

Brevard Public Schools

Surfside Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	9
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	20
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Surfside Elementary School

475 CASSIA BLVD, Satellite Beach, FL 32937

<http://www.surfside.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.

All Panthers show PRIDE every day: Perseverance, Respect, Integrity, Determination, and Empathy.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Surfside Elementary, faculty, staff, families, and the community work as a team to support the needs of ALL students on their educational journey toward lifelong success. Surfside students are held to high academic expectations and will exemplify the Panther PRIDE core values: Perseverance, Respect, Integrity, Determination, and Empathy.

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
Erenstoff, Kassie	Principal	Mrs. Erenstoff oversees all functions of the school. She regularly monitors schedules and instructional routines to ensure optimal learning environments for student success. She serves as a member of the MTSS, IPST, and ESE teams monitoring instruction, and student outcomes.
Sicoli, Lauren	Assistant Principal	Mrs. Sicoli is responsible for all testing and accountability within the school. She is an instructional leader, monitoring instruction and routinely offering feedback. She assists with MTSS to ensure students are being provided not only strong Tier I instruction, but quality Tier II and Tier III instruction in order to best serve individual student needs.
Oehlmann, Patricia	Instructional Coach	Mrs. Oehlmann is our Literacy Coach and she provides coaching cycles to our instructional staff. She also leads collaborative planning sessions and serves on the MTSS team. On the MTSS team, she works collaboratively with teachers to ensure that they are aligning student needs with research-based interventions. She helps monitor student progress and assists teachers in problem-solving for student success.

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.

During pre-planning school data was reviewed and the 22-23 School Improvement plan goals were also reviewed new goals were developed in conjunction with teacher leadership and reviewed by the School Advisory Council. The School Advisory Council was given the opportunity to provide input and feedback on the School Improvement Plan.

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))

All data is monitored monthly, with larger assessments being reviewed quarterly. During Collaborative Planning sessions, teachers and the leadership team review student progress individually and how it impacts the overarching goals outlined in the SIP. Walkthroughs are done weekly to ensure instruction is occurring with fidelity. This includes walkthroughs during core instruction and intervention. Feedback is then provided to teachers to improve practice. In addition, SAC is updated throughout the year regarding progress towards the SIP goals.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	16%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	25%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
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)* Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	2	4	3	6	9	5	2	0	0	31
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	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	2	0	0	0	2
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	6	5	5	0	0	19
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	11	4	0	0	15
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	1	3	21	9	4	3	0	0	41

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	1	1	3	3	0	0	0	8

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	1	3	0	3	1	2	0	0	0	10
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	2	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	12	1	6	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	6	6	2	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	5	4	5	6	6	4	0	0	32

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	2	2	1	6	8	4	3	0	0	26

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)

Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	2	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	12	1	6	0	0	26
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	10	6	6	2	0	0	24
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	5	4	5	6	6	4	0	0	32

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	2	2	1	6	8	4	3	0	0	26

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)

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

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

Accountability Component	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	77	61	56	69	62	57
ELA Learning Gains	69	63	61	54	60	58
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53	54	52	50	57	53
Math Achievement*	75	60	60	79	63	63
Math Learning Gains	80	64	64	76	65	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	60	55	55	68	53	51
Science Achievement*	91	56	51	77	57	53
Social Studies Achievement*		0	50		0	
Middle School Acceleration						
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress						

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	72
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	505
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	39	Yes	1	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP	84			
MUL	78			
PAC				
WHT	71			
FRL	67			

Accountability Components by Subgroup
 Each “blank” cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	77	69	53	75	80	60	91					
SWD	31	35	33	38	52	44						
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	79	90		77	90							
MUL	81	70		69	90							
PAC												

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS												
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
WHT	77	68	54	75	78	55	90					
FRL	70	71	69	52	71	53	81					

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	81	84	79	76	84	64	67					
SWD	36	69		39	77							
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	60			73								
MUL	50			50								
PAC												
WHT	84	85	80	78	86	65	69					
FRL	67	77		60	68		42					

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	69	54	50	79	76	68	77					
SWD	31	45	40	34	60	53						
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	75	30		75	60							
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	70	56	54	81	79	79	79					
FRL	58	42	43	69	73	73	73					

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	79%	59%	20%	54%	25%
04	2023 - Spring	81%	61%	20%	58%	23%
06	2023 - Spring	76%	61%	15%	47%	29%
03	2023 - Spring	72%	56%	16%	50%	22%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	79%	67%	12%	54%	25%
03	2023 - Spring	74%	60%	14%	59%	15%
04	2023 - Spring	83%	61%	22%	61%	22%
05	2023 - Spring	88%	55%	33%	55%	33%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	86%	57%	29%	51%	35%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection

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

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

The data component that shows the lowest performance is the proficiency of students with disabilities. During the 21-22 school year, only 31% of SWD were proficient in ELA and 38% were proficient in math. We set a goal last year of raising this percentage in both categories to 50%. We fell short with 46% of SWD proficient in ELA, and 47% proficient in math. While this is a huge improvement, there is still great room for growth. The growth this past year is due to drastic shifts in staffing and service model. As we continue to refine our model of service, these numbers will continue to increase.

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

We saw a decline in two areas; 5th-grade science and ELA. In science, proficiency dropped four percentage points, and in ELA there was a decline of six percentage points. Although it was a decline from one year to the next when looking at fifth grade, the cohort of students increased six percentage points from their ELA proficiency in fourth grade.

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.

We are above the state average in all categories.

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

Our math proficiency rates showed the greatest increase. In 21-22, 74% of students were proficient in math, while 80% were proficient in 22-23. This past year, we rolled out a new math program, closely aligned to benchmark expectations. Our teachers used the program with fidelity, and we monitored math instruction closely.

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

Attendance is an issue for our students who have more than one indicator on the EWS.

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

1. SWD - Continue to move students towards mastery of the standards.
2. Attendance - Refine our procedures and find ways to help families.
3. ELA Proficiency
4. Math Proficiency - Continue to show growth in this area.

Area of Focus

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

The data component that shows the lowest performance is the proficiency of students with disabilities. During the 21-22 school year, only 31% of SWD were proficient in ELA and 38% were proficient in math. We set a goal last year of raising this percentage in both categories to 50%. We fell short with 46% of SWD proficient in ELA, and 47% proficient in math. While this is a huge improvement, there is still great room for growth. The growth this past year is due to drastic shifts in staffing and service model. As we continue to refine our model of service, these numbers will continue to increase.

Measurable Outcome:

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

During the 23-24 school year, 50% of SWD will be proficient on ELA and math, as measured by FAST PM3. All SWD will show growth on either FAST or iReady during PM3.

Monitoring:

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

We will continually monitor the progress of students by reviewing data and progress during MTSS meetings and Collaborative Planning. Classroom walkthroughs will be implemented to monitor quality of core instruction in math and ELA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kassie Erenstoff (erenstoff.kassie@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.)

1. Strong core instruction
2. Increased inclusion for students with resource minutes
3. Increased collaboration between general education and ESE teachers
4. More feedback on instructional practices for all teachers

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Increasing our core instructional practices allows all students a greater opportunity of being successful. This core instruction includes purposefully planned and implemented whole-group and small-group practices. Increasing the amount of inclusion reduces the amount of time that students are removed from non-disabled peers, thereby increasing opportunities to collaborate with on-grade-level students. By increasing feedback to teachers, we hope to elevate the practice of all of our instructors in order to improve the learning of all students.

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.

1. All teachers will participate in collaborative planning, this includes ESE teachers. In order to do this, we worked to align the planning periods of our teachers to increase opportunities for collaboration. Schedules were also modified to ensure ESE teachers could provide push-in inclusion services.

Person Responsible: Lauren Sicoli (sicoli.lauren@brevardschools.org)

By When: Preplanning

During collaborative planning, teachers will share best practices and monitor the progress of all learners. As a team, we will brainstorm how to support students now showing ample progress. Teachers will share strategies that worked in their classrooms.

Person Responsible: Patricia Oehlmann (oehlmann.patricia@brevardschools.org)

By When: Throughout the year.

Walkthroughs will be completed to monitor instruction. During walkthroughs, the administration will be looking to see that students are taking ownership of their learning and doing the bulk of the work. We will also look to see how teachers are providing feedback and differentiation to meet the varying needs within their classrooms. Teacher feedback will be routinely provided.

Person Responsible: Kassie Erenstoff (erenstoff.kassie@brevardschools.org)

By When: Throughout the school year.

#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.

During the 22-23 school year, the goal was for 80% of our students to be proficient in ELA. We missed the mark by one percentage point.

Measurable Outcome:

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

During the 23-24 school year, 81% of students will be proficient in ELA, as measured by FAST PM3. 100% of all students will show growth as evidenced by either FAST PM3, or iReady end-of-year diagnostic.

Monitoring:

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

We will routinely monitor the progress towards this using iReady data and FAST PM1 and PM2. In addition, work samples will be reviewed to ensure that students are working towards mastery of the grade-level standards.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kassie Erenstoff (erenstoff.kassie@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.)

1. Strong core instruction
2. Teacher review of work samples during collaborative planning
3. Student and teacher progress monitoring

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Again, strong core instruction is the foundation for student success. We will working with teachers during collaborative planning to ensure lessons are aligned to standards, student misconceptions are planned for, and everyone understands how to determine if students truly learned what they should have.

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.

During collaborative planning, teachers will review benchmarks, test item specs, benchmark clarifications/ misconceptions, and set goals for student learning. We will work collaboratively to review student progress and brainstorm together how to help students who did not show mastery.

Person Responsible: Patricia Oehlmann (oehlmann.patricia@brevardschools.org)

By When: Throughout the school year.

Classroom walkthroughs will be completed to ensure strong core instruction in ELA. Administration will be looking for tasks aligned to benchmarks, students doing the heavy lifting during the lessons, and student discourse aimed to move students towards mastery of the benchmarks.

Person Responsible: Kassie Erenstoff (erenstoff.kassie@brevardschools.org)

By When: Throughout the school year.

#3. 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.

Attendance continues to be a problem for students with multiple early warning indicators.

Measurable Outcome:

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

31% of students had attendance below 90% during the 22-23 school year. One-third of those students have a disability. During the 23-24 school year, this number will decrease to 25% overall.

Monitoring:

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

Students who had attendance below 90% and had more than one EWS indicator, will be provided a mentor. These mentors will help students set goals for getting to school on time and for achieving academic success.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ashleigh Schenck (schenck.ashleigh@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.)

Mentoring will be the evidence-based intervention used to help students improve attendance and academic success.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to Smink & Reimer (2005), mentoring students is a strong strategy for improving student attendance and overall academic outcomes.

Smink, J., & Reimer, M. (2005). Fifteen Effective Strategies for Improving Student Attendance and Truancy Prevention. National Dropout Prevention Center Network.

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.

Meet with families to remind them of the importance of good attendance.

Person Responsible: Ashleigh Schenck (schenck.ashleigh@brevardschools.org)

By When: October 2023

Assign mentors and garner parent permission.

Person Responsible: Lauren Sicoli (sicoli.lauren@brevardschools.org)

By When: October 2023

Provide time for mentors to meet with students, set goals, and monitor progress.

Person Responsible: Lauren Sicoli (sicoli.lauren@brevardschools.org)

By When: Throughout the year.

Review student progress and adjust plan as needed.

Person Responsible: Ashleigh Schenck (schenck.ashleigh@brevardschools.org)

By When: Throughout the year.

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).

Surfside's leadership team reviews allocations, schedules and other resources to ensure all students including SWD receive high quality on grade level instruction.