
Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Suntree Elementary School

900 JORDAN BLASS DR, Melbourne, FL 32940

<http://www.suntree.brevard.k12.fl.ud>

Demographics

Principal: Shari Tressler D

Start Date for this Principal: 7/10/2019

2019-20 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
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	22%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (73%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (77%) 2015-16: A (73%) 2014-15: A (84%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Suntree Elementary School

900 JORDAN BLASS DR, Melbourne, FL 32940

<http://www.suntree.brevard.k12.fl.ud>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-6</p>	<p>2018-19 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>24%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>26%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Brevard County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

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 Florida Department of Education 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.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To provide a safe, rigorous, and inclusive learning environment where every student excels academically, socially, and emotionally.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Empower students to make a positive impact in an ever-changing world.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address and position title for each member of the school leadership team:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Tressler, Shari	Principal	Administrators review data, reflect on best practices, and develop professional development based on data. This is done with the Leadership Team, SAC, PTO, and other forums like Coffee with the Principal, engaging all stakeholders in the process. Once data is reviewed and input collected, the team moves forward in editing the goals to meet the needs of the site.
Trosset, Paige	Assistant Principal	Administrators review data, reflect on best practices, and develop professional development based on data. This is done with the Leadership Team, SAC, PTO, and other forums like Coffee with the Principal, engaging all stakeholders in the process. Once data is reviewed and input collected, the team moves forward in editing the goals to meet the needs of the site. Mrs. Trosset also assists with state wide and district testing as well as supports our ESE team.
Seibert, Tracy	Instructional Coach	Responsible for coaching teachers in all content areas, support administration and teachers with state, district, and school based assessments, data collection and progress monitoring of student academic and behavior data, provide PD for teachers, MTSS facilitator, mentor new teacher. Mrs. Seibert also assists with state and district assessments.
Martin, Heather	Teacher, K-12	SAC Chairperson 6th grade teacher of all content areas and certified in ESE.
watson, teatanya	Teacher, K-12	SAC Member 5th grade teacher of all content areas Mentor Teacher School based Social Studies Contact

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Number of students enrolled	73	78	105	80	109	112	118	0	0	0	0	0	0	675
Attendance below 90 percent	0	30	2	2	7	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	2	1	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	3	8	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Students with two or more indicators		0	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	6

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total	
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11		12
Retained Students: Current Year		0	3	6	2	4	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	17
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

FTE units allocated to school (total number of teacher units)

49

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/10/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level												Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level												Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	83%	62%	57%	81%	63%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	66%	60%	58%	68%	60%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	62%	57%	53%	64%	52%	52%
Math Achievement	84%	63%	63%	85%	64%	61%
Math Learning Gains	75%	65%	62%	80%	62%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	65%	53%	51%	75%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	79%	57%	53%	83%	56%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey								
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Number of students enrolled	73 (0)	78 (0)	105 (0)	80 (0)	109 (0)	112 (0)	118 (0)	675 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 ()	30 ()	2 ()	2 ()	7 ()	5 ()	5 ()	51 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	2 (0)	2 (0)	1 (0)	3 (0)	3 (0)	11 (0)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	3 (0)	8 (0)	12 (0)	23 (0)

Grade Level Data

NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.

NOTE: 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
03	2019	84%	64%	20%	58%	26%
	2018	83%	63%	20%	57%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	78%	61%	17%	58%	20%
	2018	75%	57%	18%	56%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
05	2019	80%	60%	20%	56%	24%
	2018	80%	54%	26%	55%	25%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				
06	2019	85%	60%	25%	54%	31%
	2018	82%	63%	19%	52%	30%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	73%	61%	12%	62%	11%
	2018	84%	62%	22%	62%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	87%	64%	23%	64%	23%
	2018	80%	59%	21%	62%	18%
Same Grade Comparison		7%				
Cohort Comparison		3%				
05	2019	86%	60%	26%	60%	26%
	2018	83%	58%	25%	61%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		6%				
06	2019	84%	67%	17%	55%	29%
	2018	91%	68%	23%	52%	39%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	77%	56%	21%	53%	24%
	2018	74%	57%	17%	55%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE 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
SWD	61	59	54	54	62	52	44				
ELL	79	94		89	89						
ASN	83	78		96	79		80				
BLK	73	80		75							
HSP	79	65	77	82	71	65	70				
MUL	77	53		86	71						
WHT	84	67	59	83	77	65	82				
FRL	79	65	62	77	70	69	63				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	57	51	36	57	52	45	51				
ELL	62			69							
ASN	84	75		89	85						
HSP	73	63		78	71	55	64				
MUL	75	43		82	71						
WHT	83	69	56	86	70	64	78				
FRL	65	54	35	71	63	61	76				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	54	50	47	58	67	67	56				
ELL	30			30							
ASN	84	92		79	83						
BLK	58			75							
HSP	71	64	62	71	70	60	80				
MUL	74	71		78	76						
WHT	84	69	65	89	82	83	84				
FRL	67	65	69	76	76	65	65				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	74
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	79

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	593
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	55
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	86
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	83
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	76
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	73
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	72

Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	76
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	69
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

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

Florida Standards Assessment (FSA) Spring 2018
 English Language Arts (ELA)-

*4th grade showed a 3% increase, but still continues to be below 80%

Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Data:

We have no areas below 41%, however there are areas where we can continue to improve:

*Students with disabilities showed an increase from 57% to 61%, but still continues to be below 70%

*Lowest 25% showed an increase from 36% to 54%, but still continues to be below 70%

*Overall Federal Index for all Suntree Students is 74%, which is an improvement from the Spring 2017 FSA when the Overall Federal Index was 70%. Our goal continues to be to improve to 80% total possible points of students scoring a Level 3 or higher on ELA, Math, and Science State Assessments and Learning Gains.

Contributing Factors:

*Math- All 4th grade teachers participated in a new Math curriculum (Eureka). Primary grades did not participate in the program previously thus the academic language from the new program had not been established. For 6th grade, students use a middle school curriculum with rich algebraic language which they had not been previously exposed to. *Students with Disabilities (SWD) and our Lowest 25% are making learning gains and our percentage is increasing, however we would like to

see the number of SWD scoring Level 3 or higher increase.

*English Language Arts (ELA)- only 4th grade showed a 3% increase, possibly due to this being the first year writing was added to the ELA score.

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

FSA

*3rd grade Math dropped 11%

*6th grade Math dropped 7%

Contributing factors

*All 3rd grade teachers participated in a new Math curriculum (Eureka), however this was voluntary and only one of the five teachers had official training in the new math program. Primary grades did not participate in the program previously thus the academic language from the new program had not been established. There is not enough evidence to support that the implementation of Eureka was done with fidelity in 3rd grade.

* For 6th grade, students use a middle school curriculum with rich algebraic language that they had not been previously exposed to.

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.

N/A

THIS IS FROM LETTER A--- WHERE WORD LIMIT WAS EXCEEDED

Contributing Factors CONTINUED FROM (A):

* We are not consistently, across different grade levels, increasing or maintaining the number of Level of 4 and 5 on the Florida Standards Based Assessment.

* We continue to work toward strengthening our Tier 1 core instruction across all grade levels in all content areas.

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

*4th grade showed 7% increase in the number of students earning Level 3 or higher on FSA Math

*4th and 6th grade each showed 3% increase in the number of students earning Level 3 or higher on FSA ELA.

Subgroup -

*Lowest 25% showed an increase from 36% to 54% demonstrating a learning gain on FSA ELA.

To improve in these areas, across all grades levels, there was a concerted effort to focus on the MTSS process. This was done by conducting weekly TRACK (grade level data meetings) in which struggling students were the focus. Once students were identified, teams met to discuss interventions, progress monitoring strategies, as well establish and monitor short and long-term goals for the students and teachers.

Additionally, administration and teachers in grades 4-6 met with parents and students who scored Level 1 or Level 2 on FSA ELA and Math in 2018. This meeting shared information with parents related to the addition of Writing in 4th grade, how to achieve a learning gain, and the grade level change in scores from one grade level to the next.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern? (see Guidance tab for additional information)

Attendance- 51 students from our school in the 2018- 2019 school year had 19 or more absences, with 30 of those identified students coming from first grade.

Suspensions- 11 students had 1 or more suspensions at school.

This is a concern due to students missing out on instruction when they are out of school.

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

1. Increase total percentage of Suntree Students scoring a level 3 or higher on FSA ELA and Math to 80% or more
2. MTSS - using I-Ready data for targeted interventions to increase the number of students with disabilities and students in the lowest 25% scoring Level 3 or higher on FSA ELA and Math; as well as increase our students earning Level 4 and Level 5 on FSA ELA and Math
3. School-wide Eureka Math implementation for grades K-5
4. Strengthening of Tier 1 Core instruction across all grade levels in all content areas.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA 3+ Proficiency and Learning Gains for lowest 25% and highest 25%
Rationale	3 years of FSA data has shown a slight increase in overall Level 3 or higher scores and 13% increase in Learning Gains for the lowest 25%, however a decrease of 1% in overall learning gains for all students.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	<p>ELA 3+ proficiency will increase from 83% to 90%, ELA Learning Gains will increase from 66% to 75%, ELA Learning Gains for lowest 25% will increase from 62% to 70%</p> <p>The number of Level 4 and Level 5 students dropped from 48% in 2018 to 35% in 2019 and 51% in 2018 for 5th grade to 40% in 2019.</p> <p>The number of students earning Level 4 or Level 5 will increase to at least 60% in all grade levels.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Shari Tressler (tressler.shari@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>School wide created and implemented writing plan to include</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> *writing across all content areas *text based writing with complex text *focus on Integration of Knowledge and Ideas.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	We believe the problem is occurring because of a misalignment of the level of the standard, text complexity, and the need for more text-based writing incorporated into the tasks across all grade levels. We believe with more focus on writing, the number of students earning Level 3 and higher, overall Learning Gains, and Learning Gains for the lowest 25% will increase.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers, administrators, and instructional coach will participate in weekly TRACK meetings during planning time to analyze formative and summative assessment data and develop implement rigorous, standards aligned weekly units of study. 2. Administrators and instructional coach will identify specific professional development for teachers as needed to improve instructional practices based on grade level trends and weekly classroom observations 3. Each grade level will develop a grade level ELA goal based on previous year's FSA data, district diagnostics, and current iReady data and develop teacher and grade level strategies to achieve their grade level goal. 4. Grade level teams will work together to create, maintain, and adjust instruction based on the needs of the individual students in their grade level. Teachers, with the guidance of administration and the instructional coach will provide 30 minute Walk to Success to meet the individual needs of each student utilizing research based programs such as 95% Group and the iReady Toolbox. Teachers will provide explicit instruction for all levels of student abilities to include our lowest and highest 25% students. 5. Teachers will utilize and incorporate the instructional component of iReady into their daily/weekly lessons, with fidelity, so that students are receiving targeted, individualized Standards Based instruction based on their needs. 6. Instructional monitoring, feedback, and coaching will occur based on student data trends and observational data. Leadership team will create a monitoring schedule to provide feedback regarding effective implementation of standard-based instruction. 7. Administration, instructional coach, and teachers will monitor student data weekly with a strategic focus on student subgroups. 8. Administration and teachers will meet with parents of students who scored Level 1 or

Level 2 on 2018 FSA ELA.

9. Grade Level Teachers along with the support of the Instructional Coach will plan, implement, and score school wide writing assessments 3 times a year. Additionally, each grade level will administer the District QLA assessment which includes a rigorous writing component. Grade level teams will score and analyze individual student needs so that weekly instructional planning addresses these needs as well as possible Walk to Success time.

10. The school based ELA/Writing Action Team will present information to parents regarding ELA and Writing Grade Level Standards and expectations.

11. All grade levels will participate in the reading of one book, The WishTree, along with teacher created, grade level appropriate activities which will promote rigorous and engaging reading and include a writing component.

**Person
Responsible**

Shari Tressler (tressler.shari@brevardschools.org)

#2	
Title	Math 3+ Proficiency and Learning Gains for lowest 25% and highest 25%
Rationale	Our Math Level 3 or higher proficiency decreased in third and sixth grades. The percentage of SWD earning Level 3 or higher dropped from 57% in 2018 to 55% in 2019. The percentage of students in third grade scoring Level 4 or Level 5 dropped from 53% in 2018 to 44% in 2019 and in 6th grade dropped from 67% in 2018 to 63% in 2019.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	During the 2019-2020 school year, the overall number of students earning Level 3 or higher will increase from 84% to 90%, the number of overall Math Learning Gains will increase from 75% to 80%, the Learning Gains for the Lowest 25% will increase from 65% to 70%. The number of students earning Level 4 or Level 5 will increase to at least 60% in all grade levels.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Shari Tressler (tressler.shari@brevardschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	Consistent expectations through the use of Eureka Math Curriculum for grades K-5 and iReady for grades K-6.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Consistency in math instruction has been lacking. This year, all teachers in grades K-5 will implement the Eureka Math Curriculum. Additionally, teachers will utilize iReady Math instructional component so all students receive additional math instruction based on their individual needs. Grade levels will also incorporate math into their Walk to Intervention time block as needed.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teachers, administrators, and instructional coach will participate in weekly TRACK meetings during planning time to analyze formative and summative assessment data and develop implement rigorous, standards aligned weekly units of study. 2. Administrators and instructional coach will identify specific professional development for teachers as needed to improve instructional practices based on grade level trends and weekly classroom observations 3. Each grade level will develop a grade level Math goal based on previous year's FSA data, district diagnostics, and current iReady data and develop teacher and grade level strategies to achieve their grade level goal. 4. Grade level teams will work together to create, maintain, and adjust instruction based on the needs of the individual students in their grade level. Teachers, with the guidance of administration and the instructional coach will provide 30 minute Walk to Success to meet the individual needs of each student. Teachers will provide explicit instruction for all levels of student abilities to include our lowest and highest 25% students. 5. Teachers will utilize and incorporate iReady into their daily/weekly lessons, with fidelity, so that students are receiving targeted, individualized Standards Based instruction based on their needs. 6. Instructional monitoring, feedback, and coaching will occur based on student data trends and observational data. Leadership team will create a monitoring schedule to provide feedback regarding effective implementation of standard-based instruction. 7. Administration, instructional coach, and teachers will monitor student data weekly with a strategic focus on student subgroups. 8. Administration and teachers will meet with parents of students who scored Level 1 or Level 2 on 2018 FSA Math.

Person Responsible Shari Tressler (tressler.shari@brevardschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities (see the Guidance tab for more information).

On the BPS Annual Parent Survey for the 2018-2019 school year, 91% of parent responders agreed with the statement, Does your child's school keep you informed about information and events in a format that is easy to understand and 66% of parent responders stated they attended a parent meeting or event at the school that supported their child's academic success once or twice last year.

This 2019-2020 school year, school wide information will be shared with parents by email, text messages, voice messages, website, PeachJar, and a newly created Parent Handbook which includes school events on a monthly calendar.

Additionally, teachers choose one school based Action Team (ELA/Writing, Technology, Social-Emotional, Math/Science, and Safety). Each Action Team creates a yearly plan which includes information to share with parents. This year, the Action Teams will present information to parents on Math (Eureka) in November , ELA/Writing in January, Science Fair Participation in October, and Bullying in February.

Students in every grade level and all staff will read one book, The WishTree, as a read aloud in the classroom to promote rigorous and engaging reading which will culminate in school wide activities during Literacy Week in January.

When new students enroll at Suntree, the family will be greeted by the school secretary and administration to ensure they feel welcome and appreciated. The office team will created a New to Suntree folder which will include information and resources for the family new to the area.