Brevard Public Schools

John F. Turner, Senior Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

John F. Turner, Senior Elementary School

3175 JUPITER BLVD SE, Palm Bay, FL 32909

http://www.turner.brevard.k12.fl.us

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Department encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To ensure every student reaches his or her highest potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We work collaboratively as a community of learners to provide a safe, structured, and caring environment where all students are engaged learners who believe they can achieve.

Revised: August 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
Toll, Ashley	Principal	Serves as the instructional leader of the school, analyzes and shares data with stakeholders, manages the school leadership team, and maintains the school budget.
Keller, Sara	Assistant Principal	Instructional Leader. Serves as an instructional leader, shares curriculum updates and best practices, monitors and analyzes data, leads MTSS and prepares for state testing at the school.
Arnold, Megan	Teacher, K-12	Serves as Title I Coordinator to oversee interventions, family and stakeholder engagement, maintains budget and Title I compliance. 80% of the day is spent working with students in ELA intervention, 20% of the day is spent planning family engagement, maintaining budget and reviewing Title I compliance.
Acosta, Danielle	Instructional Coach	Serves as an instructional leader in the area of ELA. Provides modeling, feedback and support to teachers. Supports the MTSS process by monitoring data and helping to provide interventions to students. Supports teachers to improve their craft through professional development.
Berger, Dawn	Instructional Coach	Serves as an instructional leader in the area of Science. Provides modeling, feedback and support to teachers. Supports the MTSS process by monitoring data and helping to provide interventions to students. Supports teachers to improve their craft through professional development.
Hudder, Priscilla	School Counselor	Serves as a leader in the area of ESE and SEL. Provides modeling, feedback and support to teachers, students and families.

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.

Through the use of schoolwide surveys sent to parents, students and staff, we acquire the feedback from all areas stakeholders. We hold a Critical Needs Assessment meeting twice during the summer that includes teachers, parents and community members to analyze academic data, surveys, and walkthrough data to create solutions and new practices to improve Turner Elementary School.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

The SIP will be monitored in the following ways.
-Classroom Walkthroughs (data collected weekly)
-Data Team Meetings (held twice a month)
-Agendas from meetings (SAC, Faculty, MTSS, Data)

Evidence of Impact:
-Student Achievement Data
-Exit Slips
-Progress Monitoring Data from PM1, PM2 and PM3
-FAST Data

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	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	60%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
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)* English Language Learners (ELL) Black/African American Students (BLK) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	13	20	16	17	12	10	7	0	0	95
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	6	4	4	6	0	0	22
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	0	0	4
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	2	0	3	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	16	21	24	0	0	70
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	19	23	31	0	0	80
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	6	3	5	13	5	6	24	0	0	62
	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	3	2	2	11	13	20	29	0	0	80

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	6	3	7	9	2	1	1	0	0	29
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	2

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	27	21	13	17	17	8	0	0	103
One or more suspensions	0	1	7	7	2	1	7	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	14	15	14	0	0	48
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	19	24	17	0	0	63
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	16	6	9	14	15	14	0	0	74

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	9	3	3	9	5	5	0	0	34

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	4	6	7	1	1	1	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

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

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

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	0	27	21	13	17	17	8	0	0	103
One or more suspensions	0	1	7	7	2	1	7	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	5	14	15	14	0	0	48
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	19	24	17	0	0	63
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	16	6	9	14	15	14	0	0	74

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	9	3	3	9	5	5	0	0	34

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	5	4	6	7	1	1	1	0	0	25
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

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

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*	43	58	53	42	61	56	44		
ELA Learning Gains				53			37		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				47			39		
Math Achievement*	45	58	59	42	49	50	39		
Math Learning Gains				55			21		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				36			34		
Science Achievement*	36	58	54	56	60	59	32		
Social Studies Achievement*					64	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					56	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress	71	54	59	54			60		

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

See Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings.

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	237
Total Components for the Federal Index	5
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	48
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	385
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99
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	32	Yes	2	
ELL	39	Yes	1	
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	32	Yes	1	
HSP	42			
MUL	41			
PAC				
WHT	49			

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%
FRL	43			

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	33	Yes	1	
ELL	43			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	44			
HSP	45			
MUL	46			
PAC				
WHT	53			
FRL	42			

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	43			45			36					71
SWD	27			22			13				5	55
ELL	29			37							4	71
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35			31			25				4	
HSP	42			47			24				5	66
MUL	41			41			42				3	

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
PAC												
WHT	51			55			48				4	
FRL	39			37			24				5	77

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	42	53	47	42	55	36	56					54
SWD	24	33	24	22	44	35	29					55
ELL	28	48		29	56	42						54
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	41	60	54	28	47	21	56					
HSP	39	50	50	39	46	43	30					64
MUL	38	46		42	58							
PAC												
WHT	47	53	45	55	66	40	67					
FRL	35	48	43	33	47	29	46					52

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	44	37	39	39	21	34	32					60
SWD	26	44	47	16	21	44	21					62
ELL	31	41		31	39	50	18					60
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	43	37	30	29	10		25					
HSP	41	34		40	24		29					59
MUL	45			36								
PAC												
WHT	46	35	50	44	28	38	32					
FRL	36	36	43	36	22	32	36					61

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	44%	59%	-15%	54%	-10%
04	2023 - Spring	46%	61%	-15%	58%	-12%
06	2023 - Spring	42%	61%	-19%	47%	-5%
03	2023 - Spring	35%	56%	-21%	50%	-15%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	53%	67%	-14%	54%	-1%
03	2023 - Spring	45%	60%	-15%	59%	-14%
04	2023 - Spring	44%	61%	-17%	61%	-17%
05	2023 - Spring	37%	55%	-18%	55%	-18%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	30%	57%	-27%	51%	-21%

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.

Turner saw a significant drop in science scores this past school year. In 2022 science proficiency was 56% and it dropped to 30% in 2023. Contributing factors to this drop in proficiency were high class sizes (32 in each class), no science coach (relocated to Tampa) and teacher turnover in 5th grade classroom.

Math also saw a drop in proficiency in the 2023 school year. In 2022, Turner had 42% of students in

3rd-6th who were proficient in math. Proficiency dropped to 35% in 2023. The 22-23 school year was a math curriculum adoption year. Teachers

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

The greatest decline from the 22-23 school year was in science. It was an over decline of 26% from the prior school year. Contributing factors to this drop in proficiency were high class sizes (32 in each class), no science coach (relocated to Tampa) and teacher turnover in 5th grade classroom.

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.

Turner had the largest gap in proficiency from the state in the area of math. Turner was 35% proficient in math in 2023 while Brevard was 59% proficient and the state was 56%. Turner did have a math coach allocated for the 22-23 school year, but do to teacher turnover, that coach was placed in a classroom.

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

6th grade showed the most improvement in ELA and Math for the 22-23 school year. In ELA proficiency increased by 6% and by 16% in math. This can be attributed to departmentalization and a change in teachers in that grade level.

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

Daily attendance is a concern at Turner Elementary. 95 students had less than 90% attendance for the 22-23 school year. Students who attend school regularly have been shown to achieve at higher levels than students who do not have regular attendance. This relationship between attendance and achievement may appear early in a child's school career.
Turner is also concerned about the amount of students scoring a level 1 in ELA and Math in the 22-23 school year. IN ELA, Turner had 70 students score a level 1 and 80 scored a level 1 in math.

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

1. Math Proficiency
2. ELA Proficiency
3. Science Proficiency
4. Attendance

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Early Warning System

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

Attendance is an area of focus within positive culture and environment. Turner currently has 97 students who had less than 90% attendance rates for the entire school year. There were 105 students first semester and 85 students second semester with less than 90% attendance rates.

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

Turner will lower its chronic absent rate from 97 students to less than 50 students for the school year. Turner will lower its first semester chronic absenteeism from 85 students to less than 50 students in the first semester. Turner will lower its second semester chronic absenteeism from 105 students to less than 50 students in the second semester.

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

Through weekly attendance monitoring, parent meetings, home visits and check ins with students, we will lower the chronic absenteeism rates at Turner.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Ashley Toll (toll.ashley@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.)

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.

No description entered

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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

FAST testing was completed for the first time in 2023. Students in grades 3rd-6th scored at the following for rates of proficiency: 3rd- 455 proficient, 4th- 44% proficient, 5th- 37% proficient, 6th- 53% proficient. The 4th grade cohort improved 3+ Proficiency level increasing form 34% OGL to 44% OGL The 6th grade cohort improved 3+ Proficiency level increasing form 37% OGL to 53% OGL. However, the 4th grade cohort decreased proficiency from 48% to 37% OGL. Administrator observations and walkthroughs indicated that when Reveal(K-5) and Ed Gems (6) is implemented with fidelity students develop understanding of Florida Standards. Focus must be on delivery of Tier 1 core instruction with fidelity along with accelerating learning with missed content from extended unfinished learning.

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

As a result of the implementation of Reveal Math and Ed Gems along with iReady
math personalized instruction, Turner will increase grade level proficiency on the FAST
PM3 in math.
Grade 3 - 28% to 53% OGL 2024 FAST Math
Grade 4 - 43% to 55% OGL 2024 FAST Math
Grade 5 - 51% to 60% OGL 2024 FAST Math
Grade 6 - 52% to 60% OGL 2024 FAST Math
*Update after PM1

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

Reveal Math and Ed Gems End of Unit Assessments along with i-Ready diagnostic/FAST assessments and
lesson pass rates will be monitored to ensure mastery of grade level standards. Admin and district math coach will conduct classroom walkthroughs during the math block to monitor the fidelity of instruction with the new math curriculum.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Sara Keller (keller.sara@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.)

Deliberate practice. (effect size .79) utilizing explicit, systematic instruction using Reveal and Ed Gems curriculum. i-Ready is supported by an increase in proficiency on FAST. This progress monitoring tool will guide Turner instructional staff monitor and support efforts to accelerate growth and grade-level learning. Utilizing these tools and data from PM1-PM2 will provide rigorous and motivating reading instruction that personalizes and provides scaffolded support that meets the needs of all students that monitors and adjusts to provide precise instructional guided by i-Ready instruction.

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

Based on teacher input and student performance in Math on PM1-PM2, implementation of a cohesive adopted Tier 1 Core Curriculum and opportunities to examine analyze student work to plan for future instruction will impact instructional delivery and student achievement. i Ready has had an impact on student achievement based on 2022 Math FSA data. Implementation of the core Math curriculum and

deliberate practice to analyze student assessments to prepare for instruction and remediation will be an evidence based practice to effect student achievement.

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

Provide Reveal and Ed Gems professional development to newly hired teachers. Monthly on-going training as units are introduced.

Person Responsible: Sara Keller (keller.sara@brevardschools.org)

By When: August 2023

Analyze data and progress with grade level teams bi-monthly through Math Grade Level Meetings and MTSS.

Person Responsible: Sara Keller (keller.sara@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

Implement collaborative planning to ensure understanding and instructional delivery of Reveal(K-5) and Ed Gems(Grade 6). Planning to include data retrieved from lesson pass rates on i-Ready assigned lessons.

Person Responsible: Sara Keller (keller.sara@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

Utilize the coaching cycle with new instructional staff or staff members struggling to implement Reveal or Ed Gems. Use District math coach Sandy Davis.

Person Responsible: Sara Keller (keller.sara@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

Administration observations of math instructional to ensure explicit, systematic instruction is being implement by all staff members.

Person Responsible: Ashley Toll (toll.ashley@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing

Admin and math coach will tier teachers to look at the various levels of support they need based on progress monitoring data. Coach will reach out and set up times to work with the tier 2 and tier 3 teachers.

Person Responsible: Ashley Toll (toll.ashley@brevardschools.org)

By When: October 2023

District math coach will create a "look fors" list for math instruction. She will work with teachers on how to implement the look fors and provide feedback after observations.

Person Responsible: Sara Keller (keller.sara@brevardschools.org)

By When: October 2023

No description entered

Person Responsible: [no one identified]

By When:

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

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

Turner improved science 3+ proficiency level 24% from the 2021 to 2022 assessments. During the 2022-2023 school year, science proficiency decreased from 53% to 30%. Factors that impacted the decrease in proficiency were absence of a school science coach and overcrowding in the 5th grade classrooms (over 30 students in a room).

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

As a result of implementation of standards based science instruction, and the addition of a science coach, Turner will increase the proficiency rating of 30% to 50% on the Florida Statewide Science Assessment.

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

Utilizing Brevard Public Schools district created assessments along with PENDA activity mastery reports.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Dawn Berger (berger.dawn@brevardschools.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Standards based instruction utilizing the 5E Science Inquiry Model

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

The 5E Instructional Model is incorporated into the BPS science instructional delivery guide. Research has found that this evidence-based strategy provides flexible learning to create a constructivist, reform-based inquiry model. It further provides a science learning cycle based on evidence to support thinking

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.

Hire science instructional coach to (T) support grades K-6 science teachers. This support will be in the form of grade level planning, data analysis, support with hands on labs, and teaching reading strategies to students. Turner was able to hire back the science coach from 21-22.

Person Responsible: Ashley Toll (toll.ashley@brevardschools.org)

By When: July 2023

Purchase supplemental materials (T), supplies to support hands on science instruction.(T)

Person Responsible: Dawn Berger (berger.dawn@brevardschools.org)

By When: August 2023

Schedule monthly grade level science meetings to analyze data and create lesson plans to deliver standards based science instruction.

Person Responsible: Dawn Berger (berger.dawn@brevardschools.org)

By When: August 2023

Create a list of "look fors" that should be seen during science instruction across the grade levels. Meet with teachers to go over list and provide support for implementing them in the classroom. Provide feedback from walkthroughs.

Person Responsible: Ashley Toll (toll.ashley@brevardschools.org)

By When: August 2023.

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).

-District content specialists will meet with school coaches and classroom teachers to collaboratively plan for benchmark aligned instruction every month.
-Area director will walk classrooms with leadership team once a month.
-Quarterly data progress monitoring with area director.
-ESE support and scheduling will be monitored and adjusted based on walks with (ESE resource teacher, Area director)

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

Grade level progress monitoring indicates a need for explicit ELA instruction in grades K-2 to decrease the number of students entering 3rd grade below grade level. i-Ready data indicates that only 40% of third grade students are entering the year on grade level. 17% of current third graders are entering 2 or

more grade levels below in ELA. This trend data indicates a priority action is to improve instructional delivery in grades K-2.
Based on the Spring i-Ready ELA Diagnostic, 13% of 1st graders, 31% of 2nd graders, and 60% of 3rd graders are starting the 23-24 below grade level.
*Add PM1 data

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

22-23 FSA Data shows 61% of 4th Graders, 53% of 5th Graders and 56% of 6th Graders scored below grade level. (Levels 1 and 2). As a whole, 54.6% of Turner's 3rd-6th graders scored a level 1 or a level 2.
*Add PM1 data

Measurable Outcomes
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data-based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K -3, using the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment;

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a Level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment; and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

Short Term – From STAR-PM1 to PM2, literacy achievement will increase by 7%.
Long Term - By the Spring 2023 STAR literacy achievement will increase by 15%.
We will be monitoring ELA proficiency through STAR early literacy progress monitoring assessments.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

Short Term – From FAST- PM1 to PM2, literacy achievement will increase by 7%.
Long Term - By the Spring 2023 FAST, literacy achievement will increase by 15%.
We will be monitoring ELA proficiency through FAST progress monitoring assessments.

Monitoring

Monitoring
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

Data that will be monitored will be :
-STAR Early Literacy Progress Monitoring Data
-FAST Progress Monitoring Data
-PM 1, PM 2, FAST
-i-Ready D1 and D2
-Walkthroughs with feedback from the FCRR Walkthrough Tool
-Benchmark Advance Assessments
-Intervention Data
-Intervention instruction (T) to specifically target identified gaps (Students with Disabilities, Economically Disadvantaged, ELL, Hispanic)

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

Acosta, Danielle, acosta.danielle@brevardschools.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

• Explicit instruction
o Introduces new content, or skill clearly and directly
o Models/demonstrates use of the new or retaught content, concept, or skill
• Systematic instruction
o Logical progression from simple to more complex
• Scaffolded instruction
o Intentional, temporary, support
o Open-ended questions, prompts and cues, breaking down into smaller steps, visual aids, examples and/or encouragement
o Gradual release until student(s) can perform independently
• Lexia (Strong level of evidence (T)
o Aligns with PA, Phonics, Fluency B.E.S.T. Standards
o Science of Reading domains include PA, Phonics, Structural Analysis, Fluency, Vocabulary, Comprehension
• 95% Group (T)
o Aligns with B.E.S.T. Standards and the Foundational Benchmarks under PA
• Corrective Feedback
o Identifies student's misunderstanding relative to the target instructional goal
• Collaborative Planning
o Supports consistent, high-quality implementation of Benchmark Advance
o Allows for instructional strategies, resources, tools, and materials to be scaffolded and differentiated

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

All evidence-based practices/programs listed above address the identified need that is improving primary literacy achievement. The identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target
population as they are:
o B.E.S.T. Standards Aligned
o Aligned with the Brevard K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan
o Meet Florida's definition of evidence-based
o Systematic and/or Explicit
o Geared towards struggling readers with an emphasis on Foundational Skills such as Phonological Awareness and Phonics

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Literacy Leadership Team -Define roles and responsibilities of team members (coaches, teachers, administrators, district) for before, during and after common planning sessions. -Develop content area Planning Protocols that will delineate expectations for benchmark-aligned instructional practices. -Clearly communicate the expectations for planning with coaches and teachers at Turner Elementary School. -Establish Principal-Coach partnership agreement to specify duties and activities of the coach and how the Principal will provide support. -Principal will collaborate with content coaches before/after each planning.	Acosta, Danielle, acosta.danielle@brevardschools.org
Literacy Coaching: -Lesson planning with teachers, modeling, co-teaching, engaging in reflective conversations, and engaging in data chats -Prepare for planning process and send teachers the agenda, items, tasks, and other resources in advance for them to complete the pre-work -During planning, focus on teacher clarity, instructional model, strategies, questioning and assessments that align to the benchmark(s) and will support the intended learning. -Identify and plan for the supports that teachers will need before, during, and after planning (pre-planning sessions, coaching questions to connect teacher thinking to aligned instruction, etc.)	Acosta, Danielle, acosta.danielle@brevardschools.org
Assessment -Teachers will use program assessments for foundational reading skills, along with DIBELS measures, PASI/PSI and/or Running Records to monitor reading skills development. (T) -Define performance criteria based on assessment data that prompts the addition of Tier 2 and/or Tier 3 interventions for students not meeting expectations/benchmarks -Data chats will occur monthly around Benchmark Advance Assessments, iReady, FAST, and intervention OPM -Daily exit tickets and other formative assessments are used to determine what scaffolds or reteaching is needed	Acosta, Danielle, acosta.danielle@brevardschools.org
LLT will analyze student academic data and walkthrough data to tier teachers for ELA support. Based on tiers, differentiated support will be assigned to teachers.	Acosta, Danielle, acosta.danielle@brevardschools.org
We will carefully monitor Students with Disabilities and ELL students proficiency through STAR Early Literacy Assessments and FAST Progress Monitoring. We will meet monthly through our MTSS meetings to discuss students who fall in these fragile ESSA subgroups.	Toll, Ashley, toll.ashley@brevardschools.org

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements
This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

-School Website
-Faculty Meetings
-Open House
-SAC Meetings
-Principal's Weekly Newsletter

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

-Open House
-Parent Teacher Conferences (Quarterly)
-SAC Meetings (monthly)
-Weekly Newsletter
-Family Engagement Events (quarterly)
-Business Partner/Community Partner Meetings

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

The schedule was changed this year so that there were two walk to intervention sessions during the school day. Academic time was planned around grade level attendance data. Primary students had the greatest issue with tardies last year, so this year they will have activity in the morning instead of the ELA block. Coaches have tiered teacher interventions so that they know where to target their services.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

Title I funds are used to pay for a literacy and science coach. Our Title I coordinator is in charge of planning intervention.

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: Positive Culture and Environment: Early Warning System	$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$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.

Yes