Charles E. Bennett Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Charles E. Bennett Elementary School

1 S OAKRIDGE AVE, Green Cove Springs, FL 32043

http://ceb.oneclay.net

Demographics

Principal: Amanda Strickland

Start Date for this Principal: 8/23/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-6
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: D (37%) 2017-18: D (38%) 2016-17: C (44%)
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 Clay 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

Charles E. Bennett Elementary School

1 S OAKRIDGE AVE, Green Cove Springs, FL 32043

http://ceb.oneclay.net

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-6	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	40%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		D	D	D

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Clay 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.

At Charles E. Bennett Elementary, our mission is to work collaboratively with all stakeholders to provide a public education experience that is motivating, challenging and rewarding for all children. We will increase student achievement by providing students with learning opportunities that are rigorous, relevant and transcend beyond the boundaries of the school walls. We will ensure a working and learning environment built upon honesty, integrity and respect. Through these values, we will maximize student potential and promote individual responsibility.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Charles E. Bennett Elementary exists to prepare life-long learners for success in a global and competitive workplace and in acquiring applicable life skills.

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
Cagle, Sheree	Principal	Responsible for all leadership activities and the vision for the school. Responsible for maintaining a school that has a safe and caring environment as well as quality instruction. Administers balanced budget, promotes a positive work environment, and involves community stakeholders and parents.
Mainer, Dimitra	Assistant Principal	Responsible for maintaining school wide discipline, interviewing and hiring teachers and staff, and transportation coordinator. Promotes an environment that fosters learning and collegial atmosphere for teachers and staff.
Smith, Laura	Assistant Principal	Responsible for maintaining school wide discipline, monitors attendance, textbook coordinator and testing coordinator.
Hiers, Christina	Instructional Coach	Collects, analyzes and interpruts school level data to determine next steps for instruction. Provides support for individual classroom teachers in curriculum implementation, understanding academic content, use of instructional materials and strategies, coordinates and conducts coaching cycles. Title 1 Lead teachers, contact for TSSSA and UNISIG grant.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Friday 8/23/2019, Amanda Strickland

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.*
4

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
45

Total number of students enrolled at the school

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

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
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	78	83	82	84	92	82	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	581
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	1	2	3	4	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	2	2	4	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	20
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	2	22	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	60
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	33	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	1	2	3	4	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	23

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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 7/8/2021

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	83	82	84	91	82	95	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	613
Attendance below 90 percent	3	18	9	13	7	11	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	1	5	2	7	4	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Course failure in ELA	2	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	22	36	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	0	33	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	2	0	3	6	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	5	8	15	12	19	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	83	82	84	91	82	95	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	613
Attendance below 90 percent	3	18	9	13	7	11	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	67
One or more suspensions	1	5	2	7	4	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Course failure in ELA	2	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Course failure in Math	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	22	36	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	88
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	2	0	33	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	78
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	2	3	6	8	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	27

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	5	8	15	12	19	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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				34%	65%	57%	35%	63%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				47%	62%	58%	50%	59%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50%	54%	53%	44%	50%	48%
Math Achievement				39%	70%	63%	40%	69%	62%
Math Learning Gains				32%	66%	62%	41%	68%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				28%	56%	51%	30%	56%	47%
Science Achievement				31%	65%	53%	28%	66%	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	34%	68%	-34%	58%	-24%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	29%	64%	-35%	58%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-34%				
05	2021					
	2019	37%	62%	-25%	56%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-29%				
06	2021					
	2019	38%	64%	-26%	54%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	53%	71%	-18%	62%	-9%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	46%	69%	-23%	64%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-53%				
05	2021					
	2019	32%	64%	-32%	60%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
06	2021					
	2019	28%	70%	-42%	55%	-27%
Cohort Comparison		-32%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	31%	63%	-32%	53%	-22%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

We used the iReady reading and math diagnostic for all three assessments periods. In science we used the county baseline assessment, the midyear progress monitoring and then the FSA assessment. Our SWD population makes up approximately 30% of our total school population. The ELL students are in third and sixth grade.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20	34	49
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	34	49
	Students With Disabilities	0	7	12
	English Language Learners	n/a		
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	9	29	56
	Economically Disadvantaged	9	29	56
	Students With Disabilities	0	5	11
	English Language Learners	n/a		

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	20	44	54
	Economically Disadvantaged	20	44	54
	Students With Disabilities	0	7	14
	English Language Learners	3	3	3
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	9	29	59
	Economically Disadvantaged	9	29	59
	Students With Disabilities	0	9	14
	English Language Learners	13	3	3

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	42	51	58
	Economically Disadvantaged	42	51	58
	Students With Disabilities	7	12	16
	English Language Learners	n/a		
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	11	37	48
	Economically Disadvantaged	11	37	48
	Students With Disabilities	7	10	16
	English Language Learners	n/a		

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	15	25	27
	Economically Disadvantaged	15	25	27
	Students With Disabilities	4	4	8
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6	22	41
	Economically Disadvantaged	6	22	41
	Students With Disabilities	4	8	15
	English Language Learners	0	0	5

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	12	25	31
	Economically Disadvantaged	12	25	31
	Students With Disabilities	9	12	18
	English Language Learners	n/a		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	10	19	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	10	19	44
	Students With Disabilities	7	7	12
	English Language Learners	n/a		
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	40	54	45
	Economically Disadvantaged	40	54	45
	Students With Disabilities	0	7	20
	English Language Learners	0	0	5

Grade 6				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	14	33	20
	Economically Disadvantaged	14	33	20
	Students With Disabilities	3	9	18
	English Language Learners	0	0	5
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	10	26	31
	Economically Disadvantaged	10	26	31
	Students With Disabilities	6	15	20
	English Language Learners	0	0	5

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	18	49	50	22	36	30	41				
ELL	33			20							
BLK	27	55		22	34	38	22				
HSP	39	53		34	24						
MUL	46			42							
WHT	44	53	60	50	43	22	62				
FRL	42	59	58	40	41	32	52				

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	18	48	64	18	26	34	19				
ELL	29	57		41	50						
BLK	22	46	50	22	29	40					
HSP	39	62		50	45		29				
MUL	15			42	60						
WHT	37	46	52	41	29	21	40				
FRL	30	46	50	35	30	27	23				

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	13	40	47	19	33	27	12				
ELL	20	45		27	33						
BLK	20	45	52	23	37	31					
HSP	32	48		51	50						
MUL	18			33							
WHT	40	52	40	44	42	32	30				
FRL	31	46	43	37	37	24	21				

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	42
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	37
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	337

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	35
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	30
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	33
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	37
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	44
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

Multiracial Students	
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	48
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	46
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 lowest performance area overall was ELA Proficiency at 34%, although the lowest subdomain was Math LPQ at 28%. The fifth and sixth grade seem to contribute the most in this observation. The new curriculum along with the lack of small group instruction effective this outcome.
The trend of LPQ showing the lowest movement, if any, is consistent with district patterns over previous years.

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

Math Learning gains for all students declined from 41% to 31%. This attributed to a new curriculum and the presence of several new teachers in those tested grades.

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

Consistent with the above observations, Math Gains showed the wide gap between CEB students and the state results. The 34 point difference is the greatest gap, although overall math and ELA, as well as LPQ math and science were all at least 20 points different.
There were several brand new teachers in the tested grades in the 2018-2019 school year that can explain some of the gap. But there was also a new math curriculum, and the beginning of small group

instructional strategies that had not been used recently. Data is not an issue as the District utilizes multiple electronic platforms, and makes available to teachers the information to help inform instruction.

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

The ELA LPQ profile showed the greatest gain (7 points) and put the overall results within four points of the state average. This gain can be attributed to a focused push for rigour text in hands of students, and raising expectations around literacy across the campus.

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

The reading coach focused her attention on supporting the intermediate grades, allowing for more personalized supports.

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

The need for more focused professional development for teachers to make sure they are teaching the curriculum with fidelity. Many new teachers have joined the staff and training will need to be staggered to meet the need of all.

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 leaders will receive additional training on B.E.S.T. standards and implementation in the classroom.

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

Deeper involvement of the Social Worker to engage parents through home visit and bringing parents to events.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Charles E Bennett Elementary did not make gains on SWD and ED sub groups in English Language Arts. These are both large sub-groups as CEB with the SWD making up 30% of the population, all students are considered part of the ED subgroup. On the 2020-21 FSA students at CEB had 40% proficiency in ELA, which means the 60% of our students have the opportunity to grow to proficiency this year. When reflecting over the FSA scores the 3rd grade scores increased for 34% to 50% in 4th grade increase from 26% to 33% , in 5th grade increased from 33% to 41% but in 6th grade there was a decrease from 39% to 37%. When reviewing our end of the year data in iReady reading the follow grade levels percentage at or above grade level: kindergarten 96%, first grade 49%, second grade 54%, and third grade 58%. If we provide quality instruction by aligning lessons to the Florida/BEST Standards at the appropriate level of complexity then student achievement will improve. We will have ongoing PLC's focused on data, instructional planning and student evidence of learning. We will develop an ongoing feedback loop between leadership and teachers, teachers and academic coaches, students and teachers and students and students
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the percentage of Kindergarten- second grade on track to score level 3 or above on the grade 3 ELA assessment using the 2021-2022 end of the year screening and progress monitoring data by 2 percentage points. Increase the percentage of third grade on track to score a level 3 or above on the grade 3 ELA assessment using the 2021-2022 end of the year screening and progress monitoring data by 4 percentage points. Increase the percentage of fourth and fifth grade on track to score a level 3 or above on the grade 4/5 ELA assessment using the 2021-2022 end of the year screening and progress monitoring data by 2 percentage points. Increase the percentage of sixth grade on track to score a level 3 or above on the grade 6 ELA assessment using the 2021-2022 end of the year screening and progress monitoring data by 3 percentage points.
Monitoring:	Teachers will be using the reading curriculum adopted by the district, teachers will work with the reading coaches to implement the programs with fidelity and making sure lessons are aligned to Florida/BEST standards. Reading Coaches will be supporting academic planning/PLC for stacking standards, lesson planning and vertical awareness, teachers will attend 90% of the sessions as documented by sign in sheets. Instructional modeling with side by side coaching, targeted feedback and instructional focus, coaches will model at least 10 lessons per semester with documentation. Standards will be monitored with weekly standards focus checks, standards will be taught with a mini lessons and in small group and assessed weekly and tracked for mastery. The data is monitored and retaught as needed. Targeted instructional interventions for all students who need them, data and list of students will be available.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sheree Cagle (sheree.cagle@myoneclay.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:	Reading Coaches will work one-on-one with teachers, complete coaching cycles, collaboratively plan with teachers to provide effective standards based instruction, and monitor strategy usage. Evidence-based strategies that will be employed to achieve our goals for improvement include: Evidence-Based Programs that address the identified gaps aligned with the 5 Components of Reading such as Lexia Core5 and Power Up. Small group instruction Explicit and Systematic Phonological Awareness and Phonemic Awareness Instruction Explicit vocabulary instruction Explicit Comprehension Strategy Instruction (Before, During, After): Explicit fluency instruction The use of Lexia is monitored daily by reading coaches and administration, student progression and usage is closely tracked. Small Group Instruction will be driven by student data, which is also used to monitor student growth and the MTSS process. Lessons from Lexia are used daily for teachers to pull small groups to remediate as needed. Students who level up are celebrated weekly and certificates are printed. High quality professional development to teachers is among the most important and long standing challenges facing turnaround schools. Investing in on the job training offering side by side teaching and planning with high quality instructional coaches will develop high performing teachers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Lexia Core5 Implementation with student progress monitoring assessed through DIBELS Next® https://www.evidenceforessa.org/programs/reading/lexiar-core5r-reading-program-struggling-readers All selected strategies align with the Florida B.E.S.T. standards and the approved district Reading Plan. Research shows strong evidence in affirming the effectiveness of explicit and systematic instruction in phonological awareness, phonemic awareness, vocabulary, comprehension strategy instruction, fluency instruction, and small group instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

Reading Coaches will help teacher plan and monitor implementation of Lexia Core5 research based reading program. Reading coaches will assist teachers with an understanding of the BEST standards. Coaches will conduct coaching cycles as needed to ensure proper implementation. They will monitor implementation of all blended learning platforms.

Person Responsible Sheree Cagle (sheree.cagle@myoneclay.net)

The reading interventionist will target select students in the lowest performing quartile for data based interventions. The ESE teachers and ESE paraprofessional will work with LPQ SWD students to ensure proper interventions and accommodations are in place.

Person Responsible Sheree Cagle (sheree.cagle@myoneclay.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	If we provide quality Math instruction by aligning lessons to the Florida Standards at the appropriate level of complexity then student achievement will improve. We will have ongoing PLC's focused on data, instructional planning and student evidence of learning. We will develop an ongoing feedback loop between leadership and teachers, teachers and academic coaches, students and teachers and students and students.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase Math gains by 5% on FSA, with a focus on SWD and ED subgroups.
Monitoring:	Math Coaches supporting academic planning/PLC for unpacking standards, lesson planning and vertical awareness, teachers will attend 90% of the sessions as documented by sign in sheets. Instructional modeling with side by side coaching, targeted feedback and instructional focus, coaches will model at least 10 lessons per semester with documentation. Targeted instructional interventions for all students who need them, data and list of students will be available.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sheree Cagle (sheree.cagle@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Math Coaches will have focused support in the areas of math, one coach will focus on K-2 and the other on 3-6. Coaches will work one-on-one with teachers, complete coaching cycles and collaboratively plan with teachers to provide effective standards based instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	High quality professional development to teachers is among the most important and long standing challenges facing schools. Investing in on the job training offering side by side teaching and planning with high quality instructional coaches will develop high performing teachers. This will help teachers with the daily challenges. (Kraft 2017) https://scholar.harvard.edu/ files/mkraft/files/ kraft_blazar_hogan_2016_teacher_coaching_meta?analysis_wp_w_appendix.pdf

Action Steps to Implement

Math Coaches will help teachers plan and will monitor implementation of a research based math program based on Florida Standards blended with the current math curriculum. Coaches will plan and coduct coaches cycles as needed with teachers to ensure proper implementation. They will monitor the use and implementation of blended learning platforms.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

The ESE teachers and ESE paraprofessional will work with LPQ SWD students to insure proper math interventions and accommodations are in place.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	f we provide quality science instruction by aligning lessons to the Florida Standards at the appropriate level of complexity then student achievement will improve. We will have ongoing PLC's focused on data, instructional planning and student evidence of learning. We will develop an ongoing feedback loop between leadership and teachers, teachers and academic coaches, students and teachers and students and students.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase science proficiency by - % in 5th grade FSA, with a focus on the fair game standards.
Monitoring:	Science Coach supporting academic planning/PLC for unpacking standards, lesson planning and vertical awareness, teachers will attend 90% of the sessions as documented by sign in sheets. Instructional modeling with coaching cycles, targeted feedback and instructional focus, coaches will model at least 10 lessons per semester with documentation.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Sheree Cagle (sheree.cagle@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Science coach will have focused support in the areas science. Coaches will work one-on-one with teachers, complete coaching cycles and collaboratively plan with teachers to provide effective standards based instruction. They will also see all grade level in the science lab on a regularly, make sure all students are introduced to fair game standards.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	High quality professional development to teachers is among the most important and long standing challenges facing schools. Investing in on the job training offering side by side teaching and planning with high quality instructional coaches will develop high performing teachers. This will help teachers with the daily challenges. (Kraft 2017) https://scholar.harvard.edu/ files/mkraft/files/ kraft_blazar_hogan_2016_teacher_coaching_meta?analysis_wp_w_appendix.pdf

Action Steps to Implement

Science Coach will help fully develop a science lab and implement a Science Academy on Saturday. The academy will focus on students who are nearing proficiency and will cover all fair game standards. The science coach will monitor the use and implementation of science blended learning platforms.

Person Responsible	Sheree Cagle (sheree.cagle@myoneclay.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Early Warning Systems	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Parent Engagement Activities focused around academics and data will take place at least 8 times during the year. School Social Worker will make home visits and document these visits as needed for attendance and social issues. Parent Liaison to support parent activities during the school day, will show an increase of school volunteers by 50%. Increase positive parent communication by use of student agenda planners with parents signing daily at least 70% of the time. Student will take home Weekly Communication folder.The inclusion of a second school administrator allows for school operations and teacher/staff supports to be distributed to a smaller ratio, allowing for more intentional supports that ultimately improves school culture, teacher efficacy, and higher student outcomes. The second assistant administrator will watch all EWS signs and maintain communication with the Social Worker to foster positive home-school relationships.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase student achievement by increasing time on task and engagement by improving student attendance by 3% for all students.
Monitoring:	Student attendance will be monitored weekly by the assistant principal. School Social Worker will make home visits and document these visits as needed for attendance and social issues. Parent Liaison to support parent activities during the school day, will show an increase of school volunteers by 50%. Increase positive parent communication by use of student agenda planners with parents signing daily at least 70% of the time. Student will take home Weekly Communication folder.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Laura Smith (laura.smith1@myoneclay.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Parent Liaison, Social Social Worker and Title 1 Lead will work together to involve parent in all aspects of the students learning, giving them many opportunities to be involved within the school.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Parent engagement happens when teachers involve parents in school meetings or events, and parents volunteer their support at home and at school. In this way, they make a commitment. Parents commit to prioritizing their child's educational goals, and teachers commit to listening and providing a space for collaboration with parents. waterford.org

Action Steps to Implement

Social Worker working with the Assistant Principal to coordinate home visits for students with excessive absences.

Person Responsible	Laura Smith (laura.smith1@myoneclay.net)

Family Engagement Activities to involve parents with the academics and data driven discussions about students.

Person Responsible	[no one identified]

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the 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.

In the last two years, Charles E Bennett has reduced the number of referral for 45%. The reduction in referral has allowed for more student contact hours and to promote student engagement. At CEB we are about to support students with 2 full-time behavior management teachers, a full-time social worker and an assistant principal that helps support attendance and family engagement. For the 2021-2022 school year we will have a full-time Trauma counselor with River's Edge. This counselor will be about to work with our many students who have had traumatic events in the lives and also have on-going counseling sessions with specific students.

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.

The positive school culture is built by believing and living our mission and vision statement.
Charles E Bennett shares a single vision for the benefit for the students and families of the Green Cove Springs community. We have embraced the Social-Emotional Learning for teachers and students through the 7 Mindsets. We are building a culture of resilience with our teachers and students to never give up and always keep going. We communicate with parents and community often using social media, parent newsletters, parent link, class dojo, weekly folders and student agenda. We recognize our students and staff for the amazing things they do every day both academically and behaviorally. We are working in improving our image in the community showing them what a wonderful school Charles E Bennett is again!

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

Charles E Bennett will have 3 SAC meetings per year with an organizational meeting in September. The meetings will be held both in person and virtually during the 2020-2021 school year. This is in hope to include many stakeholders that can not attend in person due to work responsibilities.

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
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math				$69,332.20
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0071 - Charles E. Bennett Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	$49,276.23
			Notes: Salary: Math Coach			
	6400	210-Retirement	0071 - Charles E. Bennett Elementary School	UniSIG		$5,331.69
			Notes: Retirement: 10:82%			
	6400	220-Social Security	0071 - Charles E. Bennett Elementary School	UniSIG		$3,769.63
			Notes: Social Security: 7.65%			
	6400	230-Group Insurance	0071 - Charles E. Bennett Elementary School	UniSIG		$10,250.00
			Notes: Group Insurance: Full Family Plan			
	6400	240-Workers Compensation	0071 - Charles E. Bennett Elementary School	UniSIG		$704.65
			Notes: Worker's Compensation: 1.43%			
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science				$81,786.84
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6400	130-Other Certified Instructional Personnel	0071 - Charles E. Bennett Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	$48,273.01
			Notes: Salary: Science Coach			
	6400	210-Retirement	0071 - Charles E. Bennett Elementary School	UniSIG		$5,223.14
			Notes: Retirement: 10.82%			
	6400	220-Social Security	0071 - Charles E. Bennett Elementary School	UniSIG		$3,692.89
			Notes: Social Security: 7.65%			
	6400	230-Group Insurance	0071 - Charles E. Bennett Elementary School	UniSIG		$10,250.00
			Notes: Group Insurance: Full Family Plan			
	6400	240-Workers Compensation	0071 - Charles E. Bennett Elementary School	UniSIG		$690.30
			Notes: Worker's Compensation: 1.43%			
	5100	510-Supplies	0071 - Charles E. Bennett Elementary School	UniSIG		$13,657.50
			Notes: Supplies: Including but not limited to paper, journals, folders, chart paper, science lab consumables			

4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Early Warning Systems				$115,965.00
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	6150	160-Other Support Personnel	0071 - Charles E. Bennett Elementary School	UniSIG	0.6	$17,000.00
			Notes: Parent Liaison: Salary			
	6150	210-Retirement	0071 - Charles E. Bennett Elementary School	UniSIG		$1,839.40
			Notes: Retirement: 10.82%			
	6150	220-Social Security	0071 - Charles E. Bennett Elementary School	UniSIG		$1,300.50
			Notes: Social Security: 7.65%			
	6150	230-Group Insurance	0071 - Charles E. Bennett Elementary School	UniSIG		$1,000.00
			Notes: Group Insurance: Single Plan			
	6150	240-Workers Compensation	0071 - Charles E. Bennett Elementary School	UniSIG		$243.10
			Notes: Worker's Compensation: 1.43%			
	7300	110-Administrators	0071 - Charles E. Bennett Elementary School	UniSIG	1.0	$70,335.28
			Notes: Salary: Assistant Principal			
	7300	210-Retirement	0071 - Charles E. Bennett Elementary School	UniSIG		$7,610.28
			Notes: Retirement: 10.82%			
	7300	220-Social Security	0071 - Charles E. Bennett Elementary School	UniSIG		$5,380.65
			Notes: Social Security: 7.65%			
	7300	230-Group Insurance	0071 - Charles E. Bennett Elementary School	UniSIG		$10,250.00
			Notes: Group Insurance: Family Plan			
	7300	240-Workers Compensation	0071 - Charles E. Bennett Elementary School	UniSIG		$1,005.79
			Notes: Worker's Compensation: 1.43%			
					Total:	$277,518.75