

Marion County Public Schools

Bellevue Santos 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	22

Belleview Santos Elementary School

9600 SE US HIGHWAY 441, Belleview, FL 34420

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Kim White

Start Date for this Principal: 6/23/2021

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 (53%) 2017-18: F (28%) 2016-17: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	

* 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 Marion 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	11
Planning for Improvement	19
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	22

Belleview Santos Elementary School

9600 SE US HIGHWAY 441, Belleview, FL 34420

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	44%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	F

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Marion 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.

Belleview-Santos will develop academically minded learners through the planning and implementation of rigorous and relevant instruction and collaborative teaching in a safe environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Belleview-Santos works with all stakeholders to create educational opportunities where all students can learn.

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
White, Kimberly	Principal	To provide the visionary leadership necessary to design, develop, and implement a comprehensive program of instructional and support services to optimize available resources and to provide successful high quality experiences for students in a safe and orderly environment. She supervises administrative, instructional, and non-instructional personnel assigned to the school
Lafferty, Shanon	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal assists the principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, assists in the development of a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of high yield instructional strategies. She further assists the principal in the assessment of school staff, assists with the monitoring of implementation of intervention and necessary documentation, assists with the delivery of professional development for effective instructional delivery. The assistant principal carefully monitors the additional academic support schedule to ensure all personnel are serving in their specified areas.
Polish, Alison	School Counselor	She provides students with educational, personal, and vocational counseling and to identify and coordinate all available resources to empower students to reach full potential.
Haworth, Angelique	Instructional Coach	The content area specialist serves as an academic coach for teachers and paraprofessionals utilizing effective coaching practices to build capacity and support student learning. Additionally, the content area specialist serves as an intervention specialist for targeted students based on need, for the specific content area.
Viles, Teresa	Instructional Coach	The content area specialist serves as an academic coach for teachers and paraprofessionals utilizing effective coaching practices to build capacity and support student learning. Additionally, the content area specialist serves as an intervention specialist for targeted students based on need, for the specific content area.
Suranni, Joseph	Dean	He works to implement disciplinary procedures and policies to ensure a safe and orderly environment. In addition, he works with students and parents in creating educational plans for students that ensure improved academic success.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 6/23/2021, Kim White

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

32

Total number of students enrolled at the school

525

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

5

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

3

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
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	70	89	77	78	102	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	494
Attendance below 90 percent	25	27	27	24	31	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158
One or more suspensions	2	5	9	5	24	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Course failure in ELA	9	21	30	16	26	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108
Course failure in Math	8	17	21	7	23	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	20	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	17	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	3	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	8	17	26	13	34	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113

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	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 6/30/2021

2020-21 - 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	85	71	79	102	77	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	494
Attendance below 90 percent	46	34	28	49	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	200
One or more suspensions	5	6	1	13	10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in ELA	0	1	6	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	1	5	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	21	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	17	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	3	5	2	11	9	0	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	2	2	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
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	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	85	71	79	102	77	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	494
Attendance below 90 percent	46	34	28	49	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	200
One or more suspensions	5	6	1	13	10	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Course failure in ELA	0	1	6	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
Course failure in Math	0	1	5	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	21	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	17	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	3	5	2	11	9	0	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	2	2	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
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 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	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				50%	47%	57%	45%	46%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				66%	56%	58%	35%	44%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				63%	52%	53%	15%	37%	48%
Math Achievement				47%	51%	63%	32%	49%	62%
Math Learning Gains				57%	58%	62%	22%	46%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				38%	49%	51%	7%	35%	47%
Science Achievement				53%	47%	53%	40%	51%	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	37%	44%	-7%	58%	-21%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	60%	49%	11%	58%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				
05	2021					
	2019	45%	45%	0%	56%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	43%	49%	-6%	62%	-19%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	65%	54%	11%	64%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2021					
	2019	32%	45%	-13%	60%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	49%	44%	5%	53%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

The progress monitoring tools used by grade level to compile the data below are:

- English Language Arts, Grades 1-5: iReady Diagnostic-Reading Overall Placement AP1, AP2, and AP3
- Mathematics, Grades 1-5: iReady Diagnostic-Math Overall Placement AP1, AP2, and AP3
- Science, Grade 5: Grade 5 Science Quarters 1, 2, and 3 Quarterly Standards Mastery Assessment (QSMA)

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	11 / 14%	11 / 13%	25 / 29%
	Economically Disadvantaged	6 / 10%	8 / 13%	17 / 27%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 9%	0 / 0%	3 / 25%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	8 / 10%	11 / 13%	32 / 38%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7 / 12%	6 / 10%	21 / 33%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 9%	0 / 0%	2 / 18%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	1 / 13%	1 / 13%
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	13 / 20%	15 / 20%	20 / 27%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10 / 22%	11 / 22%	15 / 29%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	1 / 10%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	9 / 14%	7 / 9%	18 / 24%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7 / 16%	5 / 10%	13 / 25%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	26 / 38%	14 / 20%	20 / 27%
	Economically Disadvantaged	15 / 31%	9 / 18%	12 / 24%
	Students With Disabilities	3 / 23%	2 / 17%	2 / 17%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	6 / 9%	3 / 4%	14 / 19%
	Economically Disadvantaged	4 / 8%	2 / 4%	10 / 20%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	2 / 17%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	21 / 21%	12 / 12%	12 / 12%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11 / 15%	6 / 8%	4 / 6^
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 7%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	1 / 33%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	13 / 13%	9 / 9%	17 / 17%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7 / 10%	2 / 3%	9 / 13%
	Students With Disabilities	1 / 7%	0 / 0%	1 / 7%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	17 / 24%	4 / 5%	9 / 13%
	Economically Disadvantaged	7 / 16%	1 / 2%	5 / 11%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	13 / 19%	8 / 11%	16 / 23%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10 / 23%	5 / 11%	8 / 19%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	24 / 36%	15 / 21%	15 / 22%
	Economically Disadvantaged	14 / 35%	9 / 20%	10 / 24%
	Students With Disabilities	0 / 0 %	0 / 0%	0 / 0%
	English Language Learners	0 / 0%	0 / 0%	0 / 0%

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	26	33	40	25	38						
ELL	19			15							
BLK	30			30							
HSP	40	35		34	56		26				
WHT	42	45		45	57		43				
FRL	32	38	40	35	48	47	34				
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	58	64	22	48	44	25				
ELL	35	70		42	67						
BLK	31	60	60	18	42	55	31				
HSP	48	68		55	72	42	30				

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
WHT	57	64	44	54	58	27	67				
FRL	39	65	53	36	53	43	44				
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	19	19	5	12	7		8				
ELL	19	12	10	19	12						
BLK	29	22		21	15						
HSP	39	28	13	30	19		29				
WHT	53	42	21	39	26	20	45				
FRL	40	31	17	27	20	6	39				

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	53
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	353
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	29
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	30
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	40
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	46
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	41
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?

ELA and Math trend lines from 2018-2019 and 2020-2021 indicate a downward trend for proficiencies in 3rd and 4th grades and an upward trend in 5th grade based upon FSA data. The three year average of ELA proficiency levels are as follows: 3rd grade is 38%, 4th grade is 47%, and 5th grade is 43%. Math proficiency averages for three years are as follows: 3rd grade is 36%, 4th grade is 50%, and 5th grade is 32%.

Math Learning Gains and Math Lowest Quartile data from 2018-2019 and 2020-2021 indicate an upward trend. Math Learning Gains have a three year average of 50%, and Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains is 41%.

Science proficiency trend lines from 2018-2019 and 2020-2021 indicate a downward trend in 5th grade with a three year average of 42%.

Subgroup data from the 2021 FSA is not yet available. Based upon the progress monitoring data and FSA proficiency data it is expected that the trend lines in all subgroups will decrease. This prediction includes our ESE population who fell below the 41% threshold for ESSA.

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

Based upon the 2018-2019 and 2020-2021 FSA data, the greatest area in need of improvement is ELA proficiency and ELA Learning Gains. This is also supported by the 2021 progress monitoring data which shows all grade levels lower than 30% on grade level for the Spring assessment period.

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

One contributing factor to this data is that teachers were focused more upon Tier 2 remediation to account for learning loss from the previous year's disruption and low student ability levels. Tier 1 instruction was not to the depth of the standard. In addition, an average of 26% of the student population had less than 90% attendance due to the pandemic.

To address these issues, collaboration is being restructured to focus more on Tier 1. During collaboration teachers will break down the standard, discuss how to teach that standard in full, and determine what progress monitoring tools they will utilize to track mastery. Training will be provided for teachers to learn how to use formative assessments to make instructional decisions on their Tier 1 instruction.

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

Math Learning Gains and the Lowest Quartile data from 2018-2019 and 2020-2021 indicate an upward trend. Math Learning Gains have a three year average of 50%, and the Lowest Quartile Learning Gains is 41%.

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

School QSMA data indicated math as a concern early in the school year. Teachers added a math remediation block three times a week, established daily math reviews as a morning routine, and after school math tutoring for select students.

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

Teachers will utilize a daily check for understanding that aligns to that day's learning goal and then use that data to help determine student mastery, remediation needs, and next steps for Tier 1 instruction. Common weekly standards checks will also be given in each grade level to monitor grade level performance, and drive future instruction including remediation opportunities during weekly collaboration.

To address the ESE subgroup data, BSE conducted inclusion best practices training for all inclusion teachers and support facilitators in August 2021. Additionally, the master schedule has provided time for BSE's support facilitators to collaboratively plan with 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade teams to better prepare them to align instruction with the standards.

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.

Teachers and school leaders will be provided training on how to use formative assessments to make daily instructional decisions within the classroom. In August 2021, teachers were provided with training on how to accelerate achievement for all subgroups in Tier 1 via Kagan Structures. Coaching and modeling of how to use formative assessments will be provided by Dr. Haworth and Ms. Viles. Modeling of how to analyze data will occur weekly during collaboration sessions. Quarterly data chats for all 3rd-5th grade teachers will occur with Mrs. White and Ms. Lafferty.

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

To ensure sustainability for the coming years, administration will frequently monitor teacher implementation of strategies in order to build teacher capacity. Collaborative planning will continue to happen weekly with a focus on Tier 1 instruction that meets the depth of the standard.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction**Area of****Focus****Description
and****Rationale:**

Based upon schoolwide trend of state assessments and progress monitoring ELA is a critical area in need of improvement.

Teachers will provide standards-based instruction driven by formative assessments during Tier 1 instruction.

**Measurable
Outcome:**

ELA proficiency scores in 3rd-5th grades will increase by 5% from 40% to 45%, ELA learning gains will increase by 5% from 42% to 47%, and ELA lowest quartile learning gains will increase by 5% from 36% to 41% as measured by the 2022 Florida Standards Assessment.

ELA progress monitoring data for K-2nd grades as measured by iReady diagnostics will also increase by 5%. Kg students will increase from 55% on grade level to 60% on grade level by the end of the year. 1st Grade students will increase from 31% on grade level to 36% on grade level by the end of the year. 2nd Grade students will increase from 27% on grade level to 32% on grade level by the end of the year.

Monitoring:

School administration and teachers will utilize iReady diagnostic data, QSMA data, and weekly standards checks to monitor the desired outcome. Administration will also complete weekly walkthroughs with Google forms to track teacher implementation of formative assessments and aligned instruction.

**Person
responsible
for
monitoring
outcome:**

Kimberly White (kimberly.white@marion.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

John Hattie identifies the use of formative assessments to improve student outcomes as one the highest strategies teachers can implement with a 0.90 effect size. Hattie's strategy of formative assessments refers to teachers attending to what is happening for each student in their classroom as a result of their instruction.

**Rationale
for
Evidence-
based
Strategy:**

During the 2021 school year teachers were unable to use data to accurately determine student mastery of the standards. A failure to understand the depth of the standard as well as not use data monitoring tools to assess those standards led to lower student proficiency levels. The strategy selected is identified as one of the top strategies to increase student achievement in John Hattie's book Visible Learning.

Action Steps to Implement

Collaborative planning is being restructured to focus on Tier 1 instructional strategies and formative assessment. Data analysis will be conducted on the previous week's formative assessments.

**Person
Responsible**

Kimberly White (kimberly.white@marion.k12.fl.us)

Training will be provided on formative assessments that include what they are, how to create them, how to use them, and then how analyze the results.

**Person
Responsible**

Shanon Lafferty (shanon.lafferty@marion.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), 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.

N/A

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.

A positive school culture and environment is supported through school-wide expectations with positive behavior support systems in place. This summer, a team from the school attended a three-day Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support (PBIS) training to analyze school data and develop a plan to revitalize this program on campus.

School-wide expectations and supports are communicated to families in monthly newsletters and Skylert messages.

Additionally, teachers build a positive school and classroom culture through the implementation of Caring School Communities curriculum to included morning meet-ups and lessons designed to improve their social and emotional learning skills. Students learn how to problem solve and work together as a team.

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

The school's leadership team sets the vision and goal. In addition to the leadership team, BSE's PBIS team meets monthly to analyze school data including discipline data, attendance, and various stakeholder surveys. They work to determine next steps to continuously improve the positive culture and environment at the school. Teachers from various grade levels, special area teachers, paraprofessionals, and clerical staff are represented on the PBIS team. The team also includes various races and genders to ensure equal representation.

The school also works with various local business and churches to collaboratively promote a positive culture both at school and in the community. Due to the pandemic, there is limited contact between students and these organizations, however, school leadership communicates regularly with the organizations. These organizations assist the school through monetary donations, materials and supplies, and student incentives.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Standards-aligned Instruction	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00