Sea Park Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Sea Park Elementary School

300 SEA PARK BLVD, Satellite Beach, FL 32937

http://seapark.es.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.

Our mission is to work collaboratively to create an enriched environment that supports all students and help them strive for academic excellence. (Reviewed 8/2023)

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our vision is to serve students with a safe, positive, engaging environment to foster personal growth. (Revised 8/2023)

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hall, Stephanie	Principal	The principal is the Instructional Leader in charge of executing and monitoring personnel, resources and strategies to ensure all students have equitable access to standards-based instruction. The principal will create a Literacy Leadership Team (LLT) by selecting teachers that have a strong understanding of literacy and the legislative reading requirements. The LLT will be co-chaired by the principal and literacy coach. The function of the LLT is to support the SIP goals for literacy, to engage stakeholders in improving ELA proficiency across grade levels, and to enrich the literacy culture of the school. The principal supports the MTSS team and equips teachers with tools they need to disaggregate student performance data. Perform classroom observations and provide continuous feedback on instructional practices.
Lizek, Angele	Assistant Principal	Supporting the principal in executing and monitoring personnel, resources, and strategies to ensure all students have equitable and equal access to effective standards-based instruction. Conduct classroom observations to provide teachers with continuous feedback on instructional practices. Participates in the Literacy Leadership Team to support the SIP goals for literacy, to engage stakeholders in improving ELA proficiency and enrich the literacy culture of the school. Supports the MTSS team and equips teachers with tools they need to disaggregate student performance data. Participate in parent conferences, refers students and parents to appropriate resources, oversees the utilization of district curriculum. Lead ELL committee and monitor progress of the Language Acquisition of our ELL students.
Willman, Debra	Instructional Coach	The literacy coach will co-chair the Literacy Leadership Team. The function of the LLT is to support the SIP goals for literacy, engage stakeholders in improving ELA proficiency across grade levels and to enrich the literacy culture of the school. The instructional coach will serve as member of the MTSS/IPST team. The role of the coach is to complete the coaching cycle and model standards-aligned lessons, providing feedback to the teacher by modeling lessons. Provide support to the teacher by modeling lessons, providing feedback from classroom observations and sharing resources to the teacher. Share effective instructional strategies, progress monitoring interventions, and diagnostic data with teachers to improve instruction.
Schroeder, Sarah	School Counselor	The School Counselor will operate as an active member of the school leadership team and MTSS/IPST team. Focus on developing Tier I and Tier II academic and behavior plans. Conduct focus group sessions to address social/emotional needs of identified students and conduct training to proactively combat bullying. Support families that are in transition with providing resources available throughout the community.
McGill, Samantha	Instructional Media	The Media Specialist will serve on the Literacy Leadership Team to support the SIP goals for literacy, engage stakeholders in improving ELA proficiency across grade levels, and to enrich the literacy culture of the school. The Media Specialist will provide enrichment and support to the classroom

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		teacher by planning lessons that enrich instruction in all subject areas. The Media Specialist will share resources with the classroom teachers to improve instruction.
Esmond, Teri	Teacher, ESE	Teacher leader to serve on the Literacy Leadership Team to support the SIP goals for literacy. Role on the School Leadership Team is to communicate needs of Students with Disabilities.
Hargis, Lindsay	Teacher, ESE	Teacher leader to serve on the Literacy Leadership Team to support the SIP goals for literacy. Role on the School Leadership Team is to communicate needs of Students with Disabilities.

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.

All Sea Park Elementary staff members will have opportunity to give input in the development of our school improvement plan during pre-planning. A draft of the plan will be shared with the School Advisory Council and members can give input .

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))

On-going progress monitoring of student data will be collected and reviewed. At the school level students in K-2 are assessed with the STAR, and 3-6 students are assessed with the FAST assessment in both Reading and Math. Students in Kindergarten are monitored with the Kindergarten Literacy Survey quarterly. Students in 1-6 have quarterly ELA Assessments. On-going i-Ready instructional pathway data is available in reading and math. Intervention data will be available on a 4-6 week cycle.

Actions for continuous support and improvement include:
-quarterly collaborative grade level planning of ELA instruction with instructional coach
-analysis sheets for BEST ELA standards
-ongoing professional developments
- site based coaching
-monitor usage and implementation of i-Ready and Lexia programs
-walkthroughs/feedback
-monthly data meetings
-MTSS/IPST/Literacy Leadership Team problem solving meetings
-SAC meetings monthly to monitor implementation of School Improvement Plan

Demographic Data	
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	

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	19%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	39%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	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)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	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	2	2	2	3	2	2	2	0	0	15
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	1	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	3	3	10	1	0	0	0	0	18
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

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	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	1

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	2	7	6	4	5	3	0	0	27
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	2	7	3	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	3	8	10	0	0	22
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	1	3	7	6	0	0	17

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	1	3	7	6	0	0	17

The number of students identified retained:

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

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	2	7	6	4	5	3	0	0	27
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	2	7	3	0	0	13
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	3	8	10	0	0	22
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	1	3	7	6	0	0	17

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	1	3	7	6	0	0	17

The number of students identified retained:

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

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	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	74	58	53	71	61	56	70		
ELA Learning Gains				65			75		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				54			57		
Math Achievement*	73	58	59	71	49	50	70		
Math Learning Gains				71			72		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				62			69		
Science Achievement*	78	58	54	74	60	59	72		
Social Studies Achievement*					64	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					56	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		54	59						

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	74
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	296
Total Components for the Federal Index	4

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	67
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	468
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 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	50			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL	60			
PAC				
WHT	78			
FRL	72			

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	40	Yes	1	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	66			
MUL	68			
PAC				
WHT	71			
FRL	64			

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)

2022-23 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	74			73			78					
SWD	48			52							2	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL	52			67							2	
PAC												
WHT	79			75			80				4	
FRL	71			71			69				4	

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	71	65	54	71	71	62	74					
SWD	38	39	40	47	43	30						
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	77			54								
MUL	61	54		78	77							
PAC												
WHT	73	67	58	74	75	65	84					
FRL	68	57	45	72	70	64	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	70	75	57	70	72	69	72					
SWD	44			44								
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL	83			78								
PAC												
WHT	72	75	50	73	70	70	68					
FRL	61	75		61	63							

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	76%	59%	17%	54%	22%
04	2023 - Spring	73%	61%	12%	58%	15%
06	2023 - Spring	80%	61%	19%	47%	33%
03	2023 - Spring	69%	56%	13%	50%	19%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	81%	67%	14%	54%	27%
03	2023 - Spring	77%	60%	17%	59%	18%
04	2023 - Spring	80%	61%	19%	61%	19%
05	2023 - Spring	62%	55%	7%	55%	7%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	75%	57%	18%	51%	24%

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 ESE students continue to be our lowest performing subgroup although we have made significant achievement gains from 2021-2022 to 2022-2023. In the 2021-2022 school year, 41% of our ESE students in grades 3-6 scored a level 3 or above of the Florida Standards Assessment in Reading. In the 2022-2023 school year, 53% of our ESE students in grades 3-6 scored a level 3 or above on the PM 3 FAST (Florida Assessment of Student Thinking) Reading Assessment. This was an improvement of 14 points however, this is still a gap between all students (Reading-76%, Math-75%, Science-75%) and ESE subgroup on FAST (Readng-57%, Math-60%, Science-33%). We know that ESE students in particular need information presented in multiple ways in order to process and store in long term memory. Our staff present material visually in a variety of formats. Science is non-fiction text and can be heavy in content vocabulary. Having a schoolwide way to visually present information being learned consistently across all grade levels and content areas will help ESE and all students determine what Thinking Map to use depending on task.

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

In comparing Sea Park's end of the year i-Ready data from the 2021-2022 school year to the 2022-2023 school year only 35% of second graders met their annual typical growth in reading, and only 28% of third graders met their annual typical growth in reading. When diving deeper into the i-Ready data vocabulary, reading informational text, and comprehension strategies are areas that students need support. During the 2022-2023 school year, teachers worked with literacy coach and administration to identify evidenced based interventions and provide interventions on a six week cycle. A shared document allowed teachers to record progress so that MTSS team could provide support throughout the cycle, however weekly data input was not as consistent across all grade levels.

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.

In every subject and grade level Sea Park outscores the state and district average. When looking at ESE and non-ESE students achievement in ELA compared to state (Sea Park: ESE=40%, Non-ESE=80% OGL Gap 40 points vs. State: ESE=21%, Non-ESE=57% Gap 36 points). Even though we are higher than the state with our ESE OGL, the gap between ESE students and Non ESE students is larger. When looking at the gap from ESE to Non ESE gap in Math the state gap is 30 points and the school gap is 30 points. (Sea Park: ESE=47%. Non-ESE=77% OGL Gap 30 points vs. State: ESE=25%, Non-ESE=55% OGL Gap 30 points).

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

25% of students in grades 3-6 scored a level 3 or above on the PM 1 FAST Math Assessment; That increased to 76 % of students in grades 3-6 scoring a level 3 or above on the PM 3 FAST Math Assessment, a 51 point gain. We adopted McGraw Hill Florida Reveal Math in K-5, and EdGems in Grade 6. A math coach worked with classroom teachers on the implementation and supported staff through professional development, coaching and collaborative lesson planning. Administration conducted weekly classroom walkthroughs to monitor the implementation and give on-going feedback.

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

We have a high ESE population in third grade and our class size is currently at 25 per class. We have received an additional third grade teacher, but do not have sufficient personnel to support inclusion in the general education classroom with just two ESE teachers who primarily serve students who are self-contained and pull out resource. Reworking the ESE schedules will be the first step in meeting all student needs.

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

1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark aligned Instruction.
2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities.
3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment.

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 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.

Based on our 2022-2023 FAST Reading progress monitoring data, 59% of our students in grades 3-6 scored a level 3 or above on the PM 1 Assessment. 74% of our students in grades 3-6 scored a level 3 or above on the FAST Reading PM 3 Assessment, a 15 point gain. Our gains in reading from PM1 to PM 3 are significantly less than gains in math.

Sea Park's end of the year 2022-2023 i-Ready data results reflect that in second grade only 35% of students met their annual typical growth in reading, and in third grade only 28% of students met their annual typical growth in reading on their comparison diagnostic data. Annual growth in reading is an identified area of concern.

To increase student achievement our focus is to strengthen critical and creative thinking skills aligned to the Florida B.E.S.T. standards.

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

In the 2023-2024 school year 90% of Sea Park students will meet their annual typical growth in reading in grades K-6 according to the i-Ready end of the year data. On the 2023-2024 FAST Reading PM 3 Assessment, 80% of our students in grades 3-6 will score a level 3 or above, an increase of 6%.

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

Classroom Walkthroughs with school "look fors"
Quarterly Collaborative Planning with Instructional Coaches.
Monthly Data Meetings to analyze STAR, FAST, i-Ready, Lexia, Penda, and Monthly and Quarterly Assessments.
MTSS meetings to problem solve
Monitor usage of on-line programs and mastery of assignments

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephanie Hall (hall.stephanie@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.)

This year Sea Park Elementary is implementing Thinking Maps Training for all staff. Thinking Maps is a set of 8 visual patterns that correlate to specific cognitive processes. They are used across all grades and content areas to build the critical thinking, problem-solving, comprehension, and communication skills necessary for academic success.

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

According to Hattie, the use of graphic organizers has an effect size of .6 supporting more than one year of growth when implemented with fidelity. Graphic organizers help students organize ideas, represent relationships, and retain information. Research shows that they are an effective tool in helping students make greater meaning of the information they come in contact with through text and classroom interaction (Narkawicz & Casteel, 2012; Weimer, 2009).

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.

On-going professional development on the implementation of Thinking Maps.

Person Responsible: Debra Willman (willman.debra@brevardschools.org)

By When: Preplanning, scheduled PD Fridays, and Grade Level Team meetings.

Observe and document Implementation on Frontline to include classroom walkthroughs and informal and formal observations.

Person Responsible: Angele Lizek (lizek.angele@brevardschools.org)

By When: Bi-weekly

Facilitate quarterly extended planning for grade level teams to work collaboratively with instructional coaches to develop standards aligned lesson plans and identify thinking maps that aligned with thinking processes being taught.

Person Responsible: Angele Lizek (lizek.angele@brevardschools.org)

By When: Quarterly

Provide Quality Questioning professional development to deepen student's understanding of content through discourse.

Person Responsible: Debra Willman (willman.debra@brevardschools.org)

By When: September and January professional development days.

Vocabulary and word study professional development utilizing thinking maps.

Person Responsible: Debra Willman (willman.debra@brevardschools.org)

By When: On-going

Communicate to parents the Read-At-Home Plan and provide additional resources to support student learning from Pre-K to 6th Grade. This includes monthly in writing communication to parents for all Tier 2 and Tier 3 students.

Person Responsible: Debra Willman (willman.debra@brevardschools.org)

By When: On-going

Literacy Coach will facilitate bi-weekly data meetings and participate in grade level planning to align instruction to ensure students are mastering the B.E.S.T. standards in ELA and Math. Teachers will complete GoogleShare document with Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions to monitor students at risk.

Person Responsible: Debra Willman (willman.debra@brevardschools.org)

By When: On-going

All students not meeting grade level standards and benchmarks in grades 3-5 will be invited to participate in the Academic Support Program. ASP Reading and ASP Math will be held from the middle of January through March 2024.

Person Responsible: Angele Lizek (lizek.angele@brevardschools.org)

By When: The end of March 2024.

During classroom walkthroughs instructional coaches will monitor instructional practices and student engagement. Administration will meet with teachers and give immediate feedback for continuous teacher improvement.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Hall (hall.stephanie@brevardschools.org)

By When: On-going

Work with school staff to utilize the Beanstack platform to encourage and nurture a love for reading. Increase the circulation of books in the media center and use incentive programs.

Person Responsible: Samantha McGill (mcgill.samantha@brevardschools.org)

By When: On-going

#2. 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.

ESSA subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities continues to be the subgroup needing the most support at Sea Park Elementary. 53% of our SWD in grades 3-6 scored a level 3 or above on the 2023 FAST Reading Assessment. This is an increase from 38% of our ESE students in grades 3-6 scored a level 3 or above on the Florida Standards Assessment in Reading. 50% of our SWD in grades 3-6 scored a level 3 or above on the 2023 FAST Math Assessment. Only 28% of our fifth grade ESE students scored a level 3 or above on the 2023 FAST Reading and Math Assessments and our fifth grade ESE students scored lower than ESE students in grades 3, 4, and 6. Although Sea Park's SWD made significant gains in reading from the previous year they are still the lagging behind their general education peers and need more support .

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

SWD will increase from ELA proficiency of (22-23 FAST) 53% to (23-24 FAST) 60%.
SWD will increase from Math proficiency of (22-23 FAST) 50% to (23-24 FAST) 57%.

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

MTSS intervention data
Classroom assessments
Classroom Walk Through Document with Feedback
i-Ready, FAST, and STAR progress monitoring data

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stephanie Hall (hall.stephanie@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.)

Good readers construct mental images as they read a text. By using prior knowledge and background experiences, readers connect the author's writing with a personal picture. Through guided visualization, students learn how to create mental pictures as they read.Generating an image while reading requires that the reader be actively engaged with the text. Creating mental images while reading can improve comprehension.Teachers will model good reading with visuals using the "I do , We do, You do" methodology. Additionally choosing the right Thinking Maps and providing visual supports for their students paired with cognitive processes through scaffolding instruction. b

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

Visuals for ESE students help to define what is expected of them. Scaffolding, or breaking tasks down into smaller parts helps students to process more complex texts. Thinking Maps provides a visual paired with eight cognitive processes. This is another visual for ESE students to use in the classroom. This provides opportunities for students to utilize cognitive skills that support lifelong learning across disciplines and with greater complexity. Used together, students engage in lifelong learning across disciplines and with greater complexity as they move through each grade level. Students become aware of the thinking skills that drives their learning. (Hyerle, 1993).

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.

ESE teachers will help scaffold instruction to improve student thinking and use of visuals.

Person Responsible: Angele Lizek (lizek.angele@brevardschools.org)

By When: On-going

ESE teachers will collaborate with classroom teachers to plan and deliver on grade level standards aligned instruction.

Person Responsible: Teri Esmond (esmond.teri@brevardschools.org)

By When: Monthly.

Provide de-escalation and classroom management training for instructional staff to support to the needs of all students.

Person Responsible: Teri Esmond (esmond.teri@brevardschools.org)

By When: During pre-planning

Implement the use of Assistive Technology for identified substantially deficient students to access grade level materials through auditory assisted technology and other communication devices.

Person Responsible: Lindsay Hargis (hargis.lindsay@brevardschools.org)

By When: Completed within the first quarter of school.

ESE teachers deliver instruction utilizing Thinking Maps to engage students.

Person Responsible: Teri Esmond (esmond.teri@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing utilizing Classroom Walk Through Document

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

Between 2021-2023 fourteen instructional and support staff have left Sea Park for a variety of reasons. Nationwide there is a teacher shortage. The TNTP Insight Survey Results under Leadership, they indicated that staff members want to feel they have the opportunity to provide input on a variety of decisions at the school level. Connecting staff to the vision and mission is critical in building job satisfaction while providing timely, positive feedback.

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

Increase Leadership Domain on TNTP Survey from 5.9 to 6.4.
Increase percentage of staff taking survey (71% instructional and 47% support staff) to at least 80% in each category.

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

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.)

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

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.

Monthly recognition of instructional and support staff featured on bulletin boards, newsletter and school website.

Person Responsible: Angele Lizek (lizek.angele@brevardschools.org)

By When: Monthly

Weekly recognition of class and grade level success on writing, computer programs (i-Ready, Lexia, and Penda) and student learning.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Hall (hall.stephanie@brevardschools.org)

By When: Weekly

Team building activities woven throughout the school year to build community and relationships.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Hall (hall.stephanie@brevardschools.org)

By When: On-going

Provide mental health and systems of support for staff in need.

Person Responsible: Sarah Schroeder (schroeder.sarah@brevardschools.org)

By When: On-going

Utilize parents and volunteers to support staff. Recruit to fill open positions at our school that they have the qualifications for.

Person Responsible: Stephanie Hall (hall.stephanie@brevardschools.org)

By When: On-going

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).

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Benchmark-aligned Instruction	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

No