

Orange County Public Schools

Bonneville Elementary



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	21

Bonneville Elementary

14700 SUSSEX DR, Orlando, FL 32826

<https://bonnevillees.ocps.net/>

Demographics

Principal: Natalie Stevens

Start Date for this Principal: 2/1/2010

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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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* Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: C (48%)
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	TS&I

* 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 Orange 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	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	21

Bonneville Elementary

14700 SUSSEX DR, Orlando, FL 32826

<https://bonnevillees.ocps.net/>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2019-20 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">70%</p>

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	A

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Orange 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.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Sheehan, Kimrey	Principal	The Principal provides a common vision for instruction and learning and uses data as a basis for decision-making, ensures the school-based team is implementing research-based instructional strategies, monitors student learning, and assigns school resources to meet the needs of students.
Savitz, Alyssa	School Counselor	The Guidance Counselor supports the social and emotional needs of students and provides individual, small group, and whole class instruction based on student data and teacher recommendations.
Schlake, Andrea	Other	The Behavior Specialist facilitates and evaluates the school-wide behavior program (CHAMPS), provides professional development and support to school staff, participates in the collection and analysis of data, develops and supports Tier 2 and Tier 3 behavioral interventions, and monitors student progress.
LaRusso, Emily	Instructional Coach	The Instructional Coach develops, models, and evaluates school-wide instruction and practices, identifies and implements research-based curriculum and interventions, and provides support for all grade levels. The Instructional Coach develops, supports, and assists new teachers with curricula and resources, conducts the bi-weekly Multi-Tiered System of Supports meetings to monitor student progress.
Amick, Danielle	Other	The Staffing Specialist is responsible for compliance for all exceptional education students and those with 504 plans, conducts bi-weekly Multi-Tiered System of Supports meetings to monitor student progress, and collaborates with both general education and exceptional education teachers to ensure the least restrictive learning environment for all students.
Brenes Catinchi, Janice	Other	The Resource Teacher develops, models, and evaluates school-wide reading instruction and practices, identifies and implements research-based curriculum and interventions, and provides support for all grade levels. The Resource Teacher develops, supports, and assists new teachers with curricula and resources, conducts the bi-weekly Multi-Tiered System of Supports meetings to monitor student progress, provides biweekly professional development, implements and supervises the after-school tutoring program, and conducts all district and state testing.
Foranoce, Melissa	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal supports the common vision for instruction and learning and monitors and tracks student data, ensures the school-based team is implementing research-based instructional strategies, monitors student learning, and recommends school resources to meet students' needs.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 2/1/2010, Natalie Stevens

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

2

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

40

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 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* Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: A (62%) 2015-16: C (48%)
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	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

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	41	59	77	66	82	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	411
Attendance below 90 percent	7	17	27	22	18	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	12	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	1	6	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

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	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/15/2020

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	22	21	12	19	20	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
One or more suspensions	1	2	0	1	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	6	10	0	21	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	28	34	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90

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	2	6	0	20	15	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54

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	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	
Number of students enrolled	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	22	21	12	19	20	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105
One or more suspensions	1	2	0	1	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA or Math	6	10	0	21	4	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	28	34	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90

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	2	6	0	20	15	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54

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	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

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	55%	57%	57%	57%	54%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	53%	58%	58%	61%	58%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	43%	52%	53%	63%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	62%	63%	63%	67%	61%	61%
Math Learning Gains	49%	61%	62%	74%	64%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	36%	48%	51%	51%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	55%	56%	53%	61%	50%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (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.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	54%	55%	-1%	58%	-4%
	2018	53%	55%	-2%	57%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		1%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	49%	57%	-8%	58%	-9%
	2018	53%	54%	-1%	56%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
05	2019	57%	54%	3%	56%	1%
	2018	45%	55%	-10%	55%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	64%	62%	2%	62%	2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018	51%	61%	-10%	62%	-11%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	55%	63%	-8%	64%	-9%
	2018	69%	62%	7%	62%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison		4%				
05	2019	61%	57%	4%	60%	1%
	2018	49%	59%	-10%	61%	-12%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	54%	54%	0%	53%	1%
	2018	52%	53%	-1%	55%	-3%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
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	19	28	19	23	34	24	31				
ELL	38	44	41	54	47	47	38				
BLK	67	50		60	55						
HSP	49	51	45	58	43	41	48				
WHT	60	55		70	59		62				
FRL	48	46	47	56	44	39	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	21	32	30	23	29	14	36				
ELL	37	35	24	47	53	33	30				
BLK	50			69							
HSP	49	41	29	58	50	31	50				
WHT	65	42		68	47		59				
FRL	49	41	34	58	51	29	53				

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	20	48	50	23	26	20	36				
ELL	39	55	65	52	65	63	32				
BLK	68	82		74	82						
HSP	52	60	65	63	71	55	63				
WHT	63	57		70	78	50	50				
FRL	57	61	63	67	74	51	61				

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	50
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	48
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	401
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2

English Language Learners

Federal Index - English Language Learners	45
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0

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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	58
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	47
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0
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%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	61
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	46
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

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.

According to the results from the 2019 Florida Standards Assessment for Bonneville Elementary School our lowest performing data component was in the area of student learning gains in English Language Arts (ELA) and Math. The data indicates that only 53% of our students achieved learning gains in ELA and 49% of our students made learning gains in Math. Factors that may have contributed to this may include the number of students who entered fourth grade based on Good Cause promotion and who were not adequately monitored throughout the year, using multiple growth indicators. Based on the data from the previous year this does not seem to be a trend. Looking at the iReady 2020 MOY Diagnostic data for ELA and Math, our students were progressing toward the End of Year (EOY) proficiency goal with 3rd grade surpassing the target goal.

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

The data component that indicates the greatest decline in percentage points is in the area of overall learning gains of fourth grade students in ELA and Math. Bonneville Elementary School began the school year with over twenty students who attended summer school based on their FSA scores and were promoted by meeting certain Good Cause exemptions. In addition, many of these students were eventually staffed as ESE or provided with 504 accommodations based on intensive needs. As a school community, there was a lot of focus on i-Ready data and not enough focus on other progress monitoring indicators provided by the classroom teacher. In stark contrast to our 18-19 FSA data the iReady 2020 MOY Diagnostic data indicated growth in all areas and subsets towards our 60% proficiency goal.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

The largest component gap when compared to the state average is noticed in the area of overall ELA proficiency. 55% of students at Bonneville Elementary School demonstrate proficiency in ELA, scoring a level 3 or above. Whereas, the state average is 57% of all students are proficient in this area. A contributing factor to this discrepancy was the misguided confidence of using one data point as an effective measure of tracking student progress. This is not a trend because our 17-18 school year data shows us on par with the district.

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

After examining the data from the Florida State Assessment 2019 results, Bonneville Elementary School experienced the most growth in the area of overall student proficiency in math (62%) demonstrated by a 5% increase. In addition Bonneville experienced great improvement in the area of Learning Gains of our Bottom 25% of students with a 10% increase in ELA and 9% increase in Math. Our staff spent a lot of time tracking the progress of our students in the bottom 25% and creating time to engage in academic discourse about their data. We also focused on math center work during small group instruction and created intervention math groups to specifically work on basic skills. In reviewing the 19-20 iReady Data, we saw great improvement in third grade ELA and based on the Science Progress Monitoring Assessments we have great gains in Science.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Based on the EWS report, 109 students struggled with attendance and had attendance below 90%. Achievement levels. Another area of concern is achievement levels- 62 students in grades 3-5 scored a level 1 on ELA, and 57 students scored a level 1 on math for the 2019 FSA.

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

1. Tracking and monitoring student data using more than one data point.
2. Strategic focus on students who earned a level 1 or 2 on the FSA.
3. Increase in student learning gains.
4. Increase in the number of students demonstrating proficiency.
5. Base professional development on teacher needs assessment.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Description: Build and establish a culture for social and emotional learning at our school with adults and students.
 Rationale: Academic learning is enhanced when students have opportunities to interact with others and make meaningful connections to subject material. By ensuring that our school has a culture for social and emotional learning, we will address the following school needs:

Measurable Outcome: By the end of the school year, the staff and families have an established rapport with each other. The teachers and families have had to use technology in order to stay connected with each other during this unprecedented school year. We will see these results when looking at the 2020-2021 AdvancED survey from the parents and staff. Our target is to receive 70% positive response rate on questions relating to rapport building on the AdvancED survey.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Alyssa Savitz (alyssa.savitz@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Evidence-based Strategy: Use distributive leadership and social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise with all students.

Description of Monitoring: Our school will plan and implement two cycles of professional learning to provide training, opportunities for safe practice, and examination of impact data. Our school will monitor and measure the impact of our implemented professional learning through analysis of culture and climate survey data, needs assessments, classroom observations, and school environment observations. We will modify our plan of action as indicated by data, student needs, and adult needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Rationale for Strategy Selection: In order to achieve large-scale and sustainable improvement, it is necessary to invest in the collective capacity of a school building. To create a culture of social and emotional learning with adults and students, it is critical to harness the professional skills and leadership capabilities of everyone in the school. Through a distributive leadership model, our school will strengthen the team dynamics necessary to collectively support positive organizational improvement and change. Resources/Criteria: Research indicates that for sustainable improvement efforts to be realized, collective ownership is necessary. Through a distributive leadership model our school can implement efficient and sustainable continuous improvement practices that will support the social, emotional, and academic development of every student.

Action Steps to Implement

- Use a process to examine the current school climate and culture and Understand how social and emotional learning is connected to instructional strategies
1. Google Survey to be taken by teachers on needed/wanted professional development
 2. Professional Development opportunities on SEL
 3. Connecting SEL to data and examining trends, buy using common assessments
 4. Rigorous SEL instruction during the weekly health block.

Person Responsible Andrea Schlake (andrea.schlake@ocps.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: In looking at the data of the 2018-19 school year, we still struggle with our students, including those in our bottom 25%, making learning gains. Many of these students meet the qualifications in 1 or more areas of the early warning systems (EWS) tracking database as indicated by district in the latest accountability report. Currently, student data shows that 53% of our students made learning gains in ELA. Only 43% of our lowest 25% made learning gains within this content area. When looking at the math data, 49% of students made learning gains, and 36% of our lowest 25% made learning gains. When looking at our 2019-2020 iReady data, For grades 3-5, 59% of our lowest quartile in ELA and 63% of our lowest quartile in Math made at least a 10 point gain from the BOY to MOY iReady diagnostic.

Although we have increased in this area, this continues to be our lowest performing category.

Measurable Outcome: By the end of the school year students are expected to make the required learning gains to demonstrate an increase of knowledge in all subject areas. Students performing in the lowest 25% are expected to experience a full years growth of learning and to meet their stretch goal as measured in the following ways: bi-weekly teacher assessments of student progress and iReady data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Kimrey Sheehan (kimrey.sheehan@ocps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Instructional strategies that are proven to have high impact on students learning , close monitoring of data, small group lessons designed to meet the needs of students, data chat with teachers every three weeks.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: The district has focused on several instructional strategies that are proven to be beneficial for student learning if planned for and embedded throughout content areas. The district has also encouraged schools to have data-driven environments in order to strategically move students and demonstrate learning.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Analyze Data
2. PD opportunities
3. Classroom walk-thru's
4. Teacher coaching cycle
5. Focus on text dependent questions, and students writing in response to complex text.
6. Tier 2 and tier 3 interventions/MTSS

Person Responsible Melissa Foranoce (melissa.foranoce@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

Today's classrooms require instructors to possess competencies for teaching all students. Targeted and differentiated teaching strategies are a necessity to ensure all students are learning. Social and emotional learning is critical to ensure that the teacher is sensitive and responsive to the unique differences of each student. Recognizing the need to strengthen specific competencies to reach and teach all students requires an understanding of new ideas and a willingness to view instruction through varied cultural lenses. The leadership team will monitor the effectiveness of our Culturally Responsive Plan on a monthly basis by looking at student iReady data, classroom assessments, Florida Standards Assessment (ELA and Math) and the Next Generation Sunshine State Standards (Science).

Some school based efforts that will be implemented to increase achievement of minority students by creating opportunities to increase student learning by hosting the following events: chess club, which assists students with problem solving and critical thinking; after school tutoring program, which focuses on lowest 25% as well as students who we are targeting to close achievement gaps.

Part IV: Positive Culture & Environment

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning, and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students, and families of students, volunteers, and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services, and business partners.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate at Bonneville Elementary School, our faculty and staff engage in ongoing, school based professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. Through a distributive leadership model, Bonneville uses social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. Through this professional learning, our school uses the CASEL Core Competencies as a common language to support a positive culture of social and emotional learning and connect cognitive and conative strategies to support student success. Bonneville has a core team of teachers and administrators, which includes a mental health designee, who participate in the district-wide professional learning throughout the year. The core team works with a broader school team and is charged with personalizing and implementing professional learning for school stakeholders, based on school and community needs. Our leadership team collaborate with stakeholders, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine next steps. Development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through district programs such as the Parent Academy. Bonneville utilizes our Parent Engagement Liaison to bridge the community and school culture.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				\$30,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
		120-Classroom Teachers	0871 - Bonneville Elementary			\$30,000.00
			<i>Notes: After-school tutoring Programs</i>			
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				\$5,000.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0871 - Bonneville Elementary	Title, I Part A		\$5,000.00
			<i>Notes: Funds will be used to support instruction by providing before and after school programs, intervention materials, recognition awards ,part-time tutors, etc...</i>			
					Total:	\$35,000.00