Brevard County Public Schools
School Improvement Plan
2012-2013

Name of School: **Area:**

Central Area

Suntree Elementary School

Principal: **Area Superintendent:**

Sandra Demmon

Mecheall Giombetti

SAC Chairperson:

Jennifer Raley

Superintendent: Dr. Brian Binggeli

Mission Statement:

Empower today's students to successfully impact tomorrow.

Vision Statement:

Responsible citizens inspired by passion and purpose—skilled at helping the world achieve its potential.

RATIONAL – Continuous Improvement Cycle Process

Data Analysis from multiple data sources: *(Needs assessment that supports the need for improvement)*

Suntree Elementary School received a grade of "A" for the 2011-2012 school year. Suntree earned 659 points toward our school grade in 2012, a difference of 35 points from the 2010-2011 school year.

FCAT
Suntree Elementary felt the impact of the transition to FCAT 2.0 in 2012 as compared to the 2011 FCAT. Overall, Suntree students scored as follows:
- 90% of students met high standards in reading by scoring level 3 and above on the 2012 FCAT. This is a decrease of 8% from 2011, in which 98% of students met high standards in reading. Suntree's goal was 100% in 2012.
- 89% of students met high standards in math by scoring level 3 and above on the 2012 FCAT. This is a decrease of 6% from 2011, in which 95% of student met high standards in math. Suntree's goal was 100% in 2012.
- 87% of Suntree 4th graders met high standards in writing. This is a decrease of 12% from 2011, in which 99% of 4th graders met high standards in writing. Suntree's 2012 goal was 100% of students would meet high expectations in writing. While this was a decrease in scores, we believe our school-wide goal will address the area of writing.
- 90% of Suntree 5th graders met high standards in science by scoring level 3 and above. This is a decrease of 4% from the 2011 FCAT, in which 94% of students met high standards in science. Suntree's goal was that 98% of students would meet high standards in science.
- 78% of students made learning gains in reading on the 2012 FCAT. Suntree had no change in the percent of students making learning gains in reading from 2011 to 2012. This is below the 2012 goal of 86% making learning gains in reading.
- 81% of students made learning gains in math on the 2012 FCAT. This is an increase of 11% from the 2011 FCAT. This is below the 2012 goal of 86% making learning gains in math.
- 78% of students within the lowest 25% made a learning gain in reading on the 2012 FCAT. This is a decrease of 7% from the 2011 FCAT, in which 85% of students in the lowest 25% made learning gains in reading. This is below the 2012 goal of 94% of the lowest 25% making learning gains in reading.
- 66% of students within the lowest 25% made a learning gain in math on the 2012 FCAT. This is a decrease of 9% from the 2011 FCAT, in which 75% of students in the lowest 25% made a learning gain. This is below the 2012 goal of 86% of the lowest 25% making learning gains in math.

Subgroup Data
Suntree continues to work to close the achievement gap within its subgroups.
- 90% of white students are meeting high expectations in reading.
- 88% of white students are meeting high expectations in math.
- 43% of black students are meeting high expectations in reading.
- 71% of black students are meeting high expectations in math.
- 86% of Hispanic students are meeting high expectations in both reading and math.

- 100% of Asian students are meeting high expectations in reading and math.
- 50% of Indian/American Indian students are meeting high expectations in reading. It should be noted that there are only 2 students in this subgroup.
- 100% of Indian/American Indian students are meeting high expectations in math.
- 100% of Suntree's ELL students are meeting high expectations in both reading and math.
- 67% of economically disadvantaged students are meeting high expectations in both reading and math.
- 64% of students with disabilities are meeting high expectations in reading, well below the 2012 goal of 86%.
- 63% of students with disabilities are meeting high expectations in math, well below the 2012 goal of 86%.

FAIR

Grades K-2

The average Probability of Reading Success score of Suntree students in grades K-2 on the May 2012 FAIR assessment was 83.36. 49% of students demonstrated positive growth from May 2011 to May 2012. 17% of students demonstrated flat growth from May 2011 to May 2012. 34% of students demonstrated negative growth from May 2011 to May 2012. Available subgroup data shows that white students had an average PRS of 83.82 with 50% positive growth; 18% flat growth; and 32% negative growth. Black students had an average PRS of 73.8 with 60% positive growth; 0% flat growth; and 40% negative growth. Hispanic students had an average PRS of 83.84 with 32% positive growth; 26% flat growth; and 42% negative growth. Asian students had an average PRS of 86.89 with 58% positive growth; 11% flat growth; and 32% negative growth. American Indian students had an average PRS of 57.5 with 50% positive growth; 0% flat growth; and 50% negative growth. Economically disadvantaged students had an average PRS of 76.02 with 51% positive growth; 24% flat growth; and 24% negative growth. Subgroup data was not available for students with disabilities or ELL students.

Grades 3-6

The average Reading Comprehension score on the FAIR from May 2011 to May 2012 was 528.1 with 55% positive growth; 12% flat growth; and 33% negative growth. White students had an average RC score of 529.79 with 54% positive growth; 13% flat growth; and 34% negative growth. Black students had an average RC score of 374.75 with 50% positive growth; 13% flat growth; and 38% negative growth. Hispanic students had an average RC score of 515.38 with 76% positive growth; 14% flat growth; and 10% negative growth. Asian students had an average RC score of 560.37 with 53% positive growth; 5% flat growth; and 42% negative growth. American Indian students had an average RC score of 514 with 100% positive growth. Economically disadvantaged students had an average RC score of 501.66 with 56% positive growth; 12% flat growth; and 32% negative growth. Subgroup data was not populated for students with disabilities and ELL students.

DRLA Reading Proficiency

On the Spring 2012 District Reading and Language Arts assessment 90% of all students scored in the Low Risk range. 6% of students scored in the Moderate Risk range. 2% of students scored in the High Risk range. The average score for all students was 87.76%. 47% of all students demonstrated positive growth, while 15% demonstrated flat growth and 38% demonstrated negative growth. White students had a DRLA average of 87.74% with 46% demonstrating positive growth, while 16% demonstrated flat growth and 38% demonstrated negative growth. Black students had an average DRLA score of 76.05% with 45% demonstrating positive growth. 9% of black students demonstrated flat growth, while 45% demonstrated negative growth. Hispanic students had an average DRLA score of 82.56%. Of Hispanic students, 42% showed positive growth; 18% demonstrated flat growth; and 39% demonstrated negative growth. Asian students had a DRLA average of

94.54%. Of Asian students, 59% showed positive growth; 5% showed flat growth; and 35% showed negative growth. American Indian students had an average DRLA score of 84.85% with 100% showing positive growth. Economically disadvantaged students had an average DRLA score of 84.18%. Of economically disadvantaged students, 54% demonstrated positive growth; 18% demonstrated flat growth; and 28% demonstrated negative growth. Subgroup data was not populated for students with disabilities and ELL students.

District Required Math Assessment
On the Spring 2012 District Required End of Year assessment, 80% of all students scored in the Low Risk range. 14% of students scored in the Moderate Risk range. 5% of students scored in the High Risk range. The average score for all students was 84.48%. 40% of all students demonstrated positive growth, while 22% demonstrated flat growth and 38% demonstrated negative growth. White students had an average of 85% with 39% demonstrating positive growth, while 23% demonstrated flat growth and 38% demonstrated negative growth. Black students had an average score of 75.81% with 33% demonstrating positive growth. 8% of black students demonstrated flat growth, while 58% demonstrated negative growth. Hispanic students had an average score of 77.89%. Of Hispanic students, 45% showed positive growth; 18% demonstrated flat growth; and 37% demonstrated negative growth. Asian students had an average of 88.24%. Of Asian students, 58% showed positive growth; 8% showed flat growth; and 34% showed negative growth. American Indian students had an average score of 74.9% with 33% showing positive growth and 67% showed negative growth. Economically disadvantaged students had an average score of 77.4%. Of economically disadvantaged students, 46% demonstrated positive growth; 19% demonstrated flat growth; and 36% demonstrated negative growth. Subgroup data was not populated for students with disabilities and ELL students.

District Required Science Body of Knowledge Assessments
Life Science BOK
On the 2012 District Life Science Body of Knowledge Assessment, 88% of all students scored in the Low Risk range. 10% of students scored in the Moderate Risk range. 1% of students scored in the High Risk range. The average score for all students was 88.06%. 24% of all students demonstrated positive growth, while 41% demonstrated flat growth and 35% demonstrated negative growth. White students had an average of 88.06% with 23% demonstrating positive growth, while 42% demonstrated flat growth and 35% demonstrated negative growth. Black students had an average score of 79.01% with 27% demonstrating positive growth. 27% of black students demonstrated flat growth, while 45% demonstrated negative growth. Hispanic students had an average score of 85.72%. Of Hispanic students, 25% showed positive growth; 44% demonstrated flat growth; and 31% demonstrated negative growth. Asian students had an average of 93.5%. Of Asian students, 32% showed positive growth; 32% showed flat growth; and 32% showed negative growth. American Indian students had an average score of 70.5% with 33% showing positive growth, 33% showing flat growth, and 33% showed negative growth. Economically disadvantaged students had an average score of 84.01%. Of economically disadvantaged students, 19% demonstrated positive growth; 49% demonstrated flat growth; and 32% demonstrated negative growth. Subgroup data was not populated for students with disabilities and ELL students.
Earth/Space BOK
On the 2012 District Earth/Space Science Body of Knowledge Assessment, 94% of all students scored in the Low Risk range. 6% of students scored in the Moderate Risk range. Less than 1% of students scored in the High Risk range. The average score for all students was 90.37%. 28% of all students demonstrated positive growth, while 44% demonstrated flat growth and 28% demonstrated negative growth. White students had an average of 90.43% with 27% demonstrating positive growth, while 46% demonstrated flat growth and

28% demonstrated negative growth. Black students had an average score of 89.86% with 36% demonstrating positive growth. 45% of black students demonstrated flat growth, while 18% demonstrated negative growth. Hispanic students had an average score of 87.05%. Of Hispanic students, 28% showed positive growth; 47% demonstrated flat growth; and 25% demonstrated negative growth. Asian students had an average of 92.5%. Of Asian students, 24% showed positive growth; 24% showed flat growth; and 53% showed negative growth. American Indian students had an average score of 79.8% with 33% showing positive growth, 67% showing flat growth, and 0% showed negative growth. Economically disadvantaged students had an average score of 87.26%. Of economically disadvantaged students, 26% demonstrated positive growth; 49% demonstrated flat growth; and 25% demonstrated negative growth. Subgroup data was not populated for students with disabilities and ELL students.

Physical Science BOK

On the 2012 District Physical Science Body of Knowledge Assessment, 87% of all students scored in the Low Risk range. 9% of students scored in the Moderate Risk range. 3% of students scored in the High Risk range. The average score for all students was 87.91%. 31% of all students demonstrated positive growth, while 38% demonstrated flat growth and 31% demonstrated negative growth. White students had an average of 87.96% with 32% demonstrating positive growth, while 38% demonstrated flat growth and 30% demonstrated negative growth. Black students had an average score of 78.62% with 25% demonstrating positive growth. 42% of black students demonstrated flat growth, while 33% demonstrated negative growth. Hispanic students had an average score of 87.29%. Of Hispanic students, 37% showed positive growth; 47% demonstrated flat growth; and 16% demonstrated negative growth. Asian students had an average of 91.64%. Of Asian students, 21% showed positive growth; 29% showed flat growth; and 50% showed negative growth. American Indian students had an average score of 82.02% with 33% showing positive growth, 67% showing flat growth, and 0% showed negative growth. Economically disadvantaged students had an average score of 84.61%. Of economically disadvantaged students, 24% demonstrated positive growth; 45% demonstrated flat growth; and 30% demonstrated negative growth. Subgroup data was not populated for students with disabilities and ELL students.

Client Survey Results

The 2012 Client Survey indicates the majority of Suntree parents feel that email, Edline and notes from the teacher are the best way to communicate between the school and home. Parents would like to see more of the following topics presented at Suntree: school clubs/activities, study skills, and homework help. 55% of parents indicated that evening was best for school events. 68% of parents either participated and felt valued and felt informed and satisfied with participation in school decision making. 85% of parents felt that classroom instruction was good or excellent.

IPPAS Data

16% of Suntree's teachers scored at the Distinguished level on the Brevard County Instructional Personnel Performance Appraisal System; Dimension 2; Employs higher order questions.

Suntree's priority need, based on data analysis, is to focus on instructional practices that will:
- Increase the number of students scoring at level 3 and above, as well as maintaining and/or increasing the number of students scoring at levels 4 &5. This will effectively serve to increase learning gains among these students, as well.
- Decrease the number of students scoring level 1 and 2 in order meet high standards and increase learning gains.

- Increase the number of students scoring level 3 and above, and the students making learning gains, who are in the SWD sub group.
- Increase the number of students meeting high expectations in reading who are in the EDS sub group.
- Increase the number of students making learning gains who are in the lowest 25% sub group.

Analysis of Current Practice: *(How do we currently conduct business?)*

- Students are currently clustered for both remedial and enrichment needs.
- Attention to percentages of ESE students to General Education students is closely monitored. Special considerations were given to limit the number of students clustered in a classroom in need of intervention/ESE services.
- Teachers have received formal training and on-going feedback on Kagan Engagement Strategies over the past two years, and the Kovalik Highly Effective Teaching Model this past summer. The use of Brain–based Teaching and Learning Strategies have increased in every classroom. There has been visible evidence that all teachers have put new knowledge into practice. We need to continue to work towards and support a unified application or focus across grade levels for student to student engagement and real world connections to occur as a matter of course in each classroom.
- The Content Area Leadership Teams in place last year have been reconfigured according to more integrated areas of focus including: Common Core State Standards, Best Practices, Teaching and Learning Environment and 21st Century Skills. These teams continue to consist of representation from each grade level, and serve as a Professional Learning Community to support the implementation of the School Improvement Plan. They function as a vertical articulation team within that focus area. These teams oversee any schoolwide activities and make decisions related to school improvement initiatives.
- Grade level/Department Teams work as Professional Learning Communities at weekly meetings. These meetings are dedicated to planned, purposeful grade level collaboration. There are a variety of structures in place to facilitate shared leadership and to develop a collaborative culture. There has been limited use of this time to explore and deepen our understanding and use of higher order questioning as a tool to increase student achievement. There is currently little or no practice in place to provide a planned, purposeful and focused approach to developing higher order questioning on an individual or grade level basis.
- Math instruction is currently presented mainly in a whole group lesson format. Small group differentiated math instruction is not common practice in most classrooms.
- Policies and procedures are becoming more unified in plan and implementation from grade to grade

and classroom to classroom. A common language connected to the Kovalik LIFESKILLS has taken root, but still needs to become integral to the school culture and daily language in all classrooms, school events, and homes. Common language in the area of Higher Order Questioning is not evident and hasn't been an area of focus.

Best Practice: *(What does research tell us we should be doing as it relates to data analysis above?)*

Based on an analysis of all data from the 2011-2012 school year it is evident that we need to pursue a school improvement focus that addresses maintaining and increasing a high percentage of students scoring level 3 or above. Since a majority of students at Suntree score a 3 or above, we will narrow our focus further to increasing/maintaining our students that score a level 4 or 5 on the math, reading, and science portion of the FCAT. Research shows that asking higher order questions in a planned and purposeful manner through instruction and student to student interaction will support high levels of student learning and achievement.

Research done by Gail (1970) and Hate and Pulliam (1980) shows that only 20% of classroom questions are higher order questions. Questions that are higher level produce more learning (Redfield & Rousseau, 1981 from Classroom Instruction that Works by Marzano, Pickering, and Pollock). Marzono's ten effective strategies suggests that well designed questions can help students gain a deeper comprehension of text. J. Acree Walsh and B. Denkert Sattes in Quality Questioning (2005), we need to ask the right questions rather than more of them. Asking fewer, more complex questions leads to a deeper understanding of test. Their research looks at processing time provided after asking questions and how few content-related questions are asked and that higher level thinking questions are almost nonexistent.

Norman L. Webb in his Webb's Depth of Knowledge (Webb Alignment Tools (2005) states that, questions we ask children can be divided into four categories. Level 1 is comprised of recall questions; Level 2 is comprised of skill/concept questions; Level 3 is comprised of Strategic Thinking questions; Level 4 is comprised of

extended thinking questions. To comprehend and learn knowledge on a deeper level, the majority of the questions you ask students should be from levels 2-4. Current practice with most teachers is to ask the majority of questions from Level 1. Focusing more on higher order questions by changing your practice as the teacher will improve students' comprehension and learning.

Max Thompson states in his training materials "Lessons From Exemplary Leaders" that, "the USDOE National Testing Service has recommended, and all the major testing companies have agreed, to set a target that all state and national tests be at least 75% higher level items by the year 2011. However, as we already know, very few public school teachers regularly give tests with 75% of the items reasoning and higher level questions. Students must practice and be given feedback consistently in order to perform well on the new types of tests."

CONTENT AREA:

Reading	Math	Writing	Science	Parental Involvement	Drop-out Programs
Language Arts	Social Studies	Arts/PE	Other:		

School Based Objective: *(Action statement: What will we do to improve programmatic and/or instructional effectiveness?)*

> All Suntree teachers will utilize higher order questioning strategies that are planned and purposeful throughout daily instruction.

Strategies: *(Small number of action oriented staff performance objectives)*

Barrier	Action Steps	Person Responsible	Timetable	Budget	In-Process Measure
1.Professional Development Needs	1a. Research appropriate and meaningful training on Higher Order Questioning	Administration	Preplanning-- August		Training Agendas
	1b. Schedule training and Book Study on Quality Questioning with Reading Coach	Administration Reading Coach	Preplanning— August	$300	Training Agendas

	1c. Utilize current PLC structure to conduct and attend Steps to Quality Questioning training including follow-up, coaching, and time to share successes and challenges in implementation both within grade levels and across grade levels	Administration Reading Coach	September and October 2012 Informal follow up on-going throughout the year		Feedback sessions Follow up activities PLC Agendas Classroom Walkthroughs
	1d. Schedule and conduct training on lesson design and the use of a lesson template that includes planning and documentation of Higher Order Questioning and High Yield Strategies	Administration District Resource Teacher	February 2013		Lesson Plans Training agendas Classroom Walkthroughs
	1e. Designate a primary and intermediate model classroom to utilize for observations as teachers implement Steps to Quality Questioning	Administration	November 2012		Videos Observation Notes Reflection form

	1f. Create a model process for collecting baseline data, conducting reflective practice, feedback and coaching, on higher order questioning,	Administration Designated Teachers	October 2012-March 2013	$3500	Administration PGP's and baseline data Videos PLC agendas Feedback and coaching schedules
2. Time	2. Utilize current PLC structures, schedules and timelines to share successes and challenges in implementation of Steps to Quality Questioning	Administration Teachers Leadership Teams	September 2012-May 2013		PLC Agendas and schedules
3. Common Language	3a. Share and utilize Florida's Common Language of Instruction relating to higher order questioning with all teachers	Administration	October-November 2012		Copy of Florida's Common Language of Instruction PLC Agendas
	3b. Provide teachers/utilize the common language in Steps to Quality Questioning, i.e. Webb's Depth of Knowledge	Administration Teachers	September 2012-May 2013		PLC Agendas and schedules Handouts

	3c. Conduct classroom walkthroughs to observe common questioning language is being used in instruction, to include Steps to Quality Questioning, i.e. Webb's Depth of Knowledge	Administration	On–going throughout the year		Classroom Walkthroughs Lesson Plans

EVALUATION – Outcome Measures and Reflection

Qualitative and Quantitative Professional Practice Outcomes: *(Measures the level of implementation of the professional practices throughout the school)*

- Increased use of planned and purposeful higher order questioning will be observed and documented through the use of classroom walkthroughs and lesson plans.

- A pre/post survey of questioning practices will show an increased knowledge, understanding and awareness of higher order questioning practices.

- Increase percentage of Suntree teachers scoring at the Distinguished level on the Brevard County Instructional Personnel Performance Appraisal System; Dimension 3--employs higher order questions

- PLC Focus Calendar

- Videos

- Peer/Administrative feedback and coaching

  conference notes

Qualitative and Quantitative Student Achievement Expectations: *(Measures of student achievement)*

- Brevard County District Reading and Language

  Arts Assessments

- Brevard County District Math Assessments

- Brevard County District Body of Knowledge

  Science Assessments

- FCAT Results

- FAIR Results

- A3 Item Analysis Reports

- Surveys

- Student content area notebooks, logs, journals

APPENDIX A

(ALL SCHOOLS)

Reading Goal 1. 93% of all students will score satisfactory on the 2013 FCAT Reading Assessment in order to meet the 2013 AMO Target.	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 28%=129 students)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects ie. 31%=1134 students)
Anticipated Barrier(s): **1. Instructional delivery**		
Strategy(s): **1a. Increase the use of higher order thinking questions throughout daily instruction** **2b. Use small group structures to address the remedial and enrichment needs of students.** **3c. Track student progress in A3 for three subgroups that did not meet targeted AMO in reading (Hispanic, White, and Economically Disadvantaged).**		

FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 **Barrier(s): instructional** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	27% = 109 students	32% = 124 students
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	50% = 1 student	100% = 1 student

FCAT 2.0
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Reading
 	
Barrier(s): instructional delivery
 	
Strategy(s):
   1a. Increase the use of higher order thinking questions throughout daily instruction
   1b. Use small group structures to address the needs and challenge students working above grade level.
	63% = 253 students	68% = 266 students

Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	50% = 1 student	N/A
Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning Gains in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	0% = 0 students	100% = 1 student
FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading **Barrier(s): instructional delivery** **Strategies:** **1a. Identify and target students in the lowest 25%** **1b. Use small group structures to provide additional focused instruction on target skills (MTSS)** **1c. Monthly progress monitoring of students** **Florida Alternate Assessment:** Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	78% = 16 students N/A	83% = 55 students

Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%: Baseline data 2010-11:		
Student subgroups by ethnicity	Enter numerical data for current level of performance	Enter numerical data for expected level of performance
White:	91%=259 Students	93%=291 students
Black:	NA	NA
Hispanic:	86%=37 students	88%=19 students
Asian:	100%=15 students **Target met	96%=19 students
American Indian:	NA	NA
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Reading **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** 1.	NA	NA
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Reading **Barrier(s): 1. Time 2. Instructional delivery** **Strategy(s):** 1. **Schedule and plan time for ESE and general education teachers to collaboratively plan for instruction and needs of ESE students.** **2a.Use small group structures to address the needs of ESE students** **2b. Monthly progress monitoring of ESE students**	78%=34 students making progress 22% = 10 students not making progress **Target Met	74%=16 students making progress
Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Reading **Barrier(s): 1. Time 2. Instructional delivery** **Strategy(s):** **1a. Monthly progress monitoring of economically disadvantaged students.** **1b. Use small group structures and MTSS to address needs as indicated by progress monitoring.**	70%=41 students making progress 30%=17 students not making progress	82%=51 students making progress

Reading Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/ Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring

Steps to Quality Questioning and text complexity training with the reading coach	Monthly	Classroom walkthroughs Observations/feedback Sharing challenges and successes	
Best Practices Leadership Team presentations (i.e. student led conferences, student learning objectives)	1 x per semester	Implement and share experiences at follow-up meeting	

CELLA GOAL	Anticipated Barrier	Strategy	Person/Process/ Monitoring
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Listening/ Speaking:** 89%			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Reading:** 67%			
2012 Current Percent of Students Proficient in **Writing**: 60%			

Mathematics Goal(s): 1.	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Anticipated Barrier(s): 1.		
Strategy(s): 1.		
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at Achievement Level 3 **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** 1.	**24% = 95 students**	**29% = 107 students**
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** 1.	**50% = 1 student**	**100% = 1 student**
FCAT 2.0 Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Mathematics **Barrier(s): instructional delivery** **Strategy(s):** **1a. Increase the use of higher order thinking questions throughout daily instruction** **1b. Use small group structures to address the needs and to challenge students working above grade level.**	**63% = 255 students**	**68% = 262 students**
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** 1.	**50% = 1 student**	**N/A**

Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students making learning Gains in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	**100% = 1 student**	**100% = 1 student**
FCAT 2.0 Percentage of students in lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics **Barrier(s): instructional delivery** **Strategies:** **1a. Identify and target students in the lowest 25%** **1b. Use small group structures to provide additional focused instruction on target skills (MTSS)** **1c. Monthly progress monitoring of students**	**66% = 20 students**	**71% = 35 students**
Florida Alternate Assessment: Percentage of students in Lowest 25% making learning gains in Mathematics **Barrier(s):** **Strategy(s):** **1.**	N/A	N/A
Ambitious but Achievable Annual Measurable Objectives (AMOs). **In six years school will reduce their Achievement Gap by 50%:** **Baseline Data 2010-11:**		

Student subgroups by ethnicity :		
White:	89%=254 students ***Target Met	89%=279 students
Black:	NA	NA
Hispanic:	86%=37 students ***Target Met	80%= 19 students
Asian:	100%=15 students ***Target met	96%=19 students
American Indian:	NA	NA
English Language Learners (ELL) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics	NA	NA
Students with Disabilities (SWD) not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics **Barrier(s): 1. Time 2. Instructional delivery** Strategy(s): **1a. Schedule and plan time for ESE and general education teachers to collaboratively plan for instruction and needs of ESE students.** **2a. Use small group structures to address the needs of ESE students** **2b. Monthly progress monitoring of ESE students**	79%=35 students making progress 21%=9 students not making progress ***Target Met	74%=16 students making progress

Economically Disadvantaged Students not making satisfactory progress in Mathematics **Barrier(s): 1. Time 2. Instructional delivery** **Strategy(s):** **1a. Monthly progress monitoring of economically disadvantaged students.** **1b. Use small group structures to address needs as indicated by progress monitoring.**	70%=41 students making progress 30%=17 students not making progress	73% = 45 students

Mathematics Professional Development

PD Content/Topic/Focus	Target Dates/ Schedule	Strategy(s) for follow-up/monitoring
Common Core-unpacking of standards and moving towards implementation of mathematical practices on a daily basis	October PDD Quarterly Follow up	K-2 math assessments 3-6 sharing of new practices/ challenges

Writing	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Barrier(s): **Strategy(s):** **1.**		
FCAT: Students scoring at Achievement level 3.0 and higher in writing	87% = 82 students	92% = 74 students
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at 4 or higher in writing	N/A	N/A

Science Goal(s) (Elementary and Middle) 1.	2012 Current Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)	2013 Expected Level of Performance (Enter percentage information and the number of students that percentage reflects)
Barrier(s): **Strategy(s):** 1.		
Students scoring at Achievement level 3 in Science:	35% = 33 students	40% = 37 students
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at levels 4, 5, and 6 in Science	N/A	N/A
Students scoring at or above Achievement Levels 4 and 5 in Science:	53%=50	58%=53
Florida Alternate Assessment: Students scoring at or above Level 7 in Reading	N/A	N/A

For the following areas, please write a brief narrative that includes the data for the year 2011-12 and a description of changes you intend to incorporate to improve the data for the year 2012-13.

MULTI-TIERED SYSTEM OF SUPPORTS (MTSS)/RtI (Identify the MTSS leadership team and it role in development and implementation of the SIP along with data sources, data management and how staff is trained in MTSS)

The MTSS leadership team consists of the Principal, Assistant Principal, Reading Coach, Guidance Counselor, and School Psychologist. The MTSS leadership team supports identification of areas of need and support with strategies for the SIP. The MTSS leadership team meets monthly to review progress monitoring data as it relates to students working below grade level and ESE students. Staff is trained on the MTSS process in whole and small group PLC meetings on an ongoing basis.

PARENT INVOLVEMENT:

Suntree had 12,105.93 volunteer hours for the 2011-2012 school year. On the 2012 Client Survey,
The majority of Suntree parents felt that email, Edline and notes from the teacher are the best way to communicate between the school and home. Parents would like to see more of the following topics presented at Suntree: school clubs/activities, study skills, and homework help. 55% of parents indicated that evening was best for school events. 68% of parents either participated and felt valued and felt informed and satisfied with participation in school decision making. 85% of parents felt that classroom instruction was good or excellent. Suntree will continue to hold parent nights for math, reading, science, bullying and 21st century parenting
.

ATTENDANCE: (Include current and expected attendance rates, excessive absences and tardies)

Suntree's average attendance rate for the 2011-2012 school year was 96.16%, 0.68% higher that of the District average of 95.48%. Suntree had a 1% excused absence rate in 2012, 0.61% lower than the District average of 1.61%. Suntree had a 2.84% rate of unexcused absences in 2012, 0.06% lower than the District average of 2.90%.

SUSPENSION:

Suntree had 124 discipline referrals in the 2011-2012 school in which resulted in 8 in-school suspensions and 5 out of school suspensions. Based on 2011-2012 discipline data, suspensions and discipline referrals are not an issue at Suntree.

DROP-OUT (High Schools only):
Not Applicable

POSTSECONDARY READINESS: (How does the school incorporate students' academic and career planning, as well as promote student course selections, so that students' course of study is personally meaningful? Describe strategies for improving student readiness for the public postsecondary level based on annual analysis of the High School Feedback Report.)
Not Applicable