Martin County School District

Bessey Creek Elementary School

2020-21 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
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	28%
2019-20 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%)
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)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	26%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	20%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
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, position title, and job duties/responsibilities 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
Luicci , Nicole	Assistant Principal	Support the Vision and Mission of the school through collaborative, data-driven instructional leadership.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 6/3/2019, Stacy Schmit

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.*
3

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.*
6

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
35

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	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	28%
2019-20 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%)
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.	

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	80	83	72	98	95	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	523
Attendance below 90 percent	6	7	4	2	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/4/2020

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	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

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	

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	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

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	

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	
	(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	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%
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%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	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				
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

ESSA Federal Index	
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%	0
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%	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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	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	68
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	56
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.

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% 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?

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. Intensive literacy interventions for students in grades 1 and 2 who are achieving below grade level in literacy to close the achievement gap
2. Rigorous early literacy program with focus on phonemic awareness and phonics in grades K-2 to ensure more students reach mastery in subsequent school years
3. Rigorous writing program in grades K-5 to help challenge on-grade level and above students
4. Targeted mathematics support in grade 3
5. Additional Science support for Grade 5 through Related Arts

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The area of focus is providing intensive literacy interventions for students in grades 1 and 2 who are achieving below grade level in literacy to close the achievement gap. These are the students specifically identified by the district reading plan in the lowest 25% of students in grades 1 and 2. Bessey Creek has a high number of MTSS groups in first and second grade for students who are missing critical literacy skills, like phonemic awareness, phonics, lack of recognition/fluency of high-frequency words.
Measurable Outcome:	100% of students in our intensive intervention classrooms will reach their stretch growth as measured by iReady Reading Fall to Spring growth.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nicole Luicci (luiccin@martinschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students will receive small-group, targeted instruction in the area(s) of support needed, throughout the instructional day. The focus of the classroom will be literacy, with science and social studies content being infused through the literacy portions of the school day.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Annual Growth, Catch up Growth: The academic research is clear about the number of instructional minutes necessary to catch students up when they are behind their peers academically. The students identifies will receive additional small group minutes targeting their areas of needed supports throughout the academic day.

Action Steps to Implement	
Scheduling students based on student data and teacher input	
Person Responsible	Stacy Schmit (schmits@martin.k12.fl.us)
Teacher training to ensure interventions will be used with fidelity	
Person Responsible	Stacy Schmit (schmits@martin.k12.fl.us)
Additional instructional support added to classroom	
Person Responsible	Stacy Schmit (schmits@martin.k12.fl.us)
Lower class size established - class cap set at 15 students	
Person Responsible	Stacy Schmit (schmits@martin.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Bessey Creek will implement a rigorous early literacy program with focus on phonemic awareness and phonics in grades K-2 to ensure more students reach mastery of literacy skills by the end of each of the grade levels.
Measurable Outcome:	100% of students scoring below the 50%ile on iReady Reading on Diag 1 will meet their stretch growth goals in the areas identified as needing supports, by iReady Reading Diag 3.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nicole Luicci (luiccin@martinschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teacher will use Fundations with fidelity in K-2 classrooms. Additionally, teachers will help students learn sight words to ensure grade level mastery of words and 300 words mastered by grade 3.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Structured phonics programs have been shown to be highly effective in teaching all students the foundational skills necessary for reading comprehension. Structured programs directly teach students the spelling and sound patterns of English in a clear sequence, beginning with consonant sounds and then moving to short vowels, long vowels, and consonant blends. For beginners, structured phonics programs ensure the acquisition of foundational skills necessary to move into reading.

Action Steps to Implement	
Kindergarten teacher development on Fundations	
Person Responsible	Stacy Schmit (schmits@martin.k12.fl.us)
Implementation checks within the K-2 classrooms; monitoring of data collected from student assessments; monitoring of re-teaching and additional assessment for students needing remediation	
Person Responsible	Stacy Schmit (schmits@martin.k12.fl.us)
District modeling and remediation for teachers needing additional practice with implementation	
Person Responsible	Stacy Schmit (schmits@martin.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We will ensure our writing program is implemented with fidelity to ensure that all students, including those working at grade level and above, learn and grow in their written communication skills.
Measurable Outcome:	100% of students will receive instruction using Lucy Calkins Teachers College Reading and Writing Project (TCRWP) Writing Units of Study conventions within their ELA block.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nicole Luicci (luiccin@martinschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will implement the Lucy Calkins TCRWP Writing Units of Study K-5, to have a comprehensive, cohesive writing program that can be built upon year over year.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research conducted by Hertz and Heydenberk (1997) concluded that process writing instruction afforded students the opportunity to show appreciable, measurable gains in their writing skills. The Teachers College Reading and Writing Project was born out of a writing revolution that began around a process approach to writing instruction. This process helps students progress through an experience of composing written pieces that is similar to that of published authors. Within the Units of Study, students move through the different stages of the writing process and enhance their strategic prowess as writers.

Action Steps to Implement	
Inventory all grade levels' Writers Workshop materials.	
Person Responsible	Nicole Zech (zechn@martin.k12.fl.us)
Replace missing materials and disseminate to ensure all grade levels have all necessary workshop components to implement with fidelity.	
Person Responsible	Stacy Schmit (schmits@martin.k12.fl.us)
Conduct differentiated PD to ensure Writers workshop is being followed in every grade level to ensure a single writing program grades K-5	
Person Responsible	Nicole Luicci (luiccin@martinschools.org)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Targeted mathematics support for students in grade 3 was chosen as an area of focus due to the large gap in student growth and proficiency between grade 3 reading and grade 3 mathematics, historically, as shown by data from both Grade 3 FSA scores and iReady scores.
Measurable Outcome:	100% of students scoring at the 50%ile or lower on the Grade 3 iReady Math Diag 1 assessment will achieve stretch growth, as determined by Grade 3 iReady Math Diag 3 assessment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Nicole Luicci (luiccin@martinschools.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Targeted strategies are explicit ways to teach children different math skills. They not only help students learn concepts accurately, but effectively move young learners from one level of understanding to the next, so their math abilities keep growing.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research shows that all students can become proficient in mathematics if they use these 10 Key mathematics practices with strong evidence of effectiveness: 1. Teachers emphasize number sense. 2. Students know the 390 math facts. 3. Teachers help students understand math concepts. 4. Students are expected to use hands-on materials and visual representations to show concepts and procedures. 5. Students are taught problem-solving strategies. 6. Students are expected to show work and have opportunities to explain work in oral and written forms. 7. Students use technology, when appropriate, to learn math concepts and practice procedures. 8. Teachers provide differentiated instruction to meet the needs of all students. Teachers use explicit instruction when introducing new math content. 9. Teachers use precise math language. Students use correct math language when verbalizing explanations and steps for solving problems. 10. Teachers improve student beliefs and attitudes about math.
Action Steps to Implement	
PD with grade 3 teachers to ensure best practices are used during math instruction	
Person Responsible	Stacy Schmit (schmits@martin.k12.fl.us)
Alignment of teacher DPPs with teaching and learning focused particularly in mathematics; Grade 3 Look-fors for Learning Walks aligned to teacher DPPs to allow colleagues to give specific feedback for math instruction.	
Person Responsible	Nicole Luicci (luiccin@martinschools.org)

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Bessey Creek 5th grade students will receive additional science support for Grade 5 through Related Arts during the science and computer lab rotations. With the plethora of resources available within the science texts and online, students will benefit from extra time with content. The most recent data showed a 14 point drop in grade 5 science scores from the previous year. Also, science scores are often similar to those of ELA, and there was a discrepancy between the two, with science scores being much lower than ELA scores.
Measurable Outcome:	100% of 5th grade students will be instructed in Science concepts an additional 90 minutes each 10 instructional days within their Related Arts computer time.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stacy Schmit (schmits@martin.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategy is that of exposure to additional science concepts and additional time with content.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	As science is tested in 5th grade, and as the 5th grade science assessment covers content from 3rd, 4th, and 5th grades, students will benefit from additional time with science concepts that may have been covered in previous grade levels as well as extra time with concepts that they have not yet mastered.

Action Steps to Implement	
IC3 spark testing will be offered to 4th grade students through computer lab. This is a shift of focus from 5th grade to 4th.	
Person Responsible	Stacy Schmit (schmits@martin.k12.fl.us)
Time will be given for the Media Specialist, the science teacher, and the computer lab assistant to plan together to find resources for the 5th grade students.	
Person Responsible	Nicole Luicci (luiccin@martinschools.org)
PD as needed for the computer lab assistant to learn to navigate the science materials and connect computer projects to the science concepts.	
Person Responsible	Nicole Luicci (luiccin@martinschools.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

All identified areas of focus listed on the Needs Assessment/Analysis have been discussed in part A of Planning for Improvement.

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.

We conduct monthly PTA and SAC meetings open to all stakeholders. These meetings are held via Zoom to allow everyone the opportunity to participate.
Teachers are involved in several school-level committees (including Sunshine, Conscious Discipline, and FAC/PAC) focused on enhancing the work environment.
We recently started a social media (Facebook) platform not only to quickly disseminate information, but to also celebrate the great things happening at our school.

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: Instructional Practice: ELA**				**$0.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0331 - Bessey Creek Elementary School			$0.00
			Notes: This budget item has a $0 cost, as we are using existing teachers and classroom resources.			
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**				**$8,452.18**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	510-Supplies	0331 - Bessey Creek Elementary School	General Fund	0.0	$8,452.18
			Notes: Our Kindergarten teachers had not been using Fundations, so kits needed to be ordered for all teachers in Kindergarten. Additionally, with Covid19, many resources were sent home with students and had to be replaced this year to ensure complete kits for all teachers in 1st and 2nd grades.			
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**				**$4,978.91**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	510-Supplies	0331 - Bessey Creek Elementary School	General Fund	0.0	$4,978.91

			Notes: As a school, we have been using Writer's Workshop for writing. We had to inventory and then order items to ensure all kits were whole, K through grade 5.			
4	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**				**$2,000.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	510-Supplies	0331 - Bessey Creek Elementary School	General Fund	0.0	$2,000.00
			Notes: Differentiated PD needs, as needed by Third grade teachers.			
5	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science**				**$2,000.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
	5100	510-Supplies	0331 - Bessey Creek Elementary School	General Fund	0.0	$2,000.00
			Notes: Differentiated PD as needed by science lab teacher and computer lab aide.			
					Total:	**$17,431.09**