

Brevard Public Schools

Suntree 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	11
III. Planning for Improvement	15
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	0

Suntree Elementary School

900 JORDAN BLASS DR, Melbourne, FL 32940

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)

A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)

A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)

A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways:

1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%;
2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%;
3. Have a school grade of D or F; or
4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

To provide a safe, rigorous, and inclusive learning environment where every student excels academically, socially, and emotionally. (Last Rev. 2018-19)

Provide the school's vision statement.

Empower students to make a positive impact in an ever-changing world. (Last Rev. 2018-19)

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
Tressler, Shari	Principal	Principal supports students and teacher growth. Supports the MTSS team and equips teachers with tools needed to disaggregate student performance data. Continuously reviews school wide progress monitoring data and works with grade level teams and individual teachers on yearly goals. Performs classroom observations, supports the mental health of students and teachers on campus, participates in parent conferences and refers students and parents to appropriate resources as needed. Manages the day-to-day school operations such as the budget, facilities, personnel/employment needs and strategies to reach our short- and long-term goals. Leads the Life Skills Action Team and the Safety Action Team.
Hamilton-Brown, Kathy	Assistant Principal	Assistant Principal supports the MTSS team and supports teachers as they disaggregate student performance data. Continuously reviews school wide progress monitoring data and works with grade level teams and individual teachers on yearly goals. Oversees the utilization and classroom instruction of district adopted curriculum and BEST Standards. Serves at the school's Title IX contact, testing administrator, WIDA testing, School Improvement Plan goals and initiatives, and Mentor Program Coordinator. Leads the Math/ Science Action Team and the Teacher Wellness Action Team. Active member of the Threat Management Team.
Leathers, Heather	Instructional Coach	Works with teachers to determine appropriate instructional strategies and interventions for students and supports the MTSS process. Provides observation opportunities for all teachers and refers students and parents to appropriate resources, participates in parent conferences, supports the assistant principal in coordinating state and district testing. Over sees the iReady program, providing support to teachers, disaggregating data and planning for interventions. Leads the ELA Action Team which provides support to teachers and plans evening events for parents. Plans and implements professional development opportunities.
Allison, Jennifer	School Counselor	Support the MTSS process. Works with parents and teachers to create and implement 504 plans. Provides support and guidance as needed to students and parents. Provides whole group and small group instruction on sensitive topics and is available to meet with students individually, in small groups, and whole class. Implements WIDA testing, is the ESOL contact, and conducts COGAT screen to all third grade and/or students who are 8 years old. Supports teachers in the MTSS process and schedules necessary meetings. Provides social emotional support when needed and is part of the Threat Management Team.
Carr, Judy	Teacher, K-12	Provides gifted services once a week to qualified students. Schedules annual EP meetings with parents and plans for enrichment learning of students. Assist the Guidance Counselor with COGAT screening. Supports grade level teams with enrichment strategies for students as well as intervention supports when needed.

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.

School wide data, including student, staff, and parent survey results was shared with staff and School Advisory Council (SAC) in the Spring of 2023. Throughout the school year, previous and current student data as well as additional opportunities for input and feedback are provided to SAC members and other stakeholders. Opportunity is provided to make adjustments/revisions to current strategies to meet established goals for the year.

SIP Monitoring

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

Based on SIP goals and interests from teachers, monthly PD sessions have been embedded into the master calendar and planned throughout the school year. Other components that contribute to monitoring the SIP include classroom visits and observations, analysis of student data, weekly grade level meetings with classrooms teachers including ESE teachers and activity teachers. Feedback from parents related to already scheduled Parent Information Nights will be shared with appropriate stakeholders. The SIP will be revised as necessary to ensure continuous improvement.

Demographic Data

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

2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	27%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	22%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	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: 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	1	5	6	12	8	7	11	0	0	50	
One or more suspensions	1	3	3	1	2	7	7	0	0	24	
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	3	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	1	5	4	0	0	11	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	5	8	3	0	0	17	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	1	9	1	5	1	2	3	0	0	22	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	0	3	3	3	5	0	0	15

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

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	2	9	9	9	9	11	7	0	0	56	
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	1	2	4	6	0	0	15	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	3	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	6	6	6	0	0	21	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	7	5	9	0	0	29	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	5	0	3	0	1	4	0	0	13	

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	1	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	5

The number of students identified retained:

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

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	2	9	9	9	9	11	7	0	0	56	
One or more suspensions	0	1	1	1	2	4	6	0	0	15	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	0	2	0	0	3	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	6	6	6	0	0	21	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	8	7	5	9	0	0	29	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	5	0	3	0	1	4	0	0	13	

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	1	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	5

The number of students identified retained:

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

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*	80	58	53	81	61	56	82		
ELA Learning Gains				74			77		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				60			63		
Math Achievement*	85	58	59	84	49	50	81		
Math Learning Gains				81			78		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				67			70		
Science Achievement*	72	58	54	88	60	59	73		
Social Studies Achievement*					64	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					56	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		54	59						

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

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

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	80
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	318
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index

ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	76
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	535
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)**2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY**

ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	43			
ELL	82			
AMI				
ASN	81			
BLK	69			
HSP	75			
MUL	74			
PAC				
WHT	83			

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	61			

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	57			
ELL	88			
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	79			
HSP	80			
MUL	80			
PAC				
WHT	74			
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)

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	80			85			72					
SWD	47			50			36				4	
ELL	73			91							2	
AMI												
ASN	69			92							2	
BLK	63			74							2	
HSP	75			75							2	
MUL	75			81			67				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	83			87			76				4	
FRL	63			67			48				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21	ELP Progress
All Students	81	74	60	84	81	67	88					
SWD	55	63	53	49	64	57	57					
ELL	71	93		93	93							
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	72	75		78	92							
HSP	78	71		87	82							
MUL	80	75		73	90							
PAC												
WHT	82	74	56	85	78	58	87					
FRL	64	61	48	71	75	69	80					

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	82	77	63	81	78	70	73					
SWD	50	50	44	48	61	53	33					
ELL	60			67								
AMI												
ASN	85			100								
BLK	84			79								
HSP	84	77		87	62							
MUL	85			77								
PAC												
WHT	81	76	59	80	80	71	72					
FRL	66	65	60	64	59	64	55					

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	83%	59%	24%	54%	29%
04	2023 - Spring	81%	61%	20%	58%	23%
06	2023 - Spring	78%	61%	17%	47%	31%
03	2023 - Spring	79%	56%	23%	50%	29%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
06	2023 - Spring	88%	67%	21%	54%	34%
03	2023 - Spring	87%	60%	27%	59%	28%
04	2023 - Spring	90%	61%	29%	61%	29%
05	2023 - Spring	78%	55%	23%	55%	23%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	70%	57%	13%	51%	19%

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.

Math in grades 4 and 5 showed the lowest performance. These students had been previously using Eureka math which is a very different format from the new curriculum. These students had used Eureka since kindergarten and the switch was difficult for them to grasp. We also had large class sizes in 5th grade due to a teacher vacancy that was not filled all year. The large class affected the ability for the teachers to provide as much small group assistance.

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

The area that showed the greatest decline from the prior year was in the area of 5th grade science. Although we still outperformed the state by 113 scale score points and the district by 110 points, the percentage of students who scored a level 3 or better was at 85% in 2022 and only at 70% in 2023. Some factors that may have contributed to this decline were high class size, teacher transitions and two different curriculums.

We went the entire school year with a 5th grade position that was not filled which made the classes very large. We have a large ESE population in that grade as well.

Another factor that might have contributed was the introduction of a new science program that was to be implemented with an existing science curriculum. Teachers struggled at times to know how to make the two work together.

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.

Suntree outperformed the state in all areas.

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

Sixth grade math showed the biggest improvement in 2023. Proficiency increased from 84% proficiency to 88%. The district adopted a new math curriculum and teachers implemented it with fidelity. They also used their iReady Math diagnostic scores to help drive instruction in small groups.

Third grade math also showed an improvement. They went from 80% proficiency in Math to 87%. They also had a new math curriculum that included a lot of hands on practice and small group opportunities. Teachers used this as well as the student's iReady instruction path with fidelity to improve students' math scores.

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

The number of students not at proficiency in ELA and Math in grades 3-6 looking closely at SWD. Overall science instruction in grades 3-5 to prepare 5th grade students for state testing in science.

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

Percent of students at proficiency in ELA
Percent of students at proficiency in Math
Percent of students at proficiency in Science.

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to 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.

Realizing the extent at which Suntree teachers have focused attention on reading and math over the last several years, it was apparent we had not prioritized our science instructional content or included data analysis with this subject in our weekly grade level meetings centered around curriculum and student data. During the 2022 2023 school year, the fifth-grade classrooms remained over class size for the entire year, with 3 out of 4 classrooms with 27 students. This was due to not finding a fifth teacher for this grade level.

Measurable Outcome:

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

Suntree will monitor fifth grade science district science assessments and share results with third and fourth grade teachers. This will allow teachers adjust instructional planning. On the 2024 SSS Science Assessment, fifth grade students will demonstrate 85% proficiency, earning Level 3 or higher.

Monitoring:

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

During scheduled science assessment windows, fifth grade students will take the district unit assessments and utilize Penda Learning with fidelity. Data will be analyzed regularly. Established pacing guides will be followed with fidelity. Administration will conduct classroom walkthroughs during science instruction at least two times a week.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kathy Hamilton-Brown (hamilton-brown.kathy@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.)

Suntree administration will strive to strengthen our Tier 1 science instruction by revisiting the 5E Model of Instruction which includes five phases: Engage, Explore, Explain, Elaborate, and Evaluate. This model provides carefully planned sequencing of instruction that places students at the center of learning. All students in grades 3-6 will utilize Penda Learning, a research based, web-based program which will reinforce and revisit science standards that were previously taught.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Rodger ByBee's 5E Model of Instruction encourages all students to explore, construct understanding of scientific concepts, and relate those understandings to phenomena or engineering problems.

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.

A minimum of 30 minutes of Science instruction has been planned in the Master Schedule in grades K-6. This will provide teachers with time to plan for and teach Science daily to all students. Teachers will follow the district pacing guide according to their grade level.

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

By When: August 2023

PENDA fidelity of use for students in grades 3-5, monitoring, and plan for school wide incentives.

Person Responsible: Kathy Hamilton-Brown (hamilton-brown.kathy@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year.

Plan for additional science PD for teachers as necessary and revisit the 5E Model of Science Instruction periodically throughout the year.

Person Responsible: Kathy Hamilton-Brown (hamilton-brown.kathy@brevardschools.org)

By When: November 2023.

District Science Coach will collaborate, plan with grade level teams at least 4 times throughout the year and offer professional learning opportunities which will reinforce the focus and need for daily science instruction.

Person Responsible: Kathy Hamilton-Brown (hamilton-brown.kathy@brevardschools.org)

By When: October 2023, December 2023, March 2024

Analyze and share student data from district and state Science Assessments during each grading period looking for areas where additional support and instruction can be utilized for students not mastering the state science standards.

Person Responsible: Kathy Hamilton-Brown (hamilton-brown.kathy@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the school year.

Create a Science Lab where all fifth-grade students will participate in hands on science activities one day a week.

Person Responsible: Kathy Hamilton-Brown (hamilton-brown.kathy@brevardschools.org)

By When: November 2023

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.

One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

According to 2023 FSA data in ELA and Math and also iReady data in ELA and Math, our Students with Disabilities, are not performing at the same level of proficiency as their peers. These students are part of our lowest 25% so focusing on needed additional instruction for our lowest 25% students will encompass this subgroup.

Measurable Outcome:

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

2023 PM1 FAST results:

28% of third grade students demonstrated proficiency in ELA and 11% proficiency in Math

53% of fourth grade students demonstrated proficiency in ELA and 17% in Math

62% of fifth grade students demonstrated proficiency in ELA and 31% in Math

72% of sixth grade students demonstrated proficiency in ELA and 52% in Math

2023 to PM 1 iReady results:

76% of third grade students demonstrated proficiency in ELA and 20% in Math

58% of fourth grade students demonstrated proficiency in ELA and 50% in Math

66% of fifth grade students demonstrated proficiency in ELA and 53% in Math

71% of sixth grade students demonstrated proficiency in ELA and 64% in Math

By the end of the 2023-2024 school year, students in grades 3-6 will show at least 80% proficiency in ELA and 70% proficiency in Math according to PM3 FAST and iReady assessments.

Monitoring:

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

During weekly grade level meeting with teachers, administration and the school based instructional coach will specifically monitor the ELA, Math, and Science data of our students with disabilities and lowest performing 25% students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Heather Leathers (leathers.heather@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.)

BEST benchmark-based planning (collaborative planning between the general education teachers and ESE resource teachers) to focus on grade level instruction and assessments in all grade levels, K-6.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

When teachers intentionally plan for instruction for students who are not mastering grade level standards, learning gains will occur. Teacher clarity is imperative for successful instruction. Hattie's effect size for organizing instruction (.64), explaining content (.70), and assessment of student learning (.64), Response to Intervention (1.29), Interventions for learning needs (.77), Scaffolding (.82), and Direct Instruction (.60)

make this an important area of focus.

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.

Grade level teams will develop and monitor progress toward proficiency in core instruction, ELA, Math, and Science by establishing goals based on iReady and FAST data. Teachers will refer to end of year 2023 iReady and FAST data as well as PM1 scores for the 2023 school year when establishing goals and strategies for achieving goals.

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

By When: May 2024- This is ongoing throughout the year.

Schedule half day grade level planning sessions, to disaggregate student data in ELA and Math and adjust planning and instructional delivery as needed. These half day planning sessions will focus on iReady and FAST data and teachers will make adjustments to core instruction. ESE Resource and VE teachers will collaborate with their grade level, general education teachers.

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

By When: October 2023, December 2023, March 2024

The master schedule will include a 60-minute math block with an additional block of time, a minimum of 20 minutes, for teachers to utilize for intervention and/or small group instruction.

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

By When: August 2023

Teachers will change math instruction daily lessons to include small group instruction to the beginning of the lesson rather than the end.

Person Responsible: Heather Leathers (leathers.heather@brevardschools.org)

By When: Scheduled each month. Ongoing throughout the year.

Teachers will support students with goal setting. Administration will be included in conferences with parents of students in the lowest 25% as part of the learning team.

Person Responsible: Heather Leathers (leathers.heather@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year.

Teacher will participate in professional development opportunities throughout the year focusing on engagement strategies, ESE/ASD instruction and understanding, trauma informed classroom, and technology supports. These areas were identified by teachers at the end of the 2023 school year as areas of need or interest.

Person Responsible: Kathy Hamilton-Brown (hamilton-brown.kathy@brevardschools.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year.