Martin County School District

Bessey Creek Elementary School

2019-20 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Bessey Creek Elementary School

2201 SW MATHESON AVE, Palm City, FL 34990

martinschools.org/o/bces

Demographics

Principal: Stacy Schmit

Start Date for this Principal: 6/3/2019

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	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	28%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Asian Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (74%) 2015-16: A (66%) 2014-15: A (70%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
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 Martin 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

Bessey Creek Elementary School

2201 SW MATHESON AVE, Palm City, FL 34990

martinschools.org/o/bces

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	No	22%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	17%

School Grades History

Year	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17	2015-16
Grade	A	A	A	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Martin 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.

Mission: At Bessey Creek we will empower all children using a challenging curriculum focused on growth by creating a positive, connected community of learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision: Educating all students to be receptive, respectful, responsible, and resilient life-long learners.

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
Schmit, Stacy	Principal	Job duties and responsibilities include: 1. Developing a world-class group of educators to serve the needs of students and their families 2. Using data to identify gaps and opportunities to ensure student and family needs and met 3. Creating a robust and far-reaching team of empowered leaders on campus to ensure multiple perspectives are taken when making shared decisions 4. Engaging stakeholders to develop school-wide focus on student growth 5. Serving all stakeholders
Mershon, Elizabeth	Assistant Principal	Support the Vision and Mission of the school through collaborative leadership and data-driven instructional leadership

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	83	86	101	102	96	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	563
Attendance below 90 percent	8	10	4	7	6	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	2	7	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
11% or lower on iReady Reading	9	8	7	4	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

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)

37

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/30/2019

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Attendance below 90 percent		
One or more suspensions		
Course failure in ELA or Math		
Level 1 on statewide assessment		

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

Indicator	Grade Level	Total
Students with two or more indicators		

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	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	

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	77%	58%	57%	79%	59%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	70%	59%	58%	74%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	56%	53%	68%	54%	52%
Math Achievement	76%	65%	63%	81%	67%	61%
Math Learning Gains	72%	65%	62%	76%	67%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	59%	53%	51%	66%	55%	51%
Science Achievement	63%	58%	53%	73%	55%	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	83 (0)	86 (0)	101 (0)	102 (0)	96 (0)	95 (0)	563 (0)
Attendance below 90 percent	8 ()	10 ()	4 ()	7 ()	6 ()	8 ()	43 (0)
One or more suspensions	0 ()	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (0)	1 (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)	2 (0)	7 (0)	9 (0)	18 (0)
11% or lower on iReady Reading	9 (0)	8 (0)	7 (0)	4 (0)	2 (0)	1 (0)	31 (0)

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	77%	54%	23%	58%	19%
	2018	71%	57%	14%	57%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	73%	57%	16%	58%	15%
	2018	82%	55%	27%	56%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	79%	55%	24%	56%	23%
	2018	78%	58%	20%	55%	23%

ELA						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	75%	58%	17%	62%	13%
	2018	73%	63%	10%	62%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	74%	67%	7%	64%	10%
	2018	84%	64%	20%	62%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	80%	64%	16%	60%	20%
	2018	84%	64%	20%	61%	23%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	64%	53%	11%	53%	11%
	2018	75%	54%	21%	55%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
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	59	60	50	67	68	45	47				
HSP	81	73		73	73		75				
WHT	77	70	56	78	73	62	62				
FRL	63	63	67	63	56	37	43				

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	58	56	42	66	56	53	41				
HSP	76	78		68	55						
WHT	76	65	47	82	72	74	74				

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
FRL	63	56		65	57		47				

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	59	46	31	67	61	42	50				
HSP	77	88		76	88						
WHT	79	72	67	83	75	65	69				
FRL	67	72	77	75	69	38	50				

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	67
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	472
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	57
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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

Native American Students	
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	75
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	68
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	56
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.

FRL population of the lowest 25% making learning gains in Math was the lowest performance. Additionally, Science overall proficiency was low compared to the previous year, showing a 14% point decline.

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

Science overall proficiency showed the greatest decline. Two factors were identified for this: Science had been taken off the rotation of Related Arts, and the responsibility of science education fell solely on the classroom teacher. Additionally, the related arts wheel contained a STEM lab rotation, but no certificated teacher taught the classes during the rotation.

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.

FRL making learning gains in Math had the greatest gap. Because of legislation, I am unable to identify students falling into the category of FRL, and therefore unable to identify specifically what resources may work for individuals in this category.

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

There were incremental gains when looking at cohort data over the last two years, but drops in overall proficiency when comparing the most recent two years of data. The school was focused on teacher professional development in the area of reading endorsement.

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

The area of greatest concern is overall growth of students at all levels. Additionally, science proficiency is a concern.

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

1. Overall student growth - growth targets being met by all students
2. Increase in Science proficiency to 80%
3.
4.
5.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1	
Title	Student Growth in All Reported Areas
Rationale	Bessey Creek is a high performing school maintaining a school rating of A for the history of school grades. Student proficiency is higher than the threshold for the A school rating, and ESSA subgroups show that most, if not all, subgroups are meeting the minimum percentage to maintain the school's A rating. The school struggles with growth targets being met by all subgroups, showing that, on average, fewer than 80% of students, overall, met their individual growth goals. This shows that there is room for improvement, and this will positively impact teacher VAM.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	90% of students will meet their individual growth goals in Reading and Math by the end of the 19-20 school year, as measured by FSA and iReady Reading and Math assessments
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Stacy Schmit (schmits@martin.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	Each of the grade levels is focusing on an individual focus for the year within their classrooms: K - Executive Functioning 1, 2, 3, 4 - Academic Vocabulary 5 - Complex text and tasks
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Executive functioning centers around cognitive flexibility, working memory, and inhibitory control. These factors are essential to learning and must be strengthened in order to strengthen learning. Academic vocabulary has been found to increase growth for students who are proficient but not being pushed to grow. Exposure to complex text increases academic growth of students, as does increased exposure to cognitively complex tasks.
Action Step	
Description	1. Professional Development for teachers during PLCs to incorporate strategies aligned to the grade level focus 2. Creating a culture of peer feedback (through learning walks) to grow professional practice aligned to grade level focus 3. Dedicated time for learning walks; all teachers participating by doing walks and also by being visited by at least one peer 4. Student goal setting and commitments students will make to daily practice aligned to their goals. Tracking of personal student commitments at least weekly. 5. Student data chats 6. Teacher data chats
Person Responsible	Stacy Schmit (schmits@martin.k12.fl.us)

#2	
Title	Increase Science Proficiency
Rationale	Science proficiency very much mirrors Reading proficiency, and Bessey Creek Elementary School has a high overall proficiency for Reading. There was a significant decrease in overall science proficiency when comparing the most recent science scores to those the year prior.
State the measurable outcome the school plans to achieve	By the end of the 19-20 school year, the overall Science Proficiency, as measured by the FSA Science Grade 5 Assessment will be at least 80%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome	Stacy Schmit (schmits@martin.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy	The science lab teacher will infuse hands-on labs within each rotation on the Related Arts wheel. Additionally, general education teachers in all grade levels will incorporate hands-on science activities during the 30 minutes of time designated as outdoor play on days when students go to PE for Related Arts.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy	Hands-on learning helps students connect abstract science concepts to the real world. By integrating hands-on labs in the context of science, students will be able to experience the ideas and concepts in a tangible way.
Action Step	
Description	1. Master schedule to include Science on Related Arts rotation 2. Master schedule to include hands-on science time on PE days during 30 minute outdoor play time 3. Identification of essential labs to be conducted within Science Related Arts 4. Ongoing PD for Science Lab teacher 5. Short-cycle assessment to track student mastery of science standards
Person Responsible	Stacy Schmit (schmits@martin.k12.fl.us)

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).

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Student Growth in All Reported Areas				$2,500.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2019-20
			0331 - Bessey Creek Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		$2,500.00

		Notes: Funds to be used for resources to increase student growth	
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Increase Science Proficiency**	**$0.00**
		Total:	**$2,500.00**