

Santa Rosa County School District

# Berryhill Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

---

## Table of Contents

---

|  |           |
|--|-----------|
| <b>SIP Authority and Purpose</b>                                   | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>I. School Information</b>                                       | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>II. Needs Assessment/Data Review</b>                            | <b>11</b> |
| <b>III. Planning for Improvement</b>                               | <b>16</b> |
| <b>IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review</b>                       | <b>25</b> |
| <b>V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence</b> | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>VI. Title I Requirements</b>                                    | <b>25</b> |
| <b>VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus</b>                       | <b>0</b>  |

# Berryhill Elementary School

4900 BERRYHILL RD, Milton, FL 32570

<http://www.santarosa.k12.fl.us/schools/bhe/>

## School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Santa Rosa County School Board on 10/12/2023.

## 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),<br>(7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B)<br>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.**

The mission of Berryhill Elementary School is to love, educate, and prepare all students for graduation and a successful future.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

Our vision is to provide an environment that fosters each learner's potential, equips students for academic excellence, and promotes lifelong learning.

### 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   |
|----------------------|---------------------|---|
| Chapman, Dawn        | Principal           | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Serves as the lead administrator and ensures the implementation of all state and district policies, procedures, and regulations.</li> <li>*Works in collaboration with the Assistant Principal to nurture a safe, effective, and enjoyable learning environment.</li> <li>*Analyzes data in order to establish a high standard of expectations for our students and staff.</li> <li>*Provides direction and educational leadership with regards to curriculum and instruction, professional development, staffing, budget, technology and other facility needs.</li> <li>*Encourages open lines of communication with parents, staff, students and our community.</li> </ul>  |
| McCombs, Leann       | Assistant Principal | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Serves as the vice administrator and ensures the implementation of all state and district policies, procedures, and regulations.</li> <li>*Works in collaboration with the Principal to nurture a safe, effective, and enjoyable learning environment. *Analyzes data in order to establish a high standard of expectations for our students and staff.</li> <li>*Provides direction and educational leadership with regards to curriculum and instruction, professional development, staffing, budget, technology and other facility needs.</li> <li>*Encourages open lines of communication with parents, staff, students and our community.</li> </ul>   |
| Handley, Toniann     | Other               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Coordinates and facilitates the MTSS process, provides professional development and technical assistance for problem-solving activities including data collection, data analysis, intervention planning, and program evaluation.</li> <li>*Conducts the assessment of students and collaborates with the School-based Interventionist and classroom teachers to decide which interventions are best for each student's needs.</li> <li>*Ensures implementation of intervention support and documentation.</li> <li>*Communicates with administration, teachers, and parents regarding school-based MTSS plans and activities.</li> <li>*Facilitates the MTSS meetings.</li> <li>*Provides reading intervention to Tier 3 students.</li> </ul> |
| Hoffman, Alison      | Other               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Oversees the implementation of the Early Intervention Program as directed by the district.</li> <li>*Provides reading intervention to our Tier 2 and Tier 3 students in grades K-5.</li> <li>*Assesses students and collaborates with the MTSS Coordinator and interventionists to identify which students are in need of additional support.</li> <li>*Analyzes school-wide data to determine if interventions are appropriate.</li> <li>*Collects and tracks the progress monitoring data from all of our interventionists.</li> <li>*Participates as one of the MTSS team members.</li> </ul>  |
| Eaton Bull, Patricia | Other               | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Communicates with parents and community members to ensure that students' academic, physical, and mental health needs are being met.</li> <li>*Collects information to be discussed at the monthly Threat Assessment Team</li> </ul>   |

| Name         | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities  |
|--------------|----------------|--|
| Ward, Brandy | Teacher, K-12  | <p>meetings.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Along with School Counselor, creates our 504 plans and meets with parents and teachers to review the accommodations and ensures the students needs are appropriately being met.</li> <li>*Trains staff and leads in the administration of state assessments.</li> <li>*Along with School Counselor, submits parent and teacher-requested referrals for ESE eligibility.</li> <li>*Participates as one of the MTSS team members.</li> </ul> <p>*Prepares a variety of differentiated lessons that meet and exceed state standards across the AIMS (Arts incorporating Math &amp; Science) subject areas for all K-5 classes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>*Collaborates with teachers to ensure cohesive learning units across the grade levels.</li> <li>*Submits student work for county awards and recognition in Art and other STEM-related subjects.</li> <li>*Oversees the use, training, and upkeep of materials and supplies in our newly-created STEAM closet.</li> </ul> |

Pippin, Amanda

Teacher, K-12

- \*Prepares a variety of differentiated lessons across the subject areas for her 4th grade class.
- \*Instructs students of all Tier levels and subgroups using curriculum that is research-based, district sanctioned, and that meets and exceeds the FL DOE standards.
- \*Regularly monitors student progress and provides intervention where needed with regards to academics and behavior.
- \*Maintains regular communication with parents, administration, special education teachers, and interventionists.

**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.

On 8/8/23, our school leadership team had an informal meeting to discuss the SIP and our Focus areas this year. We received feedback and input from teachers and parents who are our '23-'24 returning School Advisory Council (SAC) members, including Angela LeBleu (parent and staff member), Molly Holmes (teacher), Julie Harrington (parent), Jennifer Thacker (parent), and Melissa Caudell (parent).

**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))



Each semester the principal and assistant principal will meet with District leaders including the Superintendent, Assistant Superintendent of Curriculum and Instruction, Grade Level Director, Literacy/Math/Science Coordinators, and the Director and Coordinator of Continuous Improvement. The purpose of the meeting will be to review current state progress monitoring data and to progress monitor the implementation of the School Improvement Strategies and Action Steps. Specific feedback will be provided and discussion will occur as to any barriers in applying the strategies of the plan.

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

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2023-24 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2022-23 Title I School Status</b>   | Yes  |
| <b>2022-23 Minority Rate</b>   | 24%  |
| <b>2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b>   | 52%  |
| <b>Charter School</b>  | No   |
| <b>RAISE School</b>  | No   |
| <b>ESSA Identification</b><br>*updated as of 3/11/2024   | ATSI   |
| <b>Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)</b>  | No   |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities (SWD)*<br>Black/African American Students (BLK)<br>Hispanic Students (HSP)<br>Multiracial Students (MUL)<br>White Students (WHT)<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL) |
| <b>School Grades History</b><br>*2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.  | 2021-22: B<br>2019-20: A<br>2018-19: A<br>2017-18: B   |
| <b>School Improvement Rating History</b>   |  |
| <b>DJJ Accountability Rating History</b>   |  |

**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   | 14          | 18 | 22 | 14 | 24 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 105   |
| One or more suspensions   | 1           | 1  | 3  | 2  | 0  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10    |
| Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)   | 0           | 2  | 10 | 5  | 3  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24    |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 0  | 6  | 2  | 2  | 4  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14    |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 3  | 26 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 47    |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 1  | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 |       |
|   | 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 | 8 | 4 | 6 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25    |

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     | 3           | 3 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1     |

**Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)**

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

| Indicator   | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   | Total |
|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|-------|
|   | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 |       |
| Absent 10% or more days   | 32          | 33 | 25 | 30 | 31 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 182   |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 0  | 2  | 0  | 0  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3     |
| Course failure in ELA   | 0           | 7  | 10 | 9  | 5  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32    |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 4  | 3  | 5  | 4  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19    |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 5  | 9  | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33    |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 3  | 13 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 |       |

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           | 5 | 6 | 6 | 10 | 7 | 0 | 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     | 1           | 8 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2     |

**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   | 32          | 33 | 25 | 30 | 31 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 182   |
| One or more suspensions   | 0           | 0  | 2  | 0  | 0  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3     |
| Course failure in ELA   | 0           | 7  | 10 | 9  | 5  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32    |
| Course failure in Math  | 0           | 4  | 3  | 5  | 4  | 3  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19    |
| Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment   | 0           | 0  | 0  | 5  | 9  | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33    |
| Level 1 on statewide Math assessment  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 3  | 13 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C. | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0     |

**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           | 5 | 6 | 6 | 10 | 7 | 0 | 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     | 1           | 8 | 1 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2     |

**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*                | 59     | 62       | 53    | 62     | 65       | 56    | 61     |          |       |
| ELA Learning Gains              |        |          |       | 56     |          |       | 55     |          |       |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile      |        |          |       | 56     |          |       | 34     |          |       |
| Math Achievement*               | 63     | 68       | 59    | 71     | 45       | 50    | 70     |          |       |
| Math Learning Gains             |        |          |       | 59     |          |       | 70     |          |       |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile     |        |          |       | 41     |          |       | 50     |          |       |
| Science Achievement*            | 48     | 57       | 54    | 46     | 68       | 59    | 60     |          |       |
| Social Studies Achievement*     |        |          |       |        | 64       | 64    |        |          |       |
| Middle School Acceleration      |        |          |       |        | 51       | 52    |        |          |       |
| Graduation Rate                 |        |          |       |        | 55       | 50    |        |          |       |
| College and Career Acceleration |        |          |       |        |          | 80    |        |          |       |
| ELP Progress                    |        | 77       | 59    |        |          |       |        |          |       |

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

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

**ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)**

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index                     |      |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)               | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students           | 57   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 1    |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 227  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 4    |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index |     |
|----------------------------|-----|
| Percent Tested             | 100 |
| Graduation Rate            |     |

| 2021-22 ESSA Federal Index                     |      |
|--|------|
| ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)               | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students           | 56   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students | No   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target   | 1    |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index      | 391  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index         | 7    |
| 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                                | 28                              | Yes                | 2   | 1   |
| ELL                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| AMI                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| ASN                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| BLK                                | 45                              |                    |   |   |
| HSP                                | 56                              |                    |   |   |
| MUL                                | 46                              |                    |   |   |
| PAC                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| WHT                                | 60                              |                    |   |   |
| FRL                                | 50                              |                    |   |   |

| 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                                | 36                              | Yes                | 1   |   |
| ELL                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| AMI                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| ASN                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| BLK                                | 47                              |                    |   |   |
| HSP                                | 82                              |                    |   |   |
| MUL                                | 57                              |                    |   |   |
| PAC                                |                                 |                    |   |   |
| WHT                                | 55                              |                    |   |   |
| FRL                                | 52                              |                    |   |   |

**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                                   | 59       |        |             | 63        |         |              | 48       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| SWD  | 30       |        |             | 35        |         |              | 19       |         |           |                   | 4                   |              |
| ELL  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  | 40       |        |             | 50        |         |              |          |         |           |                   | 2                   |              |
| HSP  | 70       |        |             | 57        |         |              | 42       |         |           |                   | 3                   |              |
| MUL  | 48       |        |             | 63        |         |              | 35       |         |           |                   | 4                   |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 61       |        |             | 64        |         |              | 52       |         |           |                   | 4                   |              |
| FRL  | 52       |        |             | 58        |         |              | 39       |         |           |                   | 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                                   | 62       | 56     | 56          | 71        | 59      | 41           | 46       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| SWD  | 35       | 52     | 52          | 44        | 36      | 15           | 21       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ELL  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  | 44       | 71     |             | 36        | 53      | 33           |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| HSP  | 76       | 73     |             | 80        | 100     |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| MUL  | 63       | 68     |             | 67        | 43      |              | 45       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 64       | 52     | 47          | 73        | 60      | 45           | 47       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  | 52       | 54     | 64          | 64        | 53      | 35           | 41       |         |           |                   |                     |              |

| 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                                   | 61       | 55     | 34          | 70        | 70      | 50           | 60       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| SWD  | 25       | 35     | 20          | 38        | 51      | 44           | 39       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ELL  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| AMI  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| ASN  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| BLK  | 21       |        |             | 14        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| HSP  | 82       |        |             | 91        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| MUL  | 47       | 50     |             | 63        | 70      |              | 43       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| PAC  |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| WHT  | 64       | 56     | 42          | 74        | 73      | 54           | 65       |         |           |                   |                     |              |
| FRL  | 53       | 54     | 31          | 64        | 65      | 43           | 52       |         |           |                   |                     |              |

**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 | 61%    | 64%      | -3%                        | 54%   | 7%                      |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 71%    | 68%      | 3%                         | 58%   | 13%                     |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 56%    | 61%      | -5%                        | 50%   | 6%                      |

| MATH  |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03    | 2023 - Spring | 64%    | 70%      | -6%                        | 59%   | 5%                      |
| 04    | 2023 - Spring | 79%    | 72%      | 7%                         | 61%   | 18%                     |
| 05    | 2023 - Spring | 59%    | 63%      | -4%                        | 55%   | 4%                      |

| SCIENCE |               |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|---------|---------------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade   | Year          | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05      | 2023 - Spring | 47%    | 55%      | -8%                        | 51%   | -4%                     |

### III. Planning for Improvement

**Data Analysis/Reflection**  
 Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

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

Our students with disabilities (SWD) showed the lowest performance using raw data from our '22-'23 FAST scores. We had over 45 students newly qualify (and/or transferred in) for ESE services in the '22-'23 school year. This group not only grew during the school year, but our 4th and 5th grade classes ended up having the largest population of SWDs out of all grade levels (K-5).

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

The raw data for our 3rd-5th grade Math shows our scores decreased from 71% overall proficiency in '22 down to 67% proficient in '23. These students were the first group to test using the Cambium FAST test. The comparison of this year's scores is with that of the FSA in '21-'22, which most students had prior experience with and the FSA was a paper-based test. Both students and teachers encountered the FAST computer-based assessment for the first time in the '23-'24 school year and they may need time to adjust to the new assessment format.

**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.**



The greatest gap when compared to the state average was that of our 3rd grade ELA which was 56% proficient. This is still 6% greater than the state's proficiency (50%), however, it is 5% shy of the district's proficiency level of 61%. When looking at the students who scored Level 1 and Level 2, several of them transferred into our school after PM1. Those students actually made up 4.76% of the 3rd grade population. Their scores alone brought down our proficiency score by 3%. Had those students been here for the entire year, receiving consistent instruction, that gap may have been reduced.

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

Our 2nd grade students went from 65% proficiency in ELA in '21-'22 to 82% proficient in '22-'23. In Math, that same group went from 73% proficient in '21-'22 to 82% proficient in '23-'24. The biggest identifiable action for this improvement was the use of our ESSR funds to hire intervention teachers. We had 6 interventionists working with struggling students in ELA and Math. There were 8 groups of 2nd graders pulled out for daily 30-minute intervention in ELA. We also purchased Lexia licenses for all of our students in October 2022. The majority of our 2nd grade teachers used the program with fidelity.

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

According to the EWS data, 103 students scored Level 1 or Level 2 on the FAST ELA test and 85 students scored a Level 1 or a Level 2 on the FAST Math test. That means 188 students in just those two grade levels that will require PMPs and/or intervention. This is one of our major areas of concern especially since the reduction in ESSR funding has resulted in the loss of 2 full-time intervention teachers.

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

1. Increasing our 3rd grade ELA proficiency scores.
2. Improving the learning gains of our students with disabilities.
3. Creating a school-wide initiative for expanding our STEM-based learning experiences.
4. Maintaining excellence in ensuring a positive school environment for children and their families with increased parental involvement activities and communication with all of our stakeholders.

**Area of Focus**

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

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

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

Based on the preliminary data (using scores from '21-'22), the lowest 25% of our Students with Disabilities (SWD) demonstrated a significant decrease in their Math learning gains (going from 44% to 15%)--a decrease of 29%. This underperforming subgroup results in our designation as an ATSI school (Additional Targeted Support and Improvement). Thus, our need is to improve the proficiency levels among that SWD subgroup in both ELA and Math.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

In '22, only 35% of our SWD population was proficient in ELA and 44% of our SWD population was proficient in Math. Our goal is to increase proficiency in both subject areas by at least 2%.

**Monitoring:**

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

Classroom teachers, ESE teachers, and interventionists will be monitoring these students using frequent progress monitoring tools in addition to the PM1 and PM2 reports in order to ensure that they are on target to increase proficiency levels from last year's scores to this year's PM3.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Toniann Handley (handleyt@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

**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.)

We have changed the distribution of our students with disabilities on our class rosters. For the '23-'24 school year, we have disseminated the SWDs among a greater number of classes; thereby reducing the number of SWDs to be placed in each class. Our hope is that the reduction per classroom will allow for smaller groups for each ESE/dual cert. teachers for the improved implementation of John Hattie's evidence-based strategy of comprehensive interventions for learning disabled students.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We chose this strategy because it is specific to the needs of students with disabilities. John Hattie's book, *Visible Learning* states, "The important instructional components (of comprehension interventions for learning disabled students) include 'attention to sequencing, drill-repetition-practice, segmenting information into parts or units, controlling task difficulty through prompts and cues (scaffolding)...and making use of small interactive groups.'" (effect size 0.77)--Source: J Hattie, Dec. 2017 [visiblelearningplus.com](http://visiblelearningplus.com). According to *Leverage Leadership 2.0* author, Paul Bambrick-Santoyo, "The only difference between the general education setting and the special education setting is the need to reassess more frequently and with differentiated assignments."

**Tier of Evidence-based Intervention**

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

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

### Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Analyze assessment data using last year's progress monitoring plans (PMPs), FAST and STAR scores, HMM screeners, Amira, Lexia, and PM1 to identify which SWDs require Tier 3 interventions by a Reading Endorsed teacher.

**Person Responsible:** Alison Hoffman (hoffmana@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** The end of the first quarter

2. All SWDs who scored Level 1s and 2s on the '22-'23 FAST will be provided a district-sanctioned intervention and their progress will be monitored by their classroom teacher, interventionist, and/or an ESE teacher.

**Person Responsible:** Toniann Handley (handleyt@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** Interventions begin the 3rd week of school and continue through May or until the student meets proficiency through adequate data collection tools.

3. Informal and formal observations will be conducted by administration to ensure the appropriate use of this strategy by our ESE and intervention staff.

**Person Responsible:** Leann McCombs (mccombsl@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** Observations begin once interventions begin and continue throughout the school year.

4. We will utilize supplemental resources to address the academic needs of these students.

**Person Responsible:** Leann McCombs (mccombsl@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** As needed throughout the year.

**#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other****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.

We understand the importance of including parents in each child's educational life. Therefore, our focus will be on creating a partnership with parents/guardians to promote a positive culture within our school through the active participation of our stakeholders in school-wide and individual classroom events.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

Our goal is to increase the average proficiency of our 3rd-5th graders on the ELA FAST PM3 test. In 2023, 3rd grade was 56% proficient, 4th grade was 71% proficient, and 5th grade was 60% proficient, resulting in an average proficiency of 62.3%. In 2024, we want to increase that average by 2%.

**Monitoring:**

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

We will provide exit surveys for our parents to fill out after family-involved events. The academic aspect will be monitored through the data collection and MTSS processes. After PM1 and PM2, there will be data chats with teachers and MTSS meetings so that interventions may be added or changed for students who are struggling. The parents of these students will receive frequent communication about their child's progress from their classroom teachers, ESE teachers, and interventionists.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Alison Hoffman (hoffmana@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

**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.)

As stated by the FLDOE, Parent and Family Engagement (PFE) has been shown to have a positive effect on student grades and test scores. Therefore, we plan to implement a more streamlined communications process and increase the opportunities for family engagement both in school-wide and individual classroom-based events.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to the FL DOE website, "Parent and Family Engagement (PFE) in a child's education is a greater predictor of academic success than whether or not that family is affluent or poor. Research tells us that students with engaged parents and families, are more likely to: Learn to read faster (Exhibit faster rates of literacy acquisition.); Have higher grades and test scores; Are promoted and take more challenging classes;

Adapt better to school and have better attendance; Have better social skills and behavior; Graduate; Go on to community/technical college or university.

<https://www.fldoe.org/policy/federal-edu-programs/title-i-part-a-improving-the-academic-/parents.shtml>

**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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

### Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Maintain positive communication with parents and disseminate information through a variety of means-- phone calls, Class Tag, paper copies, school website, and Facebook page.

**Person Responsible:** Leann McCombs (mccombsl@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** Continuously throughout the year

2. We will utilize supplemental resources to address the academic needs of our students and the involvement of their parents/guardians.

**Person Responsible:** Dawn Chapman (chapmand@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** Throughout the school year

3. Increase our parent and family engagement opportunities throughout the school year; to include events such as: Steam Jam, Vocabulary Science Parade, 5th grade living wax museum, Veteran's breakfast, Donuts with grown-ups, parent guest readers, Dr Seuss week events, field day, etc.

**Person Responsible:** Dawn Chapman (chapmand@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** Starting in the Fall and continuing throughout the year.

### #3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

#### Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

With the introduction of HB1537, the proficiency scores of our 3rd graders are of paramount importance. Our intermediate level students (gr. 3-5) have routinely surpassed the state proficiency average on standardized tests. However, our '22-'23 ELA proficiency scores in 3rd grade (56%) and 5th grade (60%) were lagging behind the district averages--3rd grade (61%), 5th grade (63%).

#### Measurable Outcome:

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

Though our evidence-based intervention for this focus area will be implemented school-wide, our measurable outcome will be tied to the proficiency scores of our 3rd graders on the '23-'24 FAST assessments. Our '22-'23 3rd graders were 56% proficient on the ELA test compared to 50% of the state's 3rd graders and 61% of Santa Rosa County's 3rd graders. The goal is that through professional development and a shift in our teaching models that we would achieve sustained improvement in our results over the next several years.

Short term: We will improve our 3rd grade ELA proficiency percentage by 3% for the '23-'24 school year. Long term: The proficiency percentage will maintain an annual increase for the next three years as more and more teachers are making the change toward student-led academic teaming.

#### Monitoring:

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

During their informal and formal observations throughout the 2nd and 3rd nine weeks, administrators will be looking to see the use of teaching model changes where student feedback is an essential element in the classroom environment. Admin will check with students during their visits to make sure that students know what they are to be learning. Afterwards, admin will meet with teachers to discuss changes that are necessary to ensure this method aligns with learning scales and ultimately, learning targets.

#### Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Leann McCombs (mccombsl@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

#### 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.)

Our interventions for this focus area are two-fold and will be implemented over the course of a few years. To start, admin will provide professional development on aligning learning scales with learning targets. Teachers will be encouraged to utilize student feedback to build on their effective instruction. Teachers will also be given the opportunity to participate in book studies on "Designing and Teaching Learning Goals and Objectives" (Marzano) and "The Power of Student Teams" by M Toth and D Sousa. The long term goal of this intervention is to move more and more classrooms toward utilizing student-led academic teaming.

#### Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

According to John Hattie's book, Visible Learning (p. 173), "When teachers seek, or at least are open to, feedback from students as to what students know, what they understand, where they make errors, when they have misconceptions, when they are not engaged--then teaching and learning can be synchronized and powerful. Feedback to teachers helps make learning visible." By starting with a focus on feedback, teachers will have an easier time of transitioning toward our future goal of student-led academic teams. In

fact, on page 74 of the book, *The Power of Student Teams*, authors M. Toth and D. Sousa state that feedback is inherent in the student-led academic teaming process and has a large effect size (0.73).

**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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No

**Action Steps to Implement**

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

1. Provide teachers with professional development and book studies that are relevant to their students' needs for improvement in ELA.

**Person Responsible:** Leann McCombs (mccombsl@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** Professional development on learning scales/targets will be done during the first semester. The book studies will be done by the Spring.

2. The leadership team will meet to review data collected during observations/classroom walkthroughs. Feedback and possibly additional professional development will be provided to teachers.

**Person Responsible:** Dawn Chapman (chapmand@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** Throughout the school year, with preliminary observations/walk throughs being done during the 2nd quarter.

3. Utilize supplemental resources to address the academic needs of students.

**Person Responsible:** Dawn Chapman (chapmand@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** Throughout the school year

4. Discuss 3rd grade students in particular and analyze PM1 and PM2 data to recommend any adjustments to instruction and/or interventions during weekly MTSS meetings.

**Person Responsible:** Toniann Handley (handleyt@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** To begin after PM1 and continue through to PM3.

5. Provide interventions to our students who are struggling in ELA using district-sanctioned intervention programs and software.

**Person Responsible:** Alison Hoffman (hoffmana@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** Interventions will begin the third week of school and will continue throughout the school year.

**#4. 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.

Our proficiency percentage on the 5th grade Science assessment was 8% lower than the district average (55%). Since the only grade that is assessed by the state in Science is 5th grade, we realize the need for a long-term plan that provides consistent instruction across the grade levels.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

While an increased Science proficiency score at the end of the year equips our 5th graders for middle school, we know the instruction to get them to that point takes place over the span of several years. Therefore we are looking to see measurable growth each year with the implementation of a 5-year plan. Short Term: In our first year, we plan to increase our 5th grade proficiency on the state Science assessment by 2% to 49%.

Long Term: Every subsequent year, we will be increasing our proficiency by 2% to close BHE's gap with the district's proficiency level. Our hope is to ultimately surpass the district's proficiency level.

**Monitoring:**

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

By the end of the first nine weeks, the Principal and Assistant Principal will have walked through every classroom during their dedicated Science block. Administrators will meet with teachers to provide feedback to support the development of explicit Science instruction.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Dawn Chapman (chapmand@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

**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.)

In order to increase our school-wide Science proficiency, we will utilize the evidence-based strategy of spaced versus mass practice. According to John Hattie's research, this strategy has an effect size of 0.65. According to John Hattie's book Visible Learning, "It is the frequency of different opportunities rather than merely spending "more" time on tasks that makes the difference to learning."

**Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our students will have multiple opportunities to experience a variety of Science-based lessons. They have their dedicated Science blocks for instruction using their Science curriculum, but teachers can also utilize supplemental materials and Science software. New to this year, we have added a STEAM closet that is full of activities and supplies that teachers can check-out to expand the Science experience in their classrooms. Students also attend AIMS class every other week--this strategy is one that we have recently put in place (last year).

**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 2 - Moderate Evidence

**Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?**

No



### Action Steps to Implement

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

1. Purchase supplemental Science materials, software, and other resources, such as Mystery Science, IXL, Scholastic Science Spin and additional items for the "STEAM closet," for all students in Gr. K-5 in order to enhance and broaden the scope of Science instruction across the grade levels.

**Person Responsible:** Leann McCombs (mccombsl@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** The end of the first quarter.

2. By conducting walkthroughs, admin will ensure that teachers are utilizing our dedicated Science block for incorporating multiple exposures of a topic into their daily Science instruction.

**Person Responsible:** Leann McCombs (mccombsl@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** By the end of the first nine weeks, admin will have walked through every classroom during their Science block.

3. Each student will participate in an AIMS class every 7 days. This class gives students different opportunities for hands-on science experiences and experiments that support and correlate with their classroom lessons and the Science curriculum.

**Person Responsible:** Brandy Ward (wardb@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** Classes begin the first full week of school.

4. We will utilize supplemental resources to address the academic needs of students.

**Person Responsible:** Dawn Chapman (chapmand@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** By the end of the school year

5. We will continue encouraging the use of varied school-wide science activities, including but not limited to: STEAM night, the Science word of the week, Career Day, the Science vocabulary parade, STEAM closet activities, Maker Spaces, and daily fun facts (on iTV).

**Person Responsible:** Dawn Chapman (chapmand@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

**By When:** Activities occur throughout the school year with STEAM night happening in the Fall and the Science vocabulary parade in the Spring.

### 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).

Although our school does not receive school improvement funding allocations, we do receive a Title 1 budget/ funding. Allocations for the spending of our Title 1 funds is determined through the use of teacher surveys (to determine software and supplies purchases), through discussions with grade level chairs and during data chats with teachers, and also via input from regularly scheduled leadership and SAC committee meetings.

### 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.

In informal meeting was held with some of the SAC members on 8/8/23. Following that meeting, their feedback and input was added to our SIP. Once it was edited accordingly, it was submitted to the district for review. Upon district approval, copies of the finalized SIP will be made available at our first SAC committee meeting and it will be uploaded to the school's webpage. A notice will be sent to parents/guardians via ClassTag with instructions on how to view it on our webpage. Additionally, printed copies will be available upon request.

<https://bhe.santarosaschools.org/en-US/berryhill-elementary-e75a1d8c>

**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))

As detailed in our Focus area on Positive Culture and Environment, our plan is to implement a more streamlined communications process and to increase the opportunities for family engagement both in school-wide and individual classroom-based events. We will maintain positive communication with parents and disseminate information through a variety of means--phone calls, Class Tag, paper copies, school website, and Facebook page.

<https://bhe.santarosaschools.org/en-US/berryhill-elementary-e75a1d8c>

**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)**

As mentioned in our academic Focus areas, we plan to strengthen our academic program through a variety of methods over a multi-year timeline.

--We are starting with our teachers--providing professional development and book studies in an effort to improve targeted instruction, incorporate student feedback, and ultimately implement student-led academic teaming.

--We plan to increase parental involvement in school-based functions so that with their cooperation our students will have additional opportunities to thrive in a positive learning environment.

--We will further the expansion of our STEAM-related instruction as we provide enrichment and incorporate higher-level thinking activities with a multidisciplinary approach.

**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))**

Not Applicable