Ocean Breeze Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Ocean Breeze Elementary School

1101 CHEYENNE DR, Indian Harbour Beach, FL 32937

http://www.ocean.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.

Ocean Breeze Elementary School's mission is to develop motivated and confident life-long learners who are prepared for future challenges (updated 2019).

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to maintain a safe, respectful, and inclusive school community where responsibility for learning is shared, and everyone counts. Ocean Breeze will nurture and encourage every child to discover personal strengths and talents, develop a passion for learning, and acquire the skills to be a creative and collaborative problem solver. (updated 2019).

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
Michaud, Shelley	Principal	Oversee the day to day operations of the school including: fiscal monitoring, data analysis, supervision & evaluation, curriculum & instructional planning, behavior management, facilitate collegiality & collaboration, engage stakeholders, talent & recruitment management, and all other duties necessary in building leadership.
Allred, Michelle	Assistant Principal	Assist the principal in the oversight the day to day operations of the school including: fiscal monitoring, data analysis, supervision & evaluation, curriculum & instructional planning, behavior management, facilitate collegiality & collaboration, engage stakeholders, talent & recruitment management, and all other duties necessary in building leadership.
McKenzie, Chantell	Instructional Coach	Support staff with the collection & analysis of student data to inform instructional decisions & promote student growth & performance. Model and support best practice in literacy instruction. Facilitate data & assessment meetings, and provide intervention or intervention support to substantially deficient 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.

Administrators, teachers, instructional coach, and SAC review EOY data, analyze if previous year's SIP goals were met, and select focus areas for improvement. Stakeholders prioritize instructional adjustments to support student growth. Administrators review parent and student surveys with staff and SAC to address areas for improvement addressed in survey results.

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))

Focus goals will be reviewed after each FAST/STAR PM, at monthly data meetings, throughout the MTSS process, intervention monitoring, and after quarterly ELA assessments. Adjustments will be made according to student need and growth/achievement progress.

Demographic Data

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	18%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	26%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	1	5	7	6	8	8	4	0	0	39
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	2	2	1	2	0	0	10
Course failure in English Language Arts (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	0	5	14	13	0	0	32
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	6	13	17	0	0	36
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	1	1	0	3	0	0	5

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	1	1	1	2	3	5	0	0	13

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	0	1	4	0	0	1	0	0	0	6
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	2	6	10	9	8	9	4	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	3	1	1	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	7	5	1	0	0	19
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	13	10	7	7	0	0	37

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	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	2	6	10	9	8	9	4	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	8	3	1	1	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	6	7	5	1	0	0	19
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	13	10	7	7	0	0	37

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	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	2

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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

Accountability Component	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	77	61	56	80	62	57
ELA Learning Gains	72	63	61	68	60	58
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	69	54	52	65	57	53
Math Achievement*	81	60	60	81	63	63
Math Learning Gains	79	64	64	79	65	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	69	55	55	65	53	51
Science Achievement*	74	56	51	76	57	53
Social Studies Achievement*		0	50		0	
Middle School Acceleration						
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress						

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See [Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings](#).

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	74
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	521
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	97
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	51			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	76			
MUL	85			
PAC				
WHT	74			
FRL	74			

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	77	72	69	81	79	69	74					
SWD	43	68	67	45	56	50	29					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	78	87		68	78	75	70					
MUL	82	82		94	82							
PAC												
WHT	77	71	67	82	79	66	79					
FRL	70	74	72	75	77	79	71					

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	76	74	65	74	71	56	70					
SWD	43	58		48	47		62					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	76	55		71	64							
MUL	82	62		77	77							
PAC												
WHT	77	79	76	76	75	59	76					
FRL	65	69	62	65	65	44	63					

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	80	68	65	81	79	65	76					
SWD	51	55	52	57	67	64	40					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	88	78		92	76							
MUL	88	82		71	82							
PAC												
WHT	81	67	67	84	81	73	75					
FRL	73	68	64	73	66	59	61					

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	75%	59%	16%	54%	21%
04	2023 - Spring	71%	61%	10%	58%	13%
06	2023 - Spring	79%	61%	18%	47%	32%
03	2023 - Spring	78%	56%	22%	50%	28%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	86%	67%	19%	54%	32%
03	2023 - Spring	81%	60%	21%	59%	22%
04	2023 - Spring	74%	61%	13%	61%	13%
05	2023 - Spring	68%	55%	13%	55%	13%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	80%	57%	23%	51%	29%

III. Planning for Improvement

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

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

In looking at the 2022 and 2023 data, our lowest scoring areas are in the SWD subgroup. While we made gains in the SWD subgroup in 2023, according to our data review, this subgroup continues to perform below our other subgroups. Our SWD population is often also part of the lowest 25%, so there is a connection to these data points.

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

Between 2021 & 2022, we declined only in ELA learning gains by two points. However, we decline significantly (-7 to -13) in math achievement, math learning gains and math learning gains lowest 25%. In 2023, our overall ELA achievement grew in 3rd grade, but fell between 5 and 7 percentile points in grades 4-6. In math, our overall achievement stayed the same in 3rd grade but declined 4 to 10 points in grades 4-6. More concerning is the significant increase in the number of level ones in both ELA & math in last year's 4th & 5th grades.

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.

Ocean Breeze out performed the state in all categories.

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

Based on the data we have for 2023, our 3rd grade ELA score improved most significantly. We focused an SIP goal on grade 3 ELA, we hosted after school power hour sessions for support with our 3rd graders, we targeted ELA in team planning and data review meetings with grade 3.

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

In the 2023 data, one area of concern is the number of first and second grade students being identified for retention consideration. Another is the number of level 1's scored by our current 5th & 6th grades in both ELA & math, and the number of students identified as substantially deficient prior to grade 3 (core instruction) concerns.

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

1) Decrease the number of level 1's in 5th & 6th math & ELA.
2) Continue growth in learning gains, especially for our SWD subgroup.
3) Strengthen overall achievement scores for SWD to, at least, 50% in math & ELA.

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

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.

47% of SWDs scored L3 or above in math and 49% in ELA. Our lowest scoring areas in 2023 are with our lowest 25% and in the SWD subgroup. While we made gains in the SWD subgroup in 2023, according to our data review, this subgroup continues to perform below our other subgroups. Our SWD population is often also part of the lowest 25%, so there is a connection to these data points.

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

At least 50% of SWDs will achieve a level 3; of those not meeting L3, 25% will make a learning gain as evidenced on the FAST PM 3.

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

-Monthly data meetings
-Intervention data and action based on decision trees
-Lexia data (T2 & 3)
-iReady diagnostic & myPath data
-ESE progress reports/progress on goals and objectives
-FAST progress monitoring

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

-SWD students will be provided tiered interventions according to the MTSS process and decision trees.
-SWD students will use Lexia intervention weekly to support instruction
-Scaffolding of instruction to fill gaps.
-Invite students who are L 1 or L2 to after school "Power Hour" tutoring opportunities.

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

These strategies have assisted us slowly improving overall achievement rates in math & ELA for our SWD population. It is critical we continue to build on tiered interventions and acceleration for our SWD population.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

-Tiered interventions during SMART (intervention time).
-Strong core instruction
-Scaffolding of instruction to fill gaps.
-Standards Mastery (i-Ready)- teachers will adhere to curriculum units/
standards focus document/pacing guides.
-Observations looking for task alignment with standards
-Intervention/supplemental support opportunities.
-ESE teachers will provide push in services for ELA & math (inclusive
scheduling), particularly in the to the maximum extent according to student
needs.

Person Responsible: Shelley Michaud (michaud.shelley@brevardschools.org)

By When: Core instruction and interventions will be monitored and adjusted as needed throughout the school year.

#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.

Address the increase in the number of students scoring a L1 in ELA & math.

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

Reduce the number of students scoring a Level 1 and increase the number of students moving between learning gain levels by 25% (focus on 5th & 6th grade level 1's).

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

Benchmark/Savvas & Reveal/EdGems unit assessments
FAST progress monitoring
Lexia usage and growth for T2 & T3 students
Classroom instructional walks in ELA
iReady My Path data
PLC meetings to review data
After school support for L1 & L2 students with a focus on high L2's

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Chantell McKenzie (mckenzie.chantell@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.)

Delivery of daily standards aligned lessons, tasks, and assessments aligned to the Standards Focus Documents/Pacing Guides and curriculum units. Continuous review & adjustment of intervention strategies and supports for students.

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

The rationale for this strategy is that providing standards based curriculum aligned ELA & math lessons with integrity, Ocean Breeze 5th & 6th graders should perform consistently and competitively with grade level beachside counterparts.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

-Walk-throughs with look fors focused on alignment, and adherence to pacing guides, standards aligned lessons, tasks, and assessments aligned to Standards Focus Document/Benchmark/Savvas & Reveal/ EdGem Units/Pacing Guides.
-Tiered interventions and data review

-Small group instruction
-After school support for L1 & L2 students with a focus on high L2's
-Regular review of assessment & intervention data to determine of areas of need and refinement.
-Corrective feedback
-Offer PD to staff pertaining to instruction and intervention.

Person Responsible: Shelley Michaud (michaud.shelley@brevardschools.org)

By When: Consistently throughout the school year.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed. One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.
Continued reinforcement of a safe and positive school environment is critical to student achievement.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.
Each adult will have a working radio to communicate with colleagues and building admin, particularly as it pertains to issues of student and school safety.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.
Effective communication during monthly safety drills and throughout the day to promote a positive environment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
[no one identified]
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.)
Providing working radio communication to all staff in order to promote safety, communication, and a positive environment to maximize achievement.
Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.
SAC believes that school safety and communication are vital to a positive school environment and thus student achievement.
Tier of Evidence-based Intervention (Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)
Tier 3 - Promising 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.
Purchase and repair radios to ensure that all adults in the building have working radios for communication and safety.
Person Responsible: Shelley Michaud (michaud.shelley@brevardschools.org)
By When: January