Brevard Public Schools

Theodore Roosevelt Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Theodore Roosevelt Elementary School

1400 MINUTEMEN CSWY, Cocoa Beach, FL 32931

http://www.roosevelt.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.

To provide a safe and supportive environment in which students are guided in becoming independent lifelong learners and respectful citizens. We strive to meet the unique needs of all students through a commitment to educational equity and excellence. (Revised 20-21)

Provide the school's vision statement.

Roosevelt students are empowered to reach their full potential and succeed in a safe, engaging environment filled with a rigorous education and an understanding, respect, and tolerance for differences.
(Revised 20-21)

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
Hill-Brodigan, Elizabeth	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. The principal oversees the instructional decision making at all levels. She collaborates with all classroom teachers through 40 minute PLCs, MTSS meetings and observations. Decisions are made based on stakeholders input and disaggregation of data from multiple data points. Support may include professional development, coaching and other strategies as necessary. As the leader of the leadership team, the principal guides the growth and development of the SIP across the school. The principal participates in biweekly 40 minute PLCs with each grade level and the school leadership team.
Verduzco, Chelsea	Instructional Coach	Supporting teachers and administration with state/district and school base assessments * data collection and analysis * providing professional development to assist with rigorous standards-based instruction * managing the iReady data and observing instruction to provide assistance and any needed resources * instructing and managing Reading Endorsement course
Bolitho, Jon	Assistant Principal	Observe instruction in efforts to support teacher goal setting and implementation. Monitor, observe instruction and provide feedback for noted achievement and growth needs. Site in-service representative-this component of the assistant principal's role is vital to ensure that teachers are participating in ongoing quality professional development. Review and communicate faculty/staff/student needs. Discipline of students: Tracking data to ensure student discipline needs are being met and addressed adequately. Coordinate and facilitate yearly after school support program. Serve as an active member of school leadership team, threat assessment team. Coordinate safety drills. Ensure textbook needs are met. FOCUS contact and campus facilitator. Communicate key information vital to our school improvement goals and needs to faculty, staff and community. Be an active member and participant in stakeholder focused organizations

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		(Parent Teacher Organization). Support faculty, staff, and students through recognition of their efforts and accomplishments.

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.

Parents are invited to participate in a yearly parent survey. The survey is available in English and Spanish. The survey is open for approximately three weeks. A summary of the parent survey results are reported and posted on the Roosevelt website. Results are shared with various parent groups, SAC/ PTO. Survey results and comments guide school improvement efforts and are used to meet the diverse needs of Roosevelt students and families.

In addition, we conduct yearly student surveys including a Speak Up survey. We invite our parents, students, faculty, and community members to participate in the annual Speak Up survey. This is an opportunity for them to have a voice in helping plan for the future of instructional technology integration within Roosevelt.

Staff and teacher surveys are also conducted each year. These surveys showed both parents and teachers wanted a full time principal. The surveys also showed a need for better school wide communication.

Our School Advisory council and parent teacher organization also meets monthly. Turn out for both the PTO and SAC were very low last year.

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 is regularly monitored with fidelity to indicate whether our school is making sufficient progress toward its end goals. We discuss and plan for the SIP with our faculty in August. Each month after, we track the progress of each learner toward the attainment of proficiency in ELA, math, and science. We conduct various checkpoints for formal evaluations of the plan in progress. The leadership team conducts classroom walk throughs and observations. We attend data team meetings/PLC's bi-monthly. We discuss and analyze data from PM1-PM3. We have daily acceleration groups to give our students with the greatest achievement gaps the most attention. For evidence of impact, we will revise the plan as necessary to ensure continuous improvement.

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	28%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	39%
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)	
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	0	5	4	3	0	5	7	0	0	24
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	3
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	2	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	3	10	5	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	4	11	8	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	6	4	6	4	8	6	0	0	36

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

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

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	3	5	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	10
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	9	2	1	4	7	9	0	0	32
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	3	1	2	2	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	8	7	5	0	0	20
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	0	2	1	1	0	0	4

The number of students identified retained:

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

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	9	2	1	4	7	9	0	0	32
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	3	1	2	2	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	2	4	0	0	8
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	8	7	5	0	0	20
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

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	0	2	1	1	0	0	4

The number of students identified retained:

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

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.

District and State data will be uploaded when available.

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	73			75			78		
ELA Learning Gains	75			74			62		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	76			69			53		
Math Achievement*	69			67			75		
Math Learning Gains	69			71			71		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	71			60			72		
Science Achievement*	77			57			73		

Accountability Component	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Social Studies Achievement*									
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	73
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	510
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98
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	64			
ELL				
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				
HSP	90			
MUL	89			
PAC				
WHT	71			
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	73	75	76	69	69	71	77					
SWD	50	100		33	71							
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	100			80								
MUL	83	90		92	90							
PAC												
WHT	71	73	78	67	64	68	76					
FRL	76	78	73	70	76	77	69					

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	75	74	69	67	71	60	57					
SWD	50	54		44	46							
ELL												

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												
HSP	77			62								
MUL	100			70								
PAC												
WHT	73	71	64	67	69	61	53					
FRL	72	71		61	61		36					

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	78	62	53	75	71	72	73					
SWD	57	55	56	49	66	64	69					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	67	50		63	56							
MUL	79	45		79	82							
PAC												
WHT	81	64	56	78	70	71	78					
FRL	83	72		69	71	77	60					

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.

School, District and State data will be uploaded when available.

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.

Our current fifth graders, showed the lowest performance for the second year in a row. Last year, they were at a 58% ELA proficiency, which is below the district average of 61%. In math, they were only 45% proficiency which is both below the district average of 60% and state average of 61%. This is an unfortunate trend we are seeing with this group of students. When they were third graders we also saw a large decline in both tested areas. Grade 3 ELA fell from 77% in 2021 to 66% proficiency in 2022 in ELA, as well as Math proficiency fell from 62% in 2021 to 41% in 2022. A possible contributing factor could be attendance. Five of these students, which is 14%, were absent 10% or more days. In addition, three of the six students with IEP's scored a level 1 in ELA. In math, five out of six students scored a level 1. We were operating with a pull out service model for these students. Lastly, two out of our three students with 504's scored below grade level proficiency in ELA and both scored a level one in math.

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

Our largest decline was with our current fifth grade students. In math, two years ago, they were at 76% proficiency. Last year, they were only at 44% proficiency, this a drop of 32%.
We have seen a decline of our overall ELA achievement for this same group of students. In 2022, we had 73% proficient. Last year, only 58% were proficient. A possible contributing factor could be attendance. Five of these students, which is 14%, were absent 10% or more days. In addition, three of the six students with IEP's scored a level 1 in ELA. In math, five out of six students scored a level 1. We were operating with a pull out service model for these students. Lastly, two out of our three students with 504's scored below grade level proficiency in ELA and both scored a level one in math.

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.

Our current fifth grade students showed 44% proficiency in math. The state average was 61%. This is a gap of 17%. A possible contributing factor could be attendance. Five of these students, which is 14%, were absent 10% or more days. In addition, five out of six students scored a level 1 in math. We were operating with a pull out service model for these students. Lastly, two out of our three students with 504's both scored a level one in math. It is essential that all students are provided an opportunity to achieve their highest academic, professional and life goals regardless of race/ethnicity, disability, economic status, or native language. We are working hard to ensure that each and every student has this opportunity by improving the performance of all students while also closing the achievement gap through the implementation of system-level strategies and by measuring and tracking key performance metrics.

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

As usual, our 6th graders showed the most improvement compared to the state average. Our 6th grade ELA and math proficiency was 27% higher than the state average. The fact that Brevard has 6th grade in elementary school is the contributing factor to this. In addition, this group of students improved their math proficiency by 14%.
also to be noted, our third grade students increased 7% in ELA and 19% in math. A possible contributing factor to this is the consistency of teachers.

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

When analyzing data from our early warning systems, attendance is an area of concern. Forty-nine of these students, which is 18%, were absent 10% or more days. In addition, nineteen students with IEP's scored a level 1 in ELA. In math, twenty-four students scored a level 1. We were operating with a pull out service model for these students. Lastly, two out of our three students with 504's scored below grade level proficiency in ELA and both scored a level one in math.

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

Our highest priorities for school improvement this school year are:
1) Increase math proficiency in all grade levels. Last years 3rd grade is at 60% proficiency, 4th grade is at 44% proficiency, 5th grade is at 75%, and 6th grade is at 82%. For our primary grades, kindergarten is at 74% proficiency, 1st grade is at 79%, and 2nd grade is at 72%.

2) Increase ELA proficiency in all grade levels. Last years 3rd grade is at 73% proficiency, 4th grade is at 58% proficiency, 5th grade is at 66%, and 6th grade is at 74%. For our primary grades, kindergarten is at 77% proficiency, 1st grade is at 81%, and 2nd grade is at 65%.

3) Increase science proficiency in 5th grade. Last years 5th graders we are at 73% proficiency which is the same level of proficiency we achieved in 2022. In 2021 we were at a 60% proficiency.

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 Math

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

In looking at the 2023-2023 FAST PM3 math data, not all of our grade levels increased in the level of students proficient. Our 3rd grade was at 60% proficiency, with 13% of students scoring a level one. 4th grade was at 44% proficiency, with 33% of students scoring a level one. Our 5th grade was at 75% proficiency, with 11% of students scoring a level one. 6th grade is at 82% with 4% of students scoring a level one.
In our primary grades, kindergarten was at 74% proficiency, 1st grade at 79%, and 2nd grade at 72%. Our overall proficiency for 3rd-6th grade math is at 65%. While our overall proficiency for K-2 math is 75%. Last years 4th graders, this years 5th graders are a particular area of focus, with them scoring 44% proficiency.

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

Our goal is to increase 3rd-6th math achievement from 65% to 75% meeting proficiency. 3rd Grade will improve from 60% to 70%, 4th Grade will improve from 44% to 70%, 5th Grade will improve from 75% to 80%, and 6th Grade will improve from 82% to 85%.

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

We will monitor this through our i-Ready diagnostics, which are done three times a year. We will monitor using STAR/FAST data from our September and January, and finally our May, EOY testing. Respectively, we will monitor our students i-Ready instructional pathway pass rate, and will intervene when a student is failing lessons. If a student continues to fail lessons, we will adjust the student's path to close the gap and provide teacher assigned lessons in the area needing further support. We will continue to use the classroom assessments as another data point. This will provide feedback to use during our intervention/acceleration where there are activity teachers pushing in to support instruction.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jon Bolitho (bolitho.jonathan@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.)

Throughout the last several years, Roosevelt has been targeting the instructional needs of students using differentiated instruction and progress monitoring using i-Ready, FSA, subgroup and other formative assessments. These strategies will continue this year, and we will be using the STAR/FAST progress monitoring data as well, and will be even more involved with students knowing their own achievement throughout the year using data tracking through the iReady program. Students will track their own data for i-Ready diagnostics, as well as i-Ready weekly lesson pass rates.
We will also be implementing acceleration in all grades by using our activity teachers to push into classrooms and provide support to the classroom teacher and to the students who are already on grade level. This will allow those students who need intervention to receive the small group time with their teacher, and those students who need acceleration to receive that small group instruction as well.
We will focus on small group instruction, use of manipulatives, acceleration, and having/using a math rich vocabulary classroom.

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

Differentiated Instruction relies on the teacher knowing students academically and on a more personal level.
Acquiring and using data effectively, calls for both students and teachers to engage in progress monitoring. Monitoring student progress provides ongoing checks which enables the teacher to plan for instruction based on the various data collection tools (i.e. i-Ready, FAST, formative and summative classroom assessments etc.) Effect size speaks to the impact that a particular strategy has on student achievement. Any effect size .40 or higher, is positive (Hattie, 2013). Roosevelt has shown increases in our Math Learning Gains and Lowest 25th Percentile learning gains by double digits. The teachers know that what they have implemented works. Teacher confidence after a year of success implementing these strategies will increase and confidence in one's ability has a .92 effect size (Hattie, 2017). Acceleration and intervention were rated tier 1 strong by Whatworksclearninghouse.com.
Our K-5 math curriculum meets expectations according to Edreports.com. Specifically for alignment and usability.
Using visual reputations has a tier 1 strong rating according to the whatworksclearinghouse.

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.

We reviewed last years FAST and i-Ready data. We also reviewed our STAR/FAST data from the September progress monitoring to create groups for our interventions and acceleration. We will discuss ongoing assessments at data chats and make adjusts to intervention groups as needed.

Person Responsible: Jon Bolitho (bolitho.jonathan@brevardschools.org)

By When: September and ongoing

Conduct data chats to set goals and assess the ongoing implementation of instruction purposed for addressing goals.

Person Responsible: Jon Bolitho (bolitho.jonathan@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

Collect mid and end of year data from in class instructional efforts and assessments as well as district and iReady assessments for ongoing review and goal adjustments as needed

Person Responsible: Jon Bolitho (bolitho.jonathan@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

Our math coach is doing math observations and giving teachers specific feedback to their lessons as well as providing coaching for individual teachers as needed. (Bi-monthly)
In addition, administration will walk classrooms on a bi-weekly basis and use our Good to Great Cycle SIP look for form.
Professional development on our SIP goals, will be provided at grade level meetings, data chats, and faculty meetings. Specifically small groups, manipulatives, and staying on pacing guides.

Person Responsible: Elizabeth Hill-Brodigan (hill-brodigan.elizabeth@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing- bi-monthly Bi-weekly

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

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

Another area of focus is to increase ELA proficiency in all grade levels. Currently, 3rd grade is at 73% proficiency, 4th grade is at 58% proficiency, 5th grade is at 66%, and 6th grade is at 74%.Our overall proficiency rate for 3rd-6th ELA is 68%. The previous year, our overall percentage of students scoring a level 3 or higher was 73% down from 75% the year before. Last years 4th graders, this years 5th graders are a particular area of focus, with them scoring 58% proficiency.
For our primary grades, kindergarten is at 77% proficiency, 1st grade is at 81%, and 2nd grade is at 65%. Our overall proficiency rate for K-2 ELA is 72%.

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

Our goal is to increase 3rd-6th ELA achievement from 68% to 73% meeting proficiency. 3rd Grade will improve from 73% to 75%, 4th Grade will improve from 58% to 70%, 5th Grade will improve from 66% to 75%, and 6th Grade will improve from 74% to 80%. K-2 80%.

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

We will continue to focus on the data and will monitor students throughout the year through our bi-weekly data chats and monitoring their STAR/FAST progress monitoring data, as well as benchmark unit assessments. We will use evidence based data to execute strategies and to make decisions to positively impact our students. Strategies will align with our standards and core instruction. We will also monitor direct instruction of ELA through our use of data walkthroughs.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Chelsea Verduzco (verduzco.chelsea@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.)

We will focus on our students' data during our bi-weekly meetings with teachers and teachers will meet with students individually to discuss their data with them. We will also have data chats with teachers to discuss which students need tier 2 vs tier 3 interventions based on decision trees. We will also make sure to include ALL students by using online grade level spreadsheets to discuss all trends. We will
implement acceleration in all classrooms with the support of activity teachers. Our literacy coach will support teachers in the implementation of the district curriculum and the planning of small group instruction. This year, we will also implement collaborative planning with the coach and grade levels before the start of each unit. Last years 4th graders, this years 5th graders are a particular area of focus, with them scoring 58% proficiency. Students will utilize iReady curriculum for 45 minutes each week. Students and teachers will also monitor their passage rates and set goals.

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

Data-driven instruction has been proven to be one of the most effective methods. This is noted by Robert J. Marzano, What Works In Schools: Translating Research Into Action. "Indeed, one of the defining, characteristics of schools producing unprecedented gains in student achievements, is that they rely on data to identify probable successful

interventions (Hopkins & Ainskow, 1993). Teachers rely on data to make decisions of students specific needs and understand when teaching and learning is working and when it its not. Data-driven instruction emphasizes on whether students have mastered and learned the desire necessary skills. "They also rely on data to determine how effective those interventions are when implemented (Barth et al., 1999; Schmoker, 2001).
Acceleration and intervention were rated tier 1 strong by Whatworksclearninghouse.com.
Benchmarks for K-5 and Savvas My Perspectives for grade 6 are both rated as meets expectations for alignment and usability according to EdReports.
iReady by Curriculum Associates is rated as meets expectations for alignment and usability according to EdReports.

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.

Monitor student achievement and progress on STAR and FAST progress monitoring assessments, monitor unit assessments through Benchmark by analyzing data in Performance Matters, and use i-Ready pathways and diagnostics, as well as inform teachers of pertinent data as needed.

Person Responsible: Chelsea Verduzco (verduzco.chelsea@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

For the purpose of coaching support, observe in classrooms in collaboration with the teacher to support the implementation of the reading curriculum. We will be focusing on teaching Benchmark and BEST standards with fidelity. We will continue to emphasize the planning and teaching of small group instruction in ELA.

Person Responsible: Chelsea Verduzco (verduzco.chelsea@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

Monitor teachers interim and report card comments, as well as PMPs, and substantially deficient monthly communications home.

Person Responsible: Jon Bolitho (bolitho.jonathan@brevardschools.org)

By When: Monthly

#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.

Based on the 2023 Florida NGSSS data, our science proficiency stayed exactly the same, 73%. We were the only school out of 58 Brevard elementary schools to stay exactly the same.
In 2022, we improved from 57% to 73%. While this is a large increase in proficiency, we want to continue this positive trend. Our current 5th grade group has struggled the most with ELA and math proficiency. While working with this group very closely in ELA and math, we need to also make sure we are also supporting science. We will continue to work on implementing formative and summative assessments, while also using PENDA in 3rd-6th grade to enhance our science learning. Our 3rd grade teacher leader and administrations will monitor PENDA usage and achievement.

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

We will increase our Florida NGSSS science scores from 73% proficiency to 75% proficiency.

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

We will progress monitor the science standards from K-6 with the summative and formative assessments tracked on the Brevard County science website and put the information on a sheet as part of the data notebook, that we will discuss in data chats monthly. We will also analyze month science Penda reports.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Jon Bolitho (bolitho.jonathan@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 5E Model, developed in 1987 by the Biological Sciences Curriculum Study, promotes collaborative, active learning in which students work together to solve problems and investigate new concepts by asking question, observing, analyzing, and drawing conclusions. The 5E Model is based on the constructivist theory to learning, which suggests that people construct knowledge and meaning from experiences. By understanding and reflecting on activities, students are able to reconcile new knowledge with previous ideas.

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

When we learn things it isn't for memorizing a piece of information. Just reciting science facts or principles is not what we want children to be able to do. We want them to be able to go out in the world and make sense of novel phenomenon. The NGSSS calls for students to actively engage in science. 5E mentally engages students with a question or activity. hands on activities will be explored. Teachers will then provide the concepts or terms used for students to provide explanations and elaborate via writing on what was observed. Students will discuss and compare ideas with others. Finally they will reflect and evaluate learning. With the changes required in the updated science, engineering and computer technology fair, teachers and students can use the 5E model to go through the process together as a class prior to working on individual or team projects.

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.

Continuous training on the 5E model of science instruction to new and returning teachers.

Person Responsible: Jon Bolitho (bolitho.jonathan@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

School-wide science experiments and SMASH night to kick off science fair for all grade levels.

Person Responsible: Holly Schumann-Grubb (schumann-grubb.holly@brevardschools.org)

By When: October 2023

Continuous use of PENDA for grades 3-6 with action board in the hallways showing student success.

Person Responsible: Jon Bolitho (bolitho.jonathan@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing