored a level 1 in Math on Progress Monitoring 3. In addition, the number of students determined to be substantially deficient in ELA (lowest 15% based on national averages) increased from 62 students in 2021-22 to 114 students 2022-23.

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

1. Reducing level 1s in both ELA and Math
2. Increasing proficiency on Statewide Science Assessment
3. Decreasing the number of substantially deficient students in ELA

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 Collaborative Planning**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.

Data show that in 2022, 52% of students, grades 3-6, scored a level 3 or higher on the FSA in ELA. The number of students that scored a level 3 on the 2023 End-of-Year F.A.S.T. decreased to 45%. In addition, the 2022 Spring i-Ready Diagnostic indicated 37% of all students, grades K-6, scored on or above grade level. 2023 Spring iReady data showed 29% of students scored on grade level, a decrease from the previous year.

Data showed that in 2022, 58% of students, grades 3-6, scored a level 3 or higher on the FSA in math. The number of students that scored a level 3 on the 2023 End-of-Year F.A.S.T. decreased to 47%. In addition, the 2022 Spring i-Ready Diagnostic indicated 24% of all students, grades K-6, scored on grade level in Math. 2023 Spring iReady data showed 23% of students scored on grade level in math, a slight decrease from the previous year.

Jupiter Elementary will increase the number of students on grade level or above in ELA and math as evidenced by End-of-Year Florida's Assessment of Student Thinking (F.A.S.T.) and i-Ready assessments.

Measurable Outcome:

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

On the 2023 Spring i-Ready diagnostic, End-of-Year View, 23% of students scored on grade level or above in math. Jupiter will increase the number of students scoring on grade level or above to 50% by the end of the year diagnostic.

On the 2023, Spring i-Ready diagnostic, End-of-Year View, 29% of student scored on grade level or above in ELA. Jupiter will increase the number of students scoring on grade level or above to 50% by the end of the year diagnostic.

Jupiter will increase the percent of students at proficiency to 55% or higher in ELA and math and 60% or higher will demonstrate learning gains on the 2023 F.A.S.T from Progress Monitoring 1 to Progress Monitoring 3.

Monitoring:

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

Members of the leadership team will attend weekly collaborative planning sessions with each grade level to monitor pacing of instruction. Professional development will be provided each month to meet the needs of individual grade levels. Follow up to professional development will occur during data chats and coaching sessions. Ongoing monitoring will be done utilizing the following measures: F.A.S.T. Progress Monitoring, iReady Reading/Math Diagnostic Assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Crystal Rice (rice.crystal@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.)

The evidence-based strategy Jupiter will continue to implement during the 2023-2024 school year is collaborative planning utilizing Reveal (K-5) and EdGems (6) for math and Florida Benchmark Advance (K-5) and SAVVAS (6) for ELA as our Tier 1 curriculum.

According to the research article, Teacher Collaboration in Perspective, "Schools with higher levels of teacher collaboration for "school improvement" were associated with higher student achievement on math and reading tests." Through case-study research the article also stated that "This held true even when controlling for student demographics, school size, proportion of low-income and minority students and other factors."

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

45% of our students are proficient in ELA and 47% in math based on 2023 FAST Achievement data. This indicates that instructional practice specifically relating to consistent collaborative planning will play a critical role in student achievement for the 2023-2024 school year, with a focus on Tier 1 instruction and small group learning. Research has shown that schools with better-quality collaboration, had higher student achievement gains in math and reading. Maintaining our focus on collaborative planning for instruction and use of high quality instructional materials will support teachers in identifying their students' instructional needs

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 on Florida Benchmark Advance (K-5) and SAVVAS (6) for ELA and Reveal (K-5) and EdGems (6) for math, specifically unit and weekly planning. .

Person Responsible: Crystal Rice (rice.crystal@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing monthly PD, weekly collaborative planning, and weekly data chats.

#2. 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.

In 2022, 52% of students scored a level 3 or higher on the Florida State Assessment in ELA. The number of students that scored a level 3 in 2023 decreased to 45%.

In 2022, 58% of students scored a level 3 or higher on the Florida State Assessment in Math. The number of students that scored a level 3 in 2023 decreased to 47%.

This data indicates that we must continue to address instruction at all levels. Focus Goal 1 addresses Core (Tier 1) instruction and Focus Goal 2 addresses interventions (Tier 2 and Tier 3 instruction) in small group.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Jupiter Elementary will increase the number of students on grade level or above in ELA and Math as evidenced by i-Ready, Benchmark Advance, Florida Assessment of Student Thinking, and other district assessments. As indicated by Florida Assessment of Student Thinking Progress Monitoring 3, 55% or more of Jupiter students will score on or above grade level in both ELA and Math.

Students falling within the lowest 35% will be consistently monitored utilizing information from Performance Matters. This data will be accessible through a shared site and referenced weekly during Child Chats with teachers. The school-based shared site will also be used to monitor progress of students in the MTSS system through Form Seven. Data monitored includes: F.A.S.T Progress Monitoring, Lexia, iReady Diagnostics, iReady Usage and Pass Rates, iReady Instructional Path analysis for students not making progress, Benchmark Advance/Savvas Assessments, and Tier 3 intervention data.

Monitoring:

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

The leadership team will attend weekly collaborative planning sessions with each grade-level to monitor pacing of instruction for the ELA and Math curriculum, as well as implementation of small group instructional materials. Professional development will be provided to meet the needs of individual grade levels and follow up will occur during child chats and coaching sessions.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Crystal Rice (rice.crystal@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.)

The evidence-based strategy Jupiter will implement during the 2023-2024 school year is to ensure all struggling students are receiving consistent intensive, systematic, and explicit small group instruction on foundational reading skills. (T)

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Data from 2023 FAST and end-of-year iReady diagnostic showed a decrease in proficiency for ELA and Math. Focusing on evidence-based strategies during collaborative planning has improved our delivery of intensive, systematic, and explicit instruction. Research indicates that struggling readers need small group instruction (intervention) that is designed to meet their specific areas of weakness in order to improve their

reading skills. A comprehensive review of research literature conducted by the Institute of Education Sciences concluded that reading interventions improve reading outcomes for students at risk of struggling with typical classroom reading instruction.

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.

Identify students in the lowest 35% for all teachers and leadership team to access and monitor growth throughout the school year.

Person Responsible: Sherie Troisi (troisi.sherie@brevardschools.org)

By When: September 8th, updated on October 13th

Use data from F.A.S.T, i-Ready, Lexia, district assessments, and common formative assessments to form intervention groups. (T)

Person Responsible: Crystal Rice (rice.crystal@brevardschools.org)

By When: First groups to be formed by September 15th using FAST PM1 data. Groups will be reevaluated/restructured as needed depending on future data.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

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.

In 2022 39% of our students scored proficient on the Florida Science Assessment. In 2023, the number of students at level 3 or higher decreased to 33%. Our science scores continue to fall below state (51%) and district (57%) average.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Jupiter Elementary will increase the percent of students scoring on grade level or above on the Florida Standards Science Assessment from 33% to 45%.

Monitoring:

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

Teachers and administration will monitor student progress utilizing Penda Science weekly and monthly reports. Instruction will be adjusted based on evidence of standards not passed on Penda assignments and assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Sherie Troisi (troisi.sherie@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 in grades 3-6 will complete a minimum of 30 minutes weekly utilizing the online standards aligned Penda Science Program. These lessons support Tier 1 instruction, comprehension of science vocabulary, and are differentiated to support students who require additional support.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Students at Jupiter continue to struggle with science mastery as evidence by the Florida Standards Science Assessment. Penda Science has been proven to raise student achievement and mastery of science concepts by providing rigorous science instruction that motivates and engages students in their 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 for classroom teachers on the best practices for vocabulary instruction in science.

Person Responsible: Crystal Rice (rice.crystal@brevardschools.org)

By When: October 6th, Early Release PD

Host a Title I parent/family STEM curriculum night. (T)

Person Responsible: Rebecca Bach (bach.rebecca@brevardschools.org)

By When: April/May 2024

Conduct quarterly walks during the science block to ensure science instruction is rigorous and standards aligned and provide feedback to teachers.

Person Responsible: Sherie Troisi (troisi.sherie@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing beginning in September.

Utilize Title I funds to purchase science resources and provide hands on materials that will enhance science instruction. (T)

Person Responsible: Rebecca Bach (bach.rebecca@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing, as needed

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

D3 i-Ready data from 22-23 show that 34% of students in grades K-2 are not on track to score grade level or above on the statewide ELA assessment. Collaborative planning sessions need to have a clear structure to focus on the alignment of benchmarks, resources, student tasks, assessments, and the transfer to instruction.

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

22-23 FAST Data shows 54% of 3rd Graders, 52% of 4th Graders, 49% of 5th Graders, and 44% of 6th Graders scored below grade level (Levels 1 and 2). Increasing Primary Literacy Achievement so that gaps will not be as prominent in 3-5. Collaborative planning sessions need to have a clear structure to focus on the alignment of benchmarks, resources, student tasks, assessments, and the transfer 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

Short Term – From FAST-STAR-PM1 to PM2, literacy achievement will increase by 5%.
 Long Term - By the Spring 2024 FAST, literacy achievement will increase by 10%.

Grade-level goals:

Kindergarten Grade will increase in proficiency from 57% (PM1) to 70% (PM3)

1st Grade will increase in proficiency from 60% (PM1) to 70% (PM3)

2nd Grade will increase in proficiency from 65% (PM1) to 75% (PM3)

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Short Term – From FAST-STAR-PM1 to PM2, literacy achievement will increase by 20%.
 Long Term - By the Spring 2024 FAST, literacy achievement will increase by 40%.

3rd Grade will increase in proficiency from 18% (PM1) to 51% (PM3)

4th Grade will increase in proficiency from 29% (PM1) to 51% (PM3)

5th Grade will increase in proficiency from 35% (PM1) to 55% (PM3)

6th Grade will increase in proficiency from 43% (PM1) to 60% (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.

Ongoing monitoring will be used to evaluate instructional impact and determine next steps. This will take place throughout the year as evidence by data from:

- Progress Monitoring 1, Progress Monitoring 2, FAST
- i-Ready D1 and D2
- Walkthroughs with feedback
- Benchmark Advance Assessments
- Intervention Data (Intervention instruction will specifically target identified gaps)

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Troisi, Sherie, troisi.sherie@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?

Our focus will be on the features of effective instruction by implementing the following programs and practices:

- Focus on tightening up delivery of instruction focusing on the systematic, explicitness of instruction and reinforcing the “why” – Science of Reading.
- Scaffolded instruction - intentional, temporary, support; Gradual release until student(s) can perform independently
- Differentiated instruction - adapts instruction in response to the distinct assessed skills and needs of individual learners
- Collaborative Planning - Supports consistent, high-quality implementation of Benchmark Advance; Allows for instructional strategies, resources, tools, and materials to be scaffolded and differentiated.
- Lexia (Strong level of evidence)
- 95% Group (Strong level of evidence) - systematic and explicit instruction on foundational skills utilizing evidence-based practices as listed in the IES’ Practice Guides Assisting Students
- i-Ready (Promising level of evidence) - Universal screener data is used to start data conversations at school level.

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/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 the Brevard K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan
- Meet Florida’s definition of evidence-based
- Systematic and/or 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
Content coach will facilitate benchmark-aligned planning.	Troisi, Sherie, troisi.sherie@brevardschools.org
Professional Learning: - On-side intervention material and instructional PD will be provided by Literacy Coach. - Maximize time for PD by infusing small chunks during grade level data and planning sessions	Rice, Crystal, rice.crystal@brevardschools.org
Literacy Coaching: - Lesson planning with teachers, modeling, co-teaching, engaging in reflective conversations and engaging in data chats. - Focus on teacher clarity, instructional model, strategies, questioning, and assessments that align to the benchmark(s) and will support the intended learning.	Rice, Crystal, rice.crystal@brevardschools.org
- Teachers will use program assessments for foundational reading skills, alongside DIBELS measures, PASI/PSI and/or Running Records to monitor reading skills development. - Data chats will occur regularly around Benchmark Advance Assessments, iReady, FAST, Lexia and intervention OPM.	Troisi, Sherie, troisi.sherie@brevardschools.org

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

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

The Schoolwide Improvement Plan will be shared with all stakeholders through various methods. All staff members will attend a faculty meeting where the information will be shared and discussed. The information will be shared at a SAC meeting as well as uploaded to the school webpage. Communication

will be sent out via FOCUS communication (email and text), schoolwide newsletter as well as the school Facebook page alerting families that they can access the information via the school webpage or by coming into the front office and requesting to see the Title 1 binder.

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))

To build positive relationship with parents, families and other community stakeholders Jupiter Elementary will communicate frequently using many different platforms including FOCUS (emails, text, voice calls), monthly school newsletters, student planners, school Facebook page, school webpage, and sending home fliers/handouts with students. Teachers will also conduct quarterly positive phone calls to families. Administration will hold monthly opportunities for parents to provide feedback (ex. 2nd Cup of Coffee, Lemonade with Leadership). Jupiter's PTO and SAC committee will work on increasing parental participation. The school's Family Engagement Plan is available on the school webpage: www.brevardschools.org/JupiterES, click on the about us tab and then Title 1 section.

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)

To strengthen the academic programs at Jupiter, teachers will focus on ensuring all struggling students are receiving consistent intensive, systematic, and explicit small group instruction on foundational reading and math skills. Teacher's will use the online PENDA Science platform with fidelity to improve science instruction while focusing on science vocabulary.

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

Not applicable