School Board of Levy County

Bronson Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| School Demographics | 3 |
|--------------------------------|----|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| | |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 19 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 21 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 23 |

Bronson Elementary School

400 ISHIE AVE, Bronson, FL 32621

http://www.levyk12.org/schools

Demographics

Principal: Salinda Wiggins M

Start Date for this Principal: 8/1/2004

| 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 |
| 2020-21 Title I School | Yes |
| 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| 2020-21 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%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Info | ormation* |
| SI Region | Northeast |
| Regional Executive Director | <u>Cassandra Brusca</u> |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. Fo | or more information, click here. |

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Levy County School Board on 10/12/2021.

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 | 11 |
| Planning for Improvement | 19 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 23 |

Bronson Elementary School

400 ISHIE AVE, Bronson, FL 32621

http://www.levyk12.org/schools

School Demographics

| School Type and Gi (per MSID | | 2020-21 Title I School | Disadvan | 1 Economically taged (FRL) Rate rted on Survey 3) | | | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|----------|------------------------|----------|---|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Elementary S PK-5 | School | Yes | Yes 100% | | | | | | | | |
| Primary Servio (per MSID I | • • | Charter School | (Reporte | 9 Minority Rate ed as Non-white I Survey 2) | | | | | | | |
| K-12 General E | ducation | No | | 31% | | | | | | | |
| School Grades Histo | ory | | | | | | | | | | |
| Year | 2020-21 | 2019-20 | 2018-19 | 2017-18 | | | | | | | |
| Grade | | С | С | С | | | | | | | |

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Levy County School Board on 10/12/2021.

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.

Bronson Elementary-A Place for All to Soar

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|----------------------|------------------------|---|
| Beauchamp, Cheryl | Principal | Evaluates and supports the school's instructional programs and practices. Communicates the school's mission to all stakeholders and provides training and support for every area of the school and local community. |
| Wiggins, Salinda | Assistant Principal | Evaluates and supports the school's instructional programs and practices. Communicates the school's mission to all stakeholders and provides training and support for every area of the school and local community. Supports the principal, faculty and staff. |
| Chemin, Melinda | Reading Coach | Coach teachers through modeling lessons and providing support. Teacher intervention of some Tier 3 students. Facilitates data meetings with teachers to monitor student progress of Tier 2 and Tier 3 students. Coordinates progress monitoring process schoolwide. |
| Bowman, Tina | School Counselor | Supports the school's 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. |
| Pitts, Ashley | Teacher, K-12 | Kindergarten Team Leader-Facilitates weekly grade level planning meetings; Leads discussions on instructional strategies and ways to improve teaching and learning; leads the team in long range and short range planning and student achievement and growth goals |
| Fries, Rebecca | Teacher, K-12 | First Grade Team Leader-Facilitates weekly grade level planning meetings; Leads discussions on instructional strategies and ways to improve teaching and learning; leads the team in long range and short range planning and student achievement and growth goals |
| Carson, Melody | Teacher, K-12 | Third Grade Team Leader-Facilitates weekly grade level planning meetings; Leads discussions on instructional strategies and ways to improve teaching and learning; leads the team in long range and short range planning and student achievement and growth goals |
| Trimm, Julie | Teacher, K-12 | Fourth Grade Team Leader-Facilitates weekly grade level planning meetings; Leads discussions on instructional strategies and ways to improve teaching and learning; leads the team in long range and short range planning and student achievement and growth goals |
| Pelt, Crystal | Math Coach | Coach teachers through modeling math lessons and providing support as needed. Lead Math professional development. Provide input on math textbook adoption. Provide input to the District regarding math needs and concerns at the school level. |

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities |
|-------------------|-------------------|--|
| Ervin, Delaney | Teacher, K-12 | Second Grade Team Leader-Facilitates weekly grade level planning meetings; Leads discussions on instructional strategies and ways to improve teaching and learning; leads the team in long range and short range planning and student achievement and growth goals |
| Scott, William | Dean | Monitor school discipline; Provide Tier 1, 2, & 3 behavior support |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Sunday 8/1/2004, Salinda Wiggins M

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.

7

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.

17

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

30

Total number of students enrolled at the school

572

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

7

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--|-------------|-----|----|-----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled | 83 | 114 | 76 | 112 | 68 | 78 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 532 |
| 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 | 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 FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 27 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 7 | 11 | 15 | 9 | 13 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 77 |
| | 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|----|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| mulcator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | lotai |
| Students with two or more indicators | 7 | 11 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 42 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 7 | 11 | 3 | 7 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | |

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 8/27/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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

| Indicator | | | | | Gr | ade | Le | ve | | | | | | Total |
|---|----|----|----|----|----|-----|----|----|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled | 94 | 74 | 81 | 76 | 86 | 93 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 505 |
| 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 | 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 | 8 | 19 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| | 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|--|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total | | |
| 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total | |
| 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 | | |

2020-21 - Updated

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

| Indicator | | | | | Gr | ade | Le | ve | 1 | | | | | Total |
|---|----|----|----|----|----|-----|----|----|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled | 94 | 74 | 81 | 76 | 86 | 93 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 505 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 66 | 45 | 58 | 55 | 60 | 72 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 356 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 10 | 4 | 8 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 5 | 6 | 1 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 19 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| | 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 | | | | | | Gra | ade | Le | vel | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|----|-----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| mulcator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOLAT |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 14 | 7 | 10 | 3 | 3 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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 | | 2021 | | | 2019 | | 2018 | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--|
| School Grade Component | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State | |
| ELA Achievement | | | | 44% | 49% | 57% | 42% | 43% | 56% | |
| ELA Learning Gains | | | | 56% | 59% | 58% | 42% | 44% | 55% | |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 50% | 55% | 53% | 44% | 44% | 48% | |
| Math Achievement | | | | 51% | 58% | 63% | 57% | 52% | 62% | |
| Math Learning Gains | | | | 53% | 64% | 62% | 36% | 47% | 59% | |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | | | | 40% | 42% | 51% | 27% | 40% | 47% | |
| Science Achievement | | | | 46% | 50% | 53% | 54% | 46% | 55% | |

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 39% | 52% | -13% | 58% | -19% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 49% | 48% | 1% | 58% | -9% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -39% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 45% | 44% | 1% | 56% | -11% |
| Cohort Co | mparison | -49% | | | <u>'</u> | |

| | | | MATH | | | |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 44% | 55% | -11% | 62% | -18% |
| Cohort Con | nparison | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 60% | 59% | 1% | 64% | -4% |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -44% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 51% | 53% | -2% | 60% | -9% |
| Cohort Com | nparison | -60% | | | | |

| | SCIENCE | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|------------|---------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison | | | | | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 45% | 49% | -4% | 53% | -8% | | | | | | | | |
| Cohort Com | parison | | | | • | | | | | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

Progress monitoring data in reading and math for grades K-5th is i-Ready diagnostics taken 3 times per year. The progress monitoring data for 5th grade is the district Levy Interim Assessment.

| | | Grade 1 | | |
|--------------------------|---|--|--|--|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 4/6% | 11/14% | 27/36% |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 4/6% | 11/14% | 27/36% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0/0% | 1/16% | 2/33% |
| | English Language Learners | 0/0% | 0/0% | 0/0% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 0/0% | 8/11% | 26/35% |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 0/0% | 8/11% | 26/35% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0/0% | 0/0% | 2/33% |
| | English Language Learners | 0/0% | 0/0% | 0/0% |
| | | | | |
| | | Grade 2 | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Grade 2 Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | Proficiency All Students | | Winter 12/14% | Spring 26/30% |
| English Language Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | Fall | | |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities | Fall 8/10% | 12/14% | 26/30% |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | Fall 8/10% 8/10% | 12/14% 12/14% | 26/30% 26/30% |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language | Fall 8/10% 8/10% 0/0% | 12/14% 12/14% 0/0% | 26/30% 26/30% 0/0% |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students | Fall 8/10% 8/10% 0/0% 0/0% | 12/14% 12/14% 0/0% 0/0% | 26/30% 26/30% 0/0% 0/0% |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | Fall 8/10% 8/10% 0/0% 0/0% Fall | 12/14% 12/14% 0/0% 0/0% Winter | 26/30% 26/30% 0/0% 0/0% Spring |
| Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically | Fall 8/10% 8/10% 0/0% 0/0% Fall 3/4% | 12/14% 12/14% 0/0% 0/0% Winter 11/13% | 26/30% 26/30% 0/0% 0/0% Spring 25/29% |

| | | Grade 3 | | |
|--------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 12/19% | 16/23% | 35/49% |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 12/19% | 16/23% | 35/49% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0/0% | 0/0% | 2/40% |
| | English Language Learners | 2/25% | 0/0% | 4/40% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 1/2% | 8/11% | 24/33% |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 1/2% | 8/11% | 24/33% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0/0% | 0/0% | 0/0% |
| | English Language Learners | 0/0% | 0/0% | 2/20% |
| | | | | |
| | | Grade 4 | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Grade 4 Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | Proficiency All Students | | Winter 19/24% | Spring 23/30% |
| English Language Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | Fall | | |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities | Fall 9/13% | 19/24% | 23/30% |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | Fall 9/13% 9/13% | 19/24% 19/24% | 23/30% 23/30% |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language | Fall 9/13% 9/13% 0/0% | 19/24% 19/24% 0/0% | 23/30% 23/30% 0/0% |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students | Fall 9/13% 9/13% 0/0% | 19/24% 19/24% 0/0% 0/0% | 23/30% 23/30% 0/0% 0/0% |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | Fall 9/13% 9/13% 0/0% 0/0% Fall | 19/24% 19/24% 0/0% 0/0% Winter | 23/30% 23/30% 0/0% 0/0% Spring |
| Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically | Fall 9/13% 9/13% 0/0% 0/0% Fall 1/1% | 19/24% 19/24% 0/0% 0/0% Winter 8/10% | 23/30% 23/30% 0/0% 0/0% Spring 22/29% |

| | | Grade 5 | | |
|--------------------------|------------------------------|---------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 8/9% | 9/10% | 21/24% |
| English Language Arts | Economically Disadvantaged | 8/9% | 9/10% | 21/24% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0/0% | 0/0% | 0/0% |
| | English Language Learners | 0/0% | 0/0% | 1/50% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 4/5% | 8/9% | 24/27% |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 4/5% | 8/9% | 24/27% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0/0% | 0/0% | 0/0% |
| | English Language Learners | 0/0% | 0/0% | 0/0% |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 45/48% | | 37/39% |
| Science | Economically Disadvantaged | 45/48% | | 37/39% |
| | Students With Disabilities | 0/0% | | 0/0% |
| | English Language Learners | 0/0% | | 0/0% |

Subgroup Data Review

| | | 2021 | SCHOO | DL GRAD | E COMF | PONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD | 27 | 38 | | 40 | 38 | | 31 | | | | |
| ELL | 30 | | | 30 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 17 | | | 24 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 42 | 40 | | 35 | 20 | | | | | | |
| MUL | 42 | | | 25 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 48 | 45 | 43 | 49 | 33 | 25 | 32 | | | | |
| FRL | 39 | 48 | 50 | 38 | 26 | 28 | 25 | | | | |
| | | 2019 | SCHO | OL GRAD | E COMF | ONENT | S BY SU | JBGRO | UPS | | |
| 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 | | | | | | |

| | | 2019 | SCHO | DL GRAD | E COMF | ONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 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 |
| 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 | SCHO | OL GRAD | E COMF | ONENT | S BY SI | JBGRO | UPS | | |
| 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 | | | | | | |
| DLIZ | 22 | 00 | | 40 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 33 | 30 | | 43 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 32 | 40 | 47 | 43 | 34 | 9 | 45 | | | | |
| | | | 47 | | 34 40 | 9 | 45 | | | | |
| HSP | 32 | 40 | 47 | 46 | _ | 9 39 | 45 56 | | | | |

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

| ESSA Federal Index | | | | |
|---|-----|--|--|--|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | | | | |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 44 | | | |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO | | | |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 4 | | | |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 77 | | | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 351 | | | |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 | | | |
| Percent Tested | | | | |
| Subgroup Data | | | | |
| Students With Disabilities | | | | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 35 | | | |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | | | | |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | | | | |
| English Language Learners | | | | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 46 | | | |
| 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 | 21 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 43 |
| 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 | 34 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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 | 39 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 42 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | |

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

The 2021 fifth grade cohort struggled in both ELA and Math when they were in 3rd grade. They were not assessed in fourth due to School closings. In 2021, only 34% of this group was proficient in ELA and 35% proficient in Math. In Science, their performance was even lower, with only 26% scoring in the proficient range. The 2021 fourth grade cohort is strikingly similar. They were not assessed in 2020 and only 38% were proficient in ELA and 35% were proficient in Math in 2021. Our ELL subgroup continues to trend below the proficiency level of the total in all three tested grades. Another worrying trend is the inability to produce learning gains in ELA and Math in the past two years. Traditionally, this has been an area where BES has excelled.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

ELA and Math Proficiency in 4th and 5th; Science Proficiency in 5th; Learning gains in 4th and 5th; and ELL data overall.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

The lack of instruction due to school shutdowns and Covid quarantines have certainly been a contributing factor in the data. BES is located in a rural area and the majority of our students have limited, if any, access to reliable internet, so many were not able to access online lessons when quarantined. To address this, we revised the master schedule to increase instructional time and will monitor that time to ensure students are academically engaged to the fullest extent possible.

Another contributing factor is teacher turnover and changing teacher roles which led to inconsistent instruction. During the 2021 school year, two teachers in the primary grades were let go during their probationary periods, and several in the upper grades had to change roles multiple times mid-year as numbers of students receiving face-to-face, blended and virtual instruction fluctuated drastically. In many cases, the teachers making these adjustments were beginning teachers and/or teachers new to BES. We must support new teachers and teachers new to the school through frequent check-ins, walk-through observations, continuous feedback, mentoring. We will also address this need by relieving the Reading Coach of some duties to free her time so that she can schedule time to coach and model instruction for these teachers.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Based on the most current data, proficiency in both ELA and Math in third grade showed the most improvement.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The factor that contributed most to this improvement was small group instruction. Teachers in this grade level made a conscious effort to meet with small groups to address gaps in instruction.

Intervention in third grade was a priority and most students received Tier II support for ELA and math. Additionally, teachers supplemented the math curriculum with Ready math materials that were more aligned to the MAFS.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

To accelerate learning, teachers will need to continue the emphasis on small-group instruction. They will need to implement high impact teaching strategies as described in the research of Marzano, Pickering, & Pollock. These strategies include explicit instruction on identifying similarities and differences and summarizing; allowing time for focused and deliberate practice; including nonlinguistic representations of information during instruction; implementing Cooperative Learning; and a focus the use of higher order questioning. Teachers in grades 3, 4 and 5 will also use WICOR (Writing, Inquiry, Collaboration, Organization, and Reading) Strategies from AVID implementation. Targeted interventions will need to be in place in all grade levels

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

At the beginning of the 2021-2022 school year, all teachers received training in the high impact strategies. We have amended our classroom walk-though observation form to include a section to specifically look for these high impact strategies so we can monitor the implementation. Teachers and Admin will continue AVID training opportunities throughout the school year to address WICOR implementation and other strategies in the AVID framework. Teachers will participate in ongoing training on the use of i-Ready for instruction in small group differentiated instruction, providing purposeful practice in math; creating data-based centers; supporting and engaging ELLs with i-Ready; and providing data-based vocabulary support with i-REady's tools for instruction. Teachers and admin will receive "bite-sized" professional development during regular faculty meetings and data meetings that specifically addresses reading instruction.

Some of these "bite-sized" opportunities include small sessions of exploring the B.E.S.T. ELA standards, ELA Expectations and the use of a standards organizer.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

BES is working to improve the implementation of the MTSS framework to address the needs of all students. A comprehensive plan has been written that includes meeting regularly with teachers to analyze data, discuss student progress and achievement, and problem solve as needed. These meetings have been calendared and the plan will be presented to teachers in an upcoming faculty meeting. Teacher mentors are in place for all new teachers and teachers new to the District. New teachers will participate in the District's New Teacher Cadre, and will receive additional support through new teacher meetings held at the school. Any teacher who does not currently hold an ESOL endorsement or certification will be encouraged to complete coursework and will be given ample opportunities to do so in collaboration with others. New textbooks, ELA materials and intervention materials have been purchased that closely align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards and the math textbook adoption process has begun. Crystal Pelt, a BES teacher with over 15 years of outstanding teaching experience, has been named as our math coach and has already presented some math professional development for our teachers. Mrs. Pelt is highly qualified to act in this role, as she holds a certificate in both Elementary Education and Exceptional Student Education.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

ELA continues to be an area of work for BES. Overall, we only improved one percentage point from 44% proficient to 45% proficient. We have, however, improved the proficiency for our 3rd graders from 39% to 55%. Our ELL population, in particular, continues to struggle in ELA. In fact, proficiency for this subgroup decreased from 29% to 25%.

Measurable Outcome:

During the 2021-2022 school year, ELA proficiency will increase from 45% to 50% and ELL students will increase from 25% to 35%.

On-going progress monitoring will be conducted through regular data collection and analyzation. Grade level teams will meet regularly to make data-based instructional

Monitoring: decisions. During these meetings, a specific emphasis will be placed on disaggregating ELL data to make instructional decisions to include ESOL strategies in plans for this subgroup as a whole and for individual ELL students.

Person responsible for

Cheryl Beauchamp (cheryl.beauchamp@levyk12.org)

monitoring outcome:

Evidencebased Strategy: We will continue to focus on strategic, collaborative planning for the core ELA block, including the consistent and pervasive implementation of small group instruction. Plans will include daily standards driven instruction using the District adopted, research-based core ELA curriculum, emphasizing academic engaged time, and research-based high impact

strategies/AVID strategies.

Instructional leaders supporting teachers as they plan standards-based ELA instruction ensures that all components of the ELA block are taught with fidelity and ensures that only the research-based core reading series and District adopted supplemental materials are being used. Teaching in small groups helps teachers to better assess students' needs and progress, and provide differentiated support in all components of reading. The benefits of small group instruction is reflected in our improved third grade ELA scores. This practice is increasing throughout the school, but is still not consistent and pervasive. Based on the research of Marzano, Pickering and Pollock, there are teaching strategies that impact student learning more than others. If teachers are consistently implementing these strategies appropriately in all lessons, students will be academically engaged and will show growth in all academic areas. Academic engaged time includes appropriate practice, and

Rationale for Evidencebased Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

Train teachers on high impact strategies and the best ways to implement them into lessons. These will be two face-to-face trainings, one for K-2 teachers and one for 3-5 teachers. These will take place after school near the beginning of the school year.

Person Responsible

Salinda Wiggins (salinda.wiggins@levyk12.org)

instruction, which will lead to higher student achievement.

Revise the classroom walkthrough observation form to include small group instruction and the use of high impact strategies or AVID strategies as "look-fors." Monitor the frequency of these occurring in classrooms and report out on these findings in faculty meetings.

Person Responsible

Cheryl Beauchamp (cheryl.beauchamp@levyk12.org)

Schedule targeted professional development that supports this area of focus. AVID training includes WICOR-izing Our Lesson Plans. Other training includes i-Ready training in the use of the product for small

group instruction and targeting ELL students. Dates for trainings and other related topics will be determined, calendared and delivered. Professional development in the new B.E.S.T. Standards will also continue throughout the year.

Person

Responsible

Cheryl Beauchamp (cheryl.beauchamp@levyk12.org)

Monitor the use of supplemental services for ELL students and ESOL strategies being implemented consistently in the classroom. These discussions will be on every data meeting agenda.

Person

Responsible Tina Bowman (tina.bowman@levyk12.org)

Monitor academic engaged time in K-3. Teachers who are not making the best use of academic time will have follow up coaching meetings with the Reading Coach.

Person

Responsible

Melinda Chemin (melinda.chemin@levyk12.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the <u>SafeSchoolsforAlex.org</u>, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Compared to other schools in the state and to those in our District, we fall into the Very Low category. This means we have reported 0.2 incidents per every 100 students. We will focus on maintaining this rating by reviving our PBIS plan, and by implementing the MTSS framework, including supports for behavior and social emotional learning. Time was included in the master schedule for all classes to provide social emotional learning daily through the use of the Sandford Harmony curriculum. Discipline/behavior data will be monitored at regular data meetings.

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.

Bronson Elementary School implemented PBIS many years ago, however, the program was not implemented with fidelity in recent years. This year, we will revive the program. We have already had our

expectation charts redesigned and have presented these expectations to students through a face-to-face assembly and through a classroom presentation during the first week of school. We know that when students fully understand what behavior is expected of them, they are more likely to strive to meet those expectations. We also plan to re-open the Eagle Exchange this year. In the PBIS program, students who are making positive choices are rewarded through a token economy. They earn Eagle Cash and can then spend it in the Eagle Exchange, or use it to buy entry into reward activities such as a movie day. Another way that BES is seeking to promote a positive culture is the use of BRAG tags. Students can earn BRAG tags for a variety of positive behavior attributes or characteristics as well as determination and perseverance in their academic activities. It provides a visual reminder of their achievements and provides an opportunity for others to BRAG on them as well. Students are also rewarded as a class for positive behavior in the cafeteria during lunch. They must work as a team to earn the grade level trophy for best representation of the cafeteria expectations.

In another effort to build a positive school culture and environment, time was written into the master schedule for each teacher to teach Social-Emotional Learning activities daily. Teachers will use lessons from the Sandford Harmony curriculum to teach kindness, self-control, how to deal with difficult emotions, and self confidence, among other SEL lessons that will foster a positive school culture. During this time, teachers are also encouraged to discuss the character traits of the month and nominate students for recognition that reflect these traits. The time is also used to encourage students to develop a growth mindset through the way they speak and act. We encourage them to think and speak in ways that reflect the importance of effort, perseverance, responsibility, and embracing challenges.

Additionally, BES supports the whole child by helping to meet the varying needs of students. We have partnered with several community agencies to provide food backpacks that go home every weekend and school holidays. These same agencies help meet needs during the Holiday season so that families have meals on Thanksgiving and Christmas. Other agencies provide clothing, shoes and school supplies when students are in need. We use outside agencies for counseling services and social services when we are unable to meet the needs in-house.

The Sunshine Committee helps to foster a positive school culture for teachers and staff. The committee hosts socials and showers, sends flowers and cards when teachers have a loss, and sponsor teacher gifts during Teacher Appreciation Week. The Assistant Principal regularly sends out a newsletter to teacher and staff called News From the Nest. This had encouraging messages of appreciation, upcoming events, things to be aware of, and teaching strategies. This year, in an effort to make everyone feel included, special attention will be given to those new to the school by highlighting them in News from the Nest. Teachers and staff can be recognized by their peers through staff shout-outs and by nominations for the Above and Beyond Award. Teachers who are interested in pursuing leadership are encouraged to take on teacher leader roles to increase their knowledge and build the capacity for leadership.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

The role of school administration is to recognize teachers and staff who are demonstrating high quality teaching expectations, leadership potential, and excellent work ethic. Additionally, administration must provide support, professional development opportunities, and the resources teachers need to do their jobs successfully. The administration is also responsible for making parents and families feel welcome, valued and included as an intrical part of each student's education.

The role of the teachers in promoting a positive culture and environment is to form positive and supportive relationships with students. They must get to know their students' cultures and backgrounds and to create an environment of respect, inclusion and rapport in their classrooms. They are to communicate regularly with families, reporting student progress and describing ways that families can be engaged with student learning.

The role of the dean is to promote positive, respectful, and responsible student behavior through implementation of the PBIS program. The Dean also acts as a resource to families when students are

struggling with behavior.

The school counselor monitors students emotional health and responds to any related needs. She is also responsible for coordinating outside services for students and families and for managing and maintaining the food backpack program.

Students and families sign compacts with the school that describe their roles as well. The students commit to doing their best academically and to follow school-wide behavior expectations. Parents and families commit to supporting the school by speaking positively about the school and teachers to their students, to communicating with the school, and to encouraging their students to follow behavior expectations.

The School Advisory Council plays a vital role in the development and support of school wide improvement goals as well as providing input for building and fostering an inclusive environment through family and community events. SAC meets six times per year and provides funding for equipment and PBIS rewards as well as provides much needed support for literacy and family night events.

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 |
|---|--------|---|--------|
| | | Total: | \$0.00 |