

School Board of Levy County

Bronson Elementary School



2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	19
Budget to Support Goals	21

Bronson Elementary School

400 ISHIE AVE, Bronson, FL 32621

<http://www.levyk12.org/schools>

Demographics

Principal: Salinda Wiggins M

Start Date for this Principal: 4/4/2004

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2018-19 Title I School	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: B (56%) 2014-15: C (52%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	19
Budget to Support Goals	21

Bronson Elementary School

400 ISHIE AVE, Bronson, FL 32621

<http://www.levyk12.org/schools>

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2018-19 Title I School	2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	28%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	C	C	B	B

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

In a cooperative effort by school, community and home, we strive to provide a safe environment in which students are expected to master skills that help them reach their maximum potential in life.

Provide the school's vision statement.

N/A

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Beauchamp, Cheryl	Principal	Evaluates and supports the school's instructional programs and practices. Communicates school's mission to all stakeholders and provides training and support for every area of the school and local community.
Fries, Rebecca	Teacher, K-12	First Grade Team leader Facilitates weekly grade level meetings to discuss instructional strategies and ways to improve learning. Leads team in long range and short range planning and student achievement goals.
Bowman, Tina	School Counselor	Supports the schools instructional practices and monitors the well being of all students. Coordinates efforts with outside entities to provide appropriate services to meet the needs of our students. Coordinates and monitors the state testing process.
Carson, Melody	Assistant Principal	Evaluates and supports the school's instructional programs and practices. Provides training and guidance for the implementation of best practices schoolwide.
Turner, Cassandra	Teacher, K-12	Third Grade Team leader Facilitates weekly grade level meetings to discuss instructional strategies and ways to improve learning. Leads team in long range and short range planning and student achievement goals.
Chemin, Melinda	Teacher, K-12	Teacher intervention for Tier 3 students. Facilitates data meetings with teachers to monitor student progress of Tier 2 and Tier 3 students. Coordinates the progress monitoring process schoolwide.
O'Connell, Linda	Teacher, K-12	Interventionist for grades 3 - 5. Supports classroom instruction with intensive intervention and formative assessments.
Romagnolo, Robin	Teacher, K-12	Second Grade Team leader Facilitates weekly grade level meetings to discuss instructional strategies and ways to improve learning. Leads team in long range and short range planning and student achievement goals.
Valentine, Candace	Teacher, K-12	Fifth Grade Team leader Facilitates weekly grade level meetings to discuss instructional strategies and ways to improve learning. Leads team in long range and short range planning and student achievement goals.
DeOliveira, Gabriela	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten Team Leader Facilitates weekly grade level meetings to discuss instructional strategies and ways to improve learning. Leads team in long range and short range planning and student achievement goals.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Trimm, Julie	Teacher, K-12	Fourth Grade Team Leader Facilitates weekly grade level meetings to discuss instructional strategies and ways to improve learning. Leads team in long range and short range planning and student achievement goals.

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/20/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	30	16	17	13	19	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113
One or more suspensions	1	1	2	3	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA or Math	11	15	4	9	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	31	36	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	6	1	8	5	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Attendance below 90 percent	30	16	17	13	19	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113
One or more suspensions	1	1	2	3	6	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
Course failure in ELA or Math	11	15	4	9	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	31	36	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	88

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	6	1	8	5	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	44%	49%	57%	56%	49%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	59%	58%	58%	55%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	55%	53%	62%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	51%	58%	63%	70%	57%	61%
Math Learning Gains	53%	64%	62%	57%	52%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	42%	51%	51%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	46%	50%	53%	62%	47%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
Number of students enrolled	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	0 (30)	0 (16)	0 (17)	0 (13)	0 (19)	0 (18)	0 (113)
One or more suspensions	0 (1)	0 (1)	0 (2)	0 (3)	0 (6)	0 (7)	0 (20)
Course failure in ELA or Math	0 (11)	0 (15)	0 (4)	0 (9)	0 (1)	0 (2)	0 (42)
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (31)	0 (36)	0 (21)	0 (88)

Grade Level Data

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

NOTE: An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	39%	52%	-13%	58%	-19%
	2018	39%	48%	-9%	57%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	49%	48%	1%	58%	-9%
	2018	40%	41%	-1%	56%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
05	2019	45%	44%	1%	56%	-11%
	2018	46%	44%	2%	55%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	44%	55%	-11%	62%	-18%
	2018	63%	55%	8%	62%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-19%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	60%	59%	1%	64%	-4%
	2018	57%	59%	-2%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	51%	53%	-2%	60%	-9%
	2018	55%	53%	2%	61%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	45%	49%	-4%	53%	-8%
	2018	54%	48%	6%	55%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	33	42		47	58						
ELL	29	40		39	60	57	36				
BLK	37	50		47	54						
HSP	30	49	45	41	57	50	28				
WHT	48	58	48	54	51	35	51				
FRL	39	51	45	47	50	43	40				
2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	27	31	42	35	23		20				
ELL	20	43	43	38	35						
BLK	33	30		43							
HSP	32	40	47	46	34	9	45				
MUL	44	30		75	40						
WHT	45	44	48	59	37	39	56				
FRL	38	40	40	54	33	28	51				
2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	33	38	38	62	50	50	64				
ELL	21	64		46	55						
BLK	37	54		63	54						
HSP	41	65	60	46	52	54					
WHT	60	58	67	76	59	52	65				
FRL	52	56	63	66	54	52	52				

ESSA Data

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

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	77
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	417
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	48
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	47
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	49
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	49
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	49
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Reflection

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

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

Although Math Lowest 25th Percentile showed 13% higher, we are still only at 40%. With regards to proficiency, ELA continues to be well below the state average of 57% with only 44% of our students performing on grade level. Bronson Elementary School is a Title 1 school, with 100% of our students on free lunch and breakfast. The poverty of our community is a contributing factor to the lack of vocabulary of our students upon entering kindergarten. Reading proficiency has been a major concern with regards to student achievement over more than 10 years.

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

The greatest decline from the prior year is Science Achievement with an 8% decrease which dropped from 54% proficiency to 46%. Science Achievement scores are based on 5th grade performance. Only 45 % of our 5th graders were proficient readers. Content areas such a science and social studies are directly affected by the readability level of the text compared to the reading levels of our students. Content vocabulary is also a contributing factor to this deficit. Many of our students, due to economic status have limited experiences on which to build their knowledge. The Science FCAT is an accumulation of skills and knowledge from kindergarten through 5th grade. At Bronson Elementary, our students come to us in kindergarten with little to no exposure to print and words. Much of our time is spent building the foundation for reading and comprehension which leaves little time for content related material until about 3rd grade.

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.

ELA achievement and Science Achievement both have a gap of 13% when compared to the state average. The science gap is directly related to the low proficiency in ELA. With only 44% of our students in grades 3-5 being proficient readers, the lack of skills often prohibits that transfer of knowledge across subject areas. ELA/Reading affects every other area of teaching and learning.

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

The largest improvement was shown in the area of Math Learning Gains with a 17% increase in the students who made significant improvement. Last year's School Improvement Plan targeted Math Lowest 25th Percentile as an area of focus due to only 27% of our bottom quartile showed learning gains in 2018. In grades 3, 4, and 5, weekly grade level meetings were held with an emphasis placed on math instruction. Direct instruction with math vocabulary, fluency, and problem solving was a focus with every lesson. Small group instruction immediately followed a lesson and was based on teacher observation and formative assessments.

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

The 2 areas of the EWS data of biggest concern are 1.) Attendance below 90 percent - There were 113 students with attendance below 90% for the 2018-19 school year in Grades K-5. This is 18% of our student population. Statistics and research support the fact that attendance is a leading factor in student achievement. Students cannot learn if they do not attend school. 2.) Level 1's on ELA or Math statewide assessments - Due to the SES of our student population and attendance issues, level 1 achievement in either ELA or math is a real problem. With 88 students in grades 3-5 scoring a level 1 in either ELA or math, this is 29% of the total students in those grade levels.

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

1. ELA Achievement
2. Math Achievement
3. Math Lowest 25th Percentile
4. ELA Lowest 25th Percentile
5. Science Achievement

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	ELA Achievement Proficiency
Rationale	Reading proficiency has historically been the most challenging area of student achievement at Bronson Elementary School. Students come from very low income families and have little to no exposure to print. The entire school qualifies for free lunch and breakfast. The vocabulary deficit in our community is extreme before students enter the formal education system. Many students come to BES without any knowledge of letters and sounds and limited exposure to daily conversation. Reading is the foundation of learning and directly impacts every other aspect of the education process. BES scored 44% proficiency in ELA Achievement. This was only a 2% gain from 2018 and is still 15% below the state average. As a fundamental skill, reading proficiency must be a priority in our schoolwide improvement plan.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	FSA 2019 ELA Achievement score is 44% proficiency with a 15% gap between the school and state's outcomes. Although BES demonstrated an increase in ELA learning gains, the proficiency level remains below 50%. With a strong focus on student engagement during core reading instruction, the expected outcome for FSA 2020 is 52%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Cheryl Beauchamp (cheryl.beauchamp@levyk12.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	During core instruction, distributive summarizing will be used to determine students' level of understanding of the concept or skill. Using distributive summarizing, teachers will pull small groups of students during the 120 minutes of reading instruction based on the needs of the students with the current standard being taught. K-5 teachers are expected to give immediate feedback and explicit instruction, where students are taught using different modalities of learning in order to better comprehend and retain the information over time. Instructional strategies that activate prior knowledge, repetition of the concepts/skills, use of visuals such as anchor charts and interactive word walls, will all support long term retention and the transference of knowledge to improve student achievement. Student engagement will be a priority in every classroom with the implementation of KAGAN structures across the curriculum.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Distributive summarizing, explicit instruction, and activating prior knowledge all have been part of the significant research of Dr. Max Thompson, the founder of Learning Focus Solutions. Dr. Thompson's research and work is based on his observations and implementation of these strategies in low income schools across the country. KAGAN structures are proven to be highly effective in engaging 100% of the students in the learning process. Student engagement has a direct correlation to an increase in student achievement. Kagan provides the opportunity for all students to participate in discussions, debates, and evidenced-based answers. The structure provide a unique opportunity for students to collaborate and actively participate in higher order questions and learning.
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Teacher training in Small Group Instruction during core reading lessons - During PrePlanning, teachers in grades 3-5 participated in a half day professional development with a focus on explicit, differentiated instruction and how to determine which students need this kind of support. 2. KAGAN Training for all teachers - 2 days (Sept. 27, 2019 and Dec. 6, 2019) - Kagan Structures are instructional strategies designed to promote cooperation and communication

in the classroom, boost students' confidence and retain their interest in classroom interaction.

3. Classroom walkthroughs with specific "Look Fors" that are consistent with evidence based strategies.

4. Weekly Grade Level meetings with administrative guidance and support - There is an agenda that is followed by all grade levels and the meetings are facilitated by the team leaders. Each subject area is discussed with regards to standards and instructional strategies. This also serves as a platform for teams to give input or ask for support from administration. These agendas are completed weekly at the meetings and submitted to the principal for review. The principal address any and all pertinent issues and offers support where needed.

5. Student and teacher data chats including goal setting and tracking student progress

6. Schoolwide focus on silent reading before school everyday - Upon arrival students sit outside their classroom and read silently until teachers welcome them to their classrooms at 7:50AM.

7. Teachers and administration create packets of books to be sent home with all students who have no access to books unless they are at school. Leveled readers from prior textbook series are being gathered and distributed to students in need with the recommendation from teachers.

8. Library Aide coordinates the "Book Buddy Reading Enrichment Program" which is designed to foster a love of reading to those students who struggle academically and are economically disadvantaged.

Person

Responsible

Cheryl Beauchamp (cheryl.beauchamp@levyk12.org)

#2	
Title	Math Achievement
Rationale	In the areas of Math Learning Gains (+17%) and Math Lowest 25th Percentile (+13%), BES made significant growth. However, even with focusing on the learning gains, math proficiency dipped -6%. The gap between math achievement of the school and the state grew from 5% difference to 12% difference. The data demonstrates that even with a focus on moving non-proficient individual students, the target must be with core instruction in the area of mathematics.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	Math 2019 ELA Achievement score is 51% proficiency with a 12% gap between the school and state's outcomes. Although BES demonstrated an significant increase in math learning gains & math lowest 25th percentile, the proficiency level remains well below the state average. With a strong focus on student engagement during core math instruction, the expected outcome for Math Achievement for the 2020 FSA is 60% which would be equal to the state's average.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Melody Carson (melody.carson@levyk12.org)
Evidence-based Strategy	<p>During core instruction, distributive summarizing will be used to determine students' level of understanding of the concept or skill. Using distributive summarizing, teachers will target those students who need more support with a different approach to the skill. Specific intervention time is used daily to reinforce current standards as well as student deficits. K-5 teachers are expected to give immediate feedback and explicit instruction, where students are taught using different modalities of learning in order to better comprehend and retain the information over time. Repetition of the concepts/skills, use of visuals such as anchor charts, will support long term retention of knowledge and skills to improve student achievement. Student engagement will be a priority in every classroom with the implementation of KAGAN structures across the curriculum.</p> <p>Distributive summarizing, explicit instruction, and activating prior knowledge all have been part of the significant research of Dr. Max Thompson, the founder of Learning Focus Solutions. Dr. Thompson's research and work is based on his observations and implementation of these strategies in low income schools across the country. KAGAN structures are proven to be highly effective in engaging 100% of the students in the learning process. Student engagement has a direct correlation to an increase in student achievement. Kagan provides the opportunity for all students to participate in discussions, debates, and evidenced-based answers. The structure provide a unique opportunity for students to collaborate and actively participate in higher order questions and learning.</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	
Action Step	
Description	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Master Schedule is written to include additional mathematics core instruction as well as 25-30 minutes of daily math intervention. 2. Weekly grade level meetings are held to discuss strategies and math focus for the upcoming week. Item Specs published by FLDOE, are used to develop high order questions and are planned for lessons in advance. 3. Anchor charts are used for each concept with current and previous Essential Questions posted and students' answers to those EQ's given to reference in the classroom. 4. Students will create anchor charts to review skills before unit tests and reteach the class. 5.

Person Responsible Melody Carson (melody.carson@levy12.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities (optional)

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

Science Achievement is an area that must be targeted school wide as the concepts that are tested in 5th grade are taught at every level in the elementary school. As instructional leaders, administration has to make sure the science standards are being taught with evidence of learning shown in every classroom. This year, there will be a Family Learning Night "Scientific Explorations & Student Demonstrations" in which students will present and teacher parents and other students what they are learning in science. The areas of learning gains and lowest 25th percentile in Math and ELA are all addressed in the two areas of focus as they are directly impacted by our core instructional goals.

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A schoolwide program and opts to use the Schoolwide Improvement Plan to satisfy the requirements of the schoolwide program plan, as outlined in the Every Student Succeeds Act, Public Law No. 114-95, Â§ 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families, and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission and support the needs of students.

Bronson Elementary School will ensure the organized, ongoing, and timely manner of involving parents through the following methods:

- Presenting information on the Title I requirements and the Rights of Parents at the Annual Title I Back to School meeting on September 10, 2019 (6:30pm) for Grades VPK-5.
- The Parent Teacher Compact is revised annually in the spring by providing copies to parents and asking for input at the School Advisory Council meeting in April. The revision of the compact is announced as part of the agenda for this SAC meeting.
- Family Learning Nights are held 3 times throughout the year to involves parents in their child's learning experiences.
- Parent Involvement activities are placed on the SAC agenda for reflection and input each nine week grading period.
- Notices of SAC meetings and Family Learning Nights will be posted on the marquis, flyers are backpacked home to parents, signs in front of the school, BES NewsLink, monthly activities calendar, phone calls to parents via School Messenger and posted on school FaceBook page.
- Teachers post meeting dates and times on teacher/grade level newsletters, Class DoJo, Bloomz, and Remind as part of their home/parent communication.
- District Title 1 Survey
- BES representative on the District Accountability Council (DAC).

Administration and guidance contacts community members to support our students with career education, Guest Reader Day, Agriculture Week. Parent conference nights are held twice a year (fall and spring) in which teachers and administration stay late to accommodate working parents' schedules.

PFEP Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Bronson Elementary School is involved in the Social Emotional Learning curriculum provided by Sanford Harmony for grades K-5. All teachers participated in a training presented by our school guidance counselor and received resources and lesson plans to implement in their classrooms. The master schedule was written to provide time for specific character education and social emotional support. There are daily morning meetings held by the teacher and students in which open discussion takes place about personal and social issues in and out of the classroom. Students are taught how to share their feelings and thoughts, how to listen and empathize with others' situations and how to be a mentor to classmates and encourage and support everyone. The school's PBIS team has planned for specific character trait education and recognition of such traits throughout the school year. Teachers are expected to directly teach the traits and monitor students actions and behavior accordingly. Positive recognition and improvement is noted at every grade level schoolwide.

The Assistant Principal and Dean of Students collaborate with teachers to identify students with 2 or more of the Early Warning Systems/Signs as "at-risk". Teachers commit to mentoring at least one of these students each quarter to support and place on a check-in system. This list of students is amended as students enroll if the need for mentoring with new students arises.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

The problem solving process begins with collection of data both diagnostic, formative, and summative. Grade level data meetings are held to review and discuss the needs of our students with relevant instructional needs. By following the Levy County/State approved "Decision Tree", students are placed in intervention groups based on specified data. Intervention began the first day of school this year and is based on the most recent information for each child. Two intervention teachers work directly with the Tier 3 students to provide both Tier 2 and Tier 3 intervention everyday of the week. These students are pulled out and work with in a small group setting of no more than 6 students. Additional staff is used to support those students who are proficient, Tier 1, such as the Gifted teacher and the ESOL instructor. Classroom teachers have groups of Tier 2 students who are assigned to teachers according to the students' deficits in ELA. Teachers have also been trained on small group instruction during the core reading lessons. Students who show difficulty with a concept or skill presented, the teacher immediately moves that student to a small group setting and gives explicit instruction to reteach the concept. Student progress is tracked through our iReady progress monitoring system as well as other formative assessments. Beginning this school year, the master schedule is designed to provide the opportunity for a weekly computer education block. Students in grades K-5 will have the opportunity to develop basic computer skills to better prepare them for middle and high school. They will also have a working knowledge of Google Classroom applications which will support their transition in continuing their education. The students will develop a better understanding and use of technology and how it is used in the workforce.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

Guidance, administration, and support personnel will plan and organize a Career Fair for students during the second semester. Contacts with community members as well as local businesses and people from various jobs will be made in advance to plan an effective presentation for our students. The goal is for our students to become familiar with different careers and job opportunities. The purpose would be to help students

make connections to their education and planning for their future. Guests will be asked to share information regarding their career or job, such as the level of education and/or certifications, the average income, the type of work that is produced in a particular field. Students will be given a choice of which presentations they are most interested and write 2 questions about that career prior to the session. Students in grade 5 will participate in a research project in which they will select a career of their choice based on their interests and give a class presentation on the project.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

Administration and guidance will work together to develop a college and career awareness program in which students are involved in discussions and presentations about their future. There will be grade level presentations at the end of each quarter in which students in grades 3-5 can explore different options for their career path. By making connections with businesses and community leaders, students will learn how to gain the knowledge and experience necessary to pursue their "dream job".

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ELA Achievement Proficiency	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Math Achievement	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00