Palm Bay Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Palm Bay Elementary School

1200 ALAMANDA RD NE, Palm Bay, FL 32905

http://www.palmbay.es.brevard.k12.fl.us

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Brevard County School Board on 10/24/2023.

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.

Palm Bay Elementary School's mission is to empower our diverse community to lead and learn.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Palm Bay Elementary School's vision is to be the first choice for innovative leaders and learners.

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
Mahl, Michael	Principal	Develops and shares a vision of academic success including the allocation of fiscal and human capital resources. Monitors effectiveness of vision through classroom walkthroughs, Instructional Rounds with District Leaders and data analysis to ensure all systems align within the school community in order to improve student achievement. Serves as the Instructional Leader of the building. Leverages resource to provide teachers with the tools to support high quality learning and instruction. Models instructional practices through participation in collaborative planning and school wide professional development. Coordinates the development of an effective Multi-Tiered System of Supports to ensure students with need are provided with additional supports to achieve success. Leverages school leadership team members, teachers, and any additional staff that may be able to offer support in their area of expertise. It is through these meetings that discussions of classroom assessment data, grade level data trends, teaching strategies, curriculum, progress monitoring, and student behaviors are analyzed. If implemented interventions do not show an increase in student performance, a new or more intensive approach is developed.
Hollis, Lauren	Assistant Principal	Supports the realization of school wide vision by managing school resources. Provides instructional leadership by providing teachers with up-to-date, research based, effective practices that improve student achievement. Models effective instructional practices and supports teacher growth through observation and feedback through coaching cycles. Identifies and develops school leaders to enhance the impact of high-quality instructional practices. Encourages a culture of collaboration, self-reflection and growth through participation in collaborative planning sessions, data analysis/ MTSS meetings and coaching cycles.
Gjesdahl, Suzy	Reading Coach	Supports the successful implementation of school wide ELA goals by providing high quality professional development, leveraging resources and participating in coaching cycles. Serves as an instructional leader by sharing with teachers, high quality instructional practices and modeling lessons. Supports teachers with tools to develop and implement Tier II and III interventions to meet the needs of at risk students. Monitors the effective implementation of ELA curriculum by conducting data analysis meetings with grade level teachers and determining adjustments to practice as needed.
Hume, Michelle	Math Coach	Supports the successful implementation of the state approved math curriculum model by providing high quality professional development, leveraging resources and participating in coaching cycles. Serves as an instructional leader by sharing with teachers, high quality instructional practices and modeling lessons. Monitors the effective implementation of math curriculum by conducting data analysis meetings

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		with grade level teachers and determining adjustments to practice as needed.
Tagg, William	Administrative Support	Manages the implementation of school wide procedural goals including CHAMPS. Ensures teachers are provided with appropriate training and effectively implement practices. Collects data from walkthroughs and feedback from teachers to determine areas of success and support areas of development. Supports the implementation of high-quality 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.

Parent and teacher surveys are conducted throughout the year to gather data and review strategies. A Comprehensive Needs Assessment was conducted over the summer that included school leadership, teachers, support staff and parents to review data and develop strategies.

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))

Evidence of Implementation
- classroom walkthroughs
-data team meetings
-grade level collaborative planning
-agendas of meetings

Evidence of Impact
-student achievement data
-quarterly & unit assessments
-F.A.S.T. data 1-3

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	61%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%

Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
2021-22 ESSA Identification	ATSI
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Absent 10% or more days	21	22	21	17	13	9	14	0	0	117
One or more suspensions	3	11	10	13	1	13	13	0	0	64
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	1	6	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	1	6	20	31	30	0	0	88
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	15	18	34	0	0	67
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	5	3	7	4	6	0	0	26

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	3	3	6	7	8	15	18	0	0	60

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	4	4	3	6	0	0	2	0	0	19
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	5	3	4	0	0	13

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	30	27	24	17	17	22	0	0	137
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	0	5	3	18	0	0	30
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	16	25	29	0	0	70
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	15	29	47	0	0	91
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	9	20	14	7	22	18	0	0	90

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	1	1	17	23	42	0	0	85

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	9	3	7	0	0	1	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	0	0	6

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	30	27	24	17	17	22	0	0	137
One or more suspensions	0	1	3	0	5	3	18	0	0	30
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	16	25	29	0	0	70
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	15	29	47	0	0	91
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	9	20	14	7	22	18	0	0	90

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	1	1	17	23	42	0	0	85

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	9	3	7	0	0	1	0	0	20
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	1	1	3	0	0	6

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*	33	61	56	47	62	57
ELA Learning Gains	55	63	61	52	60	58
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	52	54	52	43	57	53
Math Achievement*	40	60	60	47	63	63
Math Learning Gains	54	64	64	59	65	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	50	55	55	42	53	51

Accountability Component	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	21	56	51	45	57	53
Social Studies Achievement*		0	50		0	
Middle School Acceleration						
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress	67			39		

* 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	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	372
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	36	Yes	3	
ELL	48			
AMI				
ASN				

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%
BLK	33	Yes	3	
HSP	41			
MUL	66			
PAC				
WHT	48			
FRL	44			

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	33	55	52	40	54	50	21					67
SWD	25	46	47	26	43	42	21					
ELL	26	53		26	67							67
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	13	46	48	25	42	43	11					
HSP	33	43		28	61							
MUL	53	80		63	67							
PAC												
WHT	42	59	47	50	55	53	30					
FRL	30	53	51	39	52	43	20					60

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	34	40	34	34	37	34	21					42
SWD	22	39	47	22	47	54	18					
ELL	26	29		39	29							42

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
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	18	30	33	19	41	41	0					
HSP	34	53		44	42							46
MUL	50			38								
PAC												
WHT	42	42		41	35	40	30					
FRL	32	39	30	32	37	38	12					45

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	52	43	47	59	42	45					39
SWD	27	36	33	40	55	39	33					
ELL	54	75		50	77							39
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	23	35	25	35	45	27	32					
HSP	56	65	75	50	75	50	46					43
MUL	52	50		45	58							
PAC												
WHT	57	58	48	54	61	50	52					
FRL	44	49	42	47	57	40	45					41

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	39%	59%	-20%	54%	-15%
04	2023 - Spring	29%	61%	-32%	58%	-29%
06	2023 - Spring	47%	61%	-14%	47%	0%
03	2023 - Spring	45%	56%	-11%	50%	-5%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	59%	67%	-8%	54%	5%
03	2023 - Spring	34%	60%	-26%	59%	-25%
04	2023 - Spring	21%	61%	-40%	61%	-40%
05	2023 - Spring	38%	55%	-17%	55%	-17%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	31%	57%	-26%	51%	-20%

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.

Overall ELA performance was 40% which is below the 50% threshold for R.A.I.S.E schools expectation. Of the three subject areas science was the lowest component at 31%. Additionally, math proficiency grades remain below 40%. Although our science scores have increased from 19% proficient from the previous year, data demonstrates that teachers would benefit from consistent collaborative planning with the science lab teacher.
The goal was to increase proficiency, mastery and full intent of the standard as opposed to surface level learning. Based on previous years' data, there appears to be a trend in learning gains in previous assessments that achieve mastery but fall short of proficiency.

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

The overall proficiency in math declined by 2% on this previous assessment. Some contributing factors include, learning a new curriculum, teacher vacancies, inconsistent collaborative planning.

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.

Math had the greatest gap at 19% when compared to the state average of 52%. Contributing factors include: teacher vacancies and inconsistent collaboration.

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

Science showed the most improvement increasing from 19% proficiency to 31% proficient. We added science lab to the activity wheel for grades 3-5 to provide hands-on lab experiences.

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

Two potential areas of concern based on the EWS are attendance and behavior.

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

Based on previous years' school data our highest priorities are increasing our proficiency levels in ELA, math, and science. Another high priority was in identifying an increase in behavior.

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.

Positive Behavior Intervention and Supports (PBIS) initiative with an emphasis on CHAMPS will be an area of focus. These programs contribute to a positive learning environment with fewer disruptions. Throughout the year professional development will occur for all teachers.

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

The goal is to decrease the number of administration-managed discipline incidents and student referrals schoolwide as documented in FOCUS. Another goal is to decrease our number of incidents by 10% and reduce the number of suspensions by 30% for our Black students and Students with Disabilities.

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

Evidence of Implementation:
The leadership team will walk through all classrooms monthly to collect data on the implementation of PBIS and CHAMPS.

Evidence of Impact:
The leadership team will meet monthly to discuss student discipline data as well as classroom walkthrough data. During these meetings, the leadership team will utilize classroom walkthrough data to determine which teachers require additional coaching. Monthly PBIS meetings with the entire faculty will be an opportunity to review school wide trends and to provide professional development around PBIS and CHAMPS.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lauren Hollis (hollis.lauren@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 Positive Behavior System is a research-based program that creates a schoolwide common language and set of expectations. The token currency encourages students to follow expectations.

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

We provide our staff with tools to maintain a positive learning environment using PBIS and CHAMPS structures. By using a positive language approach, the culture of the school will improve.

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 Learning using the CHAMPS and PBIS programs.

Person Responsible: Ashley Rothe (rothe.ashely@brevardschools.org)

By When: Monthly

#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.

Palm Bay's proficiency rates remain under 50% in ELA, Math and Science for the fourth year in a row. Our ELA proficiency rate is 40%, math 38% and science is 31%. Reviewing walk-through data from the previous year, we noticed a that small group instruction was inconsistent during Tier 1 instruction. Therefore the need for Tier 2 targeted instruction is still a need.

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

Palm Bay Elementary would like to increase the percentage of students scoring a level 3 or above on FAST by 10% in each subject area, ELA, math and science.

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

This area of focus will be monitored using lesson plans to ensure small group instruction is being purposefully planned for and walk-through day will monitor the implementation of the lesson plans.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Lauren Hollis (hollis.lauren@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.)

Differentiate small group instruction within the core program gives access to on grade level material for all students. According to High Leverage Practices, "Scaffolded supports are provided to students that are either pre-planned or provided "on the spot" and then faded and/or removed once they are not needed."

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

According to our walk-through data Palm Bay Elementary's small group instruction is inconsistent. When looking at the state assessment data we can see that not all of our students are scoring proficient in all subject areas. Providing differentiated small group instruction and target small group interventions will support all learners.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

Professional Learning for planning and implementing small group instruction by coaches and administration (T).

Person Responsible: Lauren Hollis (hollis.lauren@brevardschools.org)

By When: September 29, 2023.

Conduct monthly walkthroughs conducted by both administration and coaches to monitor the implementation.

Person Responsible: Lauren Hollis (hollis.lauren@brevardschools.org)

By When: Monthly.

Review and analyze walkthrough data and retrain as necessary with coaches and administration.

Person Responsible: Michael Mahl (mahl.mike@brevardschools.org)

By When: Monthly.

Implementing targeted small group during Tier 1 instruction with support of a Instruction Assistant (T) and targeted interventions with an intervention teacher (T)

Person Responsible: Lauren Hollis (hollis.lauren@brevardschools.org)

By When: Throughout the year

#3. 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.

Palm Bay's proficiency rates remain under 50% in ELA, Math and Science for the fourth year in a row. Our ELA proficiency rate is 40%, math 38% and science is 31%. Reviewing walk-through data from the previous year, we noticed a that small group instruction was inconsistent during Tier 1 instruction. Therefore the need for Tier 2 targeted instruction is still a need.

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

Palm Bay Elementary would like to increase the percentage of students scoring a level 3 or above on FAST by 10% in each subject area, ELA, math and science.

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

This area of focus will be monitored using classroom walk-throughs to ensure instruction is aligned to the full intent of the standard including activities and the materials used for instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Michael Mahl (mahl.mike@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.)

Standards aligned high quality core instruction gives equitable access for all students and lies at the very heart of effective and sustainable tiered systems.

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

According to the Center for Educational Leadership, "The ultimate goal of everything we do in education is to increase student achievement." To that, we need to ensure that the content we are presenting to students is targeted and complex. Another key is developing a community of leaders, a culture of collaboration, and the
constant desire and opportunity for teachers to grow professionally.

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.

Administration and coaches will collaboratively plan with teachers.

Person Responsible: Lauren Hollis (hollis.lauren@brevardschools.org)

By When: Twice a month.

Materials and programs to implement the state approved curriculum will be purchased, including but not limited to math manipulatives, science programs and fieldtrips, books and programs to support ELA instruction and technology to use programs in the classroom (T).

Person Responsible: Michelle Hume (hume.michelle@brevardschools.org)

By When: Throughout the year.

Implementation of a hands on science lab for grades 3-5 with a science lab teacher. (T)

Person Responsible: Michael Mahl (mahl.mike@brevardschools.org)

By When: Each class has an extended lab time weekly on the activity wheel.

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).

Parent and teacher surveys are conducted throughout the year to gather data and review strategies. A Comprehensive Needs Assessment was conducted over the summer that included school leadership, teachers, support staff and parents to review data and develop strategies. Based on these strategies goals were set and funds were allocated to the necessary resources.

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

This area of focus will be Implementation of Standards Aligned ELA instruction with an emphasis on small group instruction to close the achievement gap for all students, especially our African American and Students with
Disabilities subgroups. Our targeted small group intervention program for K-2 will focus on phonics and phonemic awareness using district approved intervention materials purchased with Title 1 funds. Feedback will be provided to teachers during planning and coaching to help them identify how to scaffold learning for struggling students.

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

This area of focus will be Implementation of Standards Aligned ELA instruction with an emphasis on small group instruction to close the achievement gap for all students, especially our African American and Students with
Disabilities subgroups. Our targeted small group intervention program for 3-5 will focus on vocabulary and
comprehension using district approved intervention materials purchased with Title 1 funds.
Feedback will be provided to teachers during planning and coaching to help them identify how to scaffold learning for struggling students.

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

Increase proficiency in grades K-2 by 10%, helping to increase schoolwide proficiency to 50%.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Increase proficiency in grades 3-6 10%, helping to increase schoolwide proficiency to 50%.

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.

Administrators and coaches will conduct regular classroom walk throughs to determine what supports are
still needed for teachers.
Student achievement data will be monitored and discussed with teachers regularly. District Quarterly ELA
Assessments, iReady Diagnostic, FAST Progress Monitoring will be used to monitor student progress.

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

Mahl, Michael, mahl.mike@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?

Teachers will collaboratively plan and effectively scaffold grade level material to meet the needs of all learners. Teachers will plan for intentional small group instruction using assessment data. Teachers will have support in planning and scaffolding their small group instruction from coaches and administrators.

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?

According to research by Pentimonti et al., there was a low utilization of scaffolding strategies across classrooms despite high impact on student learning.
Research by Watts-Taffe and Later research suggest that small groups for differentiation are an effective practice in literacy instruction.

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
Provide professional development for teachers on scaffolding small group instruction.	Mahl, Michael, mahl.mike@brevardschools.org
Teachers will participate in collaborative planning sessions supported by coaches and administration.	Mahl, Michael, mahl.mike@brevardschools.org
The leadership team will collect and analyze data after each assessment. Assessment data will be discussed monthly during grade level meetings.	Mahl, Michael, mahl.mike@brevardschools.org
Teachers will implement small group scaffolded instruction.	Mahl, Michael, mahl.mike@brevardschools.org
During classroom walkthroughs coaches and administration will collect data to support teachers in improving instruction.	Mahl, Michael, mahl.mike@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.

Once the SIP has been approved an announcement in the school newsletter is sent home to every family explaining where the SIP can be found and offering a printed version apon request, including translations. A message via Blackboard and FOCUS are sent out to families with a link to where the SIP can be viewed. The SIP is shared with our School Advisory Council several times a year and feedback is requested. Palm Bay Elementary's SWP is first addressed during our Annual Meeting which is advertised by a flyer and Blackboard messaging to all families. It is then discussed and reviewed at the School Advisory Meetings and Parent Meeting throughout the year.

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))

Palm Bay Elementary plans to build a positive relationship with its stakeholders through implementing feedback given by families throughout the year as possible. Our goal is to make families feel welcomed and heard. Much of the feedback received is in regard to our parent conference nights (T) and academics nights (T) that families attend to support their students' learning. During these events families

are given take home activities to support learning at home. Parents are trained how to use the materials. Families are informed of their children's progress through planners (T), interims, report cards and parent conferences and state assessment results are sent home within a week of their student completing the assessment.

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))

Palm Bay Elementary plans to strengthen its program through collaborative planning, small group instruction and targeted interventions. We have a bell-to-bell schedule to maximize student learning.

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))

Our Title I program is a school wide program meaning all students benefit from Title I funds. Our school currently hosts a Head Start program and the families involved in this program are invited and encouraged to participate in all of our events.