Ballard Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Ballard Elementary School

912 18TH ST W, Bradenton, FL 34205

https://www.manateeschools.net/ballard

Demographics

Principal: Rudy Keezer   Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

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 (50%) 2017-18: D (38%) 2016-17: D (39%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	[Lucinda Thompson](#)
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 Manatee 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

Ballard Elementary School

912 18TH ST W, Bradenton, FL 34205

https://www.manateeschools.net/ballard

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	80%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Manatee 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.

We believe that all students are important and valuable.
We believe that challenge does not break us but is the foundation for our success.
We believe that our dreams and goals will be reached through hard work and effort.
We believe that effort is the key to our success.
We believe that all students will be successful everyday who work hard and try.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Ballard will be a collaborative learning community of students, families, and staff aspiring to create leaders and positive role models who will serve as anchors for the future. We will empower all students to achieve their highest level of academic excellence, and we will work cooperatively to establish a respectful and supportive learning environment.

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
Keezer, Rudy	Principal	a. Serves as curriculum leader b. Serves on the School Data Team. c. Coordinate activities with team members to facilitate the implementation of content area performance standards, instructional objectives and interdisciplinary planning units. d. PBS Team Member e. Oversees District and State Assessment processes. f. Attendance Committee member g. MTSS Team member h. PBIS Team member I. Advocate for all SWDs to have the same school choice options as students without disabilities to ensure all SWDs receive educational services in their neighborhood school or school of choice. K. Oversees, coordinates, and monitors the implementation of best practices for inclusive education for all SWDs.
Fradley, Mary "Katie"	Assistant Principal	a. Serves as curriculum leader b. Serves on the School Data Team. c. Coordinate activities with team members to facilitate the implementation of content area performance standards, instructional objectives and interdisciplinary planning units. d. PBIS Team Member e. Serves as testing coordinator with the dean/student support specialist
Oliva, Mary	Assistant Principal	a. Serves as curriculum leader b. Serves on the School Data Team. c.Coordinate activities with team members to facilitate the implementation of content area performance standards, instructional objectives and interdisciplinary planning units. d. PBIS team Member e. Overseas textbook ordering and distribution.
Brumby, Jessica	Reading Coach	a. Serves as curriculum leader b. Serves on the School Data Team, ILT, IST, Team Leader. c. Coordinates activities with team members to facilitate the implementation of content area performance standards, instructional objectives and interdisciplinary planning units.

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		d. Monitors school wide data, coaches teachers, and provides PD.
Adriano , Victoria	Dean	a. Discipline b. Serve as curriculum leader c. PBS Chair Person d. Serve on MTSS Team. e. Testing Coordinator f. Team Leader
Henderson, Toya	Attendance/Social Work	a. Mentor children through the Check and Connect mentoring program. b. Maintain a database of interventions monthly indicating daily phone calls and student interventions and documenting the "why" students are absent with validity and reliability. c. Conduct home visits-positive home visits d. Serves on MTSS/ILT
Hernandez, Laura	Teacher, K-12	ESOL Teacher, responsible for teaching, testing and monitoring ESOL students.
Duke, Barbra	School Counselor	a. Coordinator Caring School Community and responsible for implementation and teacher training. b. Serve as Data Team Member c. PBS Team Member d.. 504 coordinator e. MTSS coordinator

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 7/1/2021, Rudy Keezer

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.*
4

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.*
2

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
23

Total number of students enrolled at the school

380

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

1

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

0

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	57	53	54	74	68	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	364
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/24/2021

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	54	60	63	88	55	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	394
Attendance below 90 percent	3	18	25	6	11	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	0	10	10	7	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
	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	3	5	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
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	54	60	63	88	55	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	394
Attendance below 90 percent	3	18	25	6	11	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	72
One or more suspensions	0	10	10	7	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	26
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
	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	3	5	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
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				35%	52%	57%	31%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				47%	57%	58%	42%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				53%	55%	53%	36%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				52%	63%	63%	37%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains				69%	68%	62%	54%	61%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				63%	53%	51%	40%	47%	47%
Science Achievement				29%	48%	53%	24%	49%	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	35%	51%	-16%	58%	-23%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	25%	56%	-31%	58%	-33%
Cohort Comparison	-35%					
05	2021					
	2019	40%	52%	-12%	56%	-16%
Cohort Comparison	-25%					

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	51%	60%	-9%	62%	-11%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	43%	65%	-22%	64%	-21%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2021					
	2019	54%	60%	-6%	60%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	26%	48%	-22%	53%	-27%
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 following progress monitoring tools were used to compile the data below:

Grades 1-2:
ELA: iReady Reading
Math: iReady Math

Grades 3-5:
ELA: District Benchmarks/FSA
Math: District Benchmarks/FSA
Science: District Benchmarks/FSA

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	21%	28%	33%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21%	28%	33%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	14.3%	6.7%	13.3%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	10%	16%	28%
	Economically Disadvantaged	10%	16%	28%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	0%	0%
	English Language Learners	0%	6.7%	6.1%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	26%	33%	48%
	Economically Disadvantaged	26%	33%	48%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	10%	30%
	English Language Learners	8.3%	8.3%	30.8%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	9%	27%	35%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9%	27%	35%
	Students With Disabilities	0%	20%	10%
	English Language Learners	0%	16.7%	15.4%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	28.8%	20.5%	27%
	Economically Disadvantaged	28.8%	20.5%	27%
	Students With Disabilities	9.7%	4.3%	4%
	English Language Learners	15.7%	14.3%	13.6%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	34.2%	39.3%	43%
	Economically Disadvantaged	34.2%	39.3%	43%
	Students With Disabilities	18.2%	18.1%	22%
	English Language Learners	24%	30.4%	41%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	53.2%	46.7%	40%
	Economically Disadvantaged	53.2%	46.7%	40%
	Students With Disabilities	37.5%	37.5%	20%
	English Language Learners	36.9%	41.2%	29%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	39.1%	34%	47%
	Economically Disadvantaged	39.1%	34%	47%
	Students With Disabilities	33.3%	25%	30%
	English Language Learners	35%	29.4%	36%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	39.7%	46.1%	39%
	Economically Disadvantaged	39.7%	46.1%	39%
	Students With Disabilities	25%	27.3%	20%
	English Language Learners	26.3%	25%	12%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	50%	52.9%	58%
	Economically Disadvantaged	50%	52.9%	58%
	Students With Disabilities	8.3%	9.1%	20%
	English Language Learners	47.4%	47.7%	53%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	44.2%	37.8%	36%
	Economically Disadvantaged	44.2%	37.8%	36%
	Students With Disabilities	8%	27%	33%
	English Language Learners	47%	35%	18%

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	14	29		26	35	27	38				
ELL	26	38	40	54	54		30				
BLK	28	42		37	50		16				
HSP	30	40	42	54	63		45				
MUL	36			45							
WHT	54	42		54	42		42				
FRL	30	39	45	46	58	40	41				
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	17	28	44	26	53	50	10				
ELL	32	53	54	50	73	73	45				
BLK	27	37	33	42	64	64	12				

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
HSP	30	45	65	55	71	63	30				
MUL	47	60		71	80						
WHT	56	59		56	68		27				
FRL	33	50	54	49	68	69	25				

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	43	48	19	40	31					
ELL	27	51	45	35	51	50	15				
BLK	22	29	25	29	52	20	26				
HSP	26	50	33	41	55	44	23				
MUL	32	31		38	56						
WHT	55	50		42	55	40	27				
FRL	29	42	31	36	55	44	22				

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	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	50
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	354
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%

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	42
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO

English Language Learners	
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	35
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	46
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	41
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	47
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	43
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?

After analyzing our 2020-2021 school grade data, a common trend with our L25 students became apparent. We did not meet our school goal for lowest quartile student learning gains in both ELA and Math. ELA L25 learning gains were 47%, which was an 18% deficiency from our goal of 65%. Math L25 learning gains were 41%, which was a 24% deficiency from our goal. Our Science proficiency goal was 43%, but only 36% of our students were proficient.

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

For the 2020-2021 school year, ELA proficiency was 34%, ELA learning gains was 41% and ELA lowest quartile learning gains was 47%. This data supports the need for overall improvement in the ELA bucket.

Although we met our goal for Math proficiency, we did not meet out goal for lowest quartile math gains. Our goal was 65%, and we earned 41% in this category.

Last year's FSA scores revealed a proficiency score of 36% for Science.

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

ELA: 48% of students began the school year on our Schoology eLearning platform. Although our eLearning teachers made every effort to engage our online learners, many students did not participate fully. This may have been a large contributing factor as to why we underperformed in the area of ELA. Now that we are fully brick-and-mortar, our teachers will be able to close the achievement gap for ELA with daily small group instruction utilizing the Literacy Footprints guided reading program.

Math: As previously mentioned, eLearning may have been a large contributing factor as to why we did not meet our goal for lowest quartile learning gains in mathematics. Now that we are fully brick-and-mortar, our teachers will be able to close the achievement gap for math with Acaletics and small group instruction.

Science: Over 60% of our fifth grade students began the year on the Schoology eLearning platform.

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

The areas that have shown the most improvement were Math and Science achievement. For 2020-2021 our Math proficiency was at 49% and our Science proficiency was at 36%.

Math Achievement Historical Data:
2018-2019 52%
2017-2018 37%
2016-2017 35%

Science Achievement Historical Data:
2018-2019 29%
2017-2018 24%
2016-2017 21%

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

Both Math and Science achievement have shown a steady increase over the past few years due to the implementation of many new strategies such as: purposeful planning with ELA, common formative assessments, accelerating the curriculum map, and reteaching 3rd and 4th grade science standards in 5th grade.

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

In order to accelerate learning in all academic areas, the main instructional focus will be targeted small group instruction for ELA and Math. Additionally, lowest quartile students will receive additional small group support weekly during their music and art rotations starting in January 2022 utilizing the resource teachers. Our L25 students will also receive additional social-emotional support through our new Ballard Cubs mentor program.

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.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies previously identified, ongoing professional development on small group instruction will occur throughout the year. This will be facilitated by our Reading Coach and District Instructional Specialist.

Professional development in the area of mentoring will occur before launching the Ballard Cubs mentor program begins. This professional development will be hosted by supervising teacher Chelsea Cardozo and Graduation Enhancement Technician Toya Henderson.

In order to better engage our student population, all instructional and support staff members will participate in an ongoing book study for: Poor Students Rich Teaching by Eric Jenson.

After assessing K-2 students with the Next Step Forward in Guided Reading Assessment Kits, all K-2 teachers will participate in a 'Gap Eliminator' professional development session to close the achievement gap in ELA. 3-5 teachers will participate in this professional development following Quarter 1 benchmark assessments.

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

In order to ensure the sustainability of improvement for the 2021-2022 school year and beyond, we have had very low staff turnover the last few years which builds teacher capacity. This year we

are implementing a SEL program Character Strong as well as a House System which will help to strengthen our school community.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	For the 2020-2021 school year, 3-5 ELA proficiency was 34%, ELA learning gains was 41% and ELA lowest quartile learning gains was 47%. At the end of the 2020-2021 school year, 25% of K-2 students were considered proficient according to the district running records assessments. In order to increase overall achievement in ELA, we will be expanding the components of the Literacy Footprints guided reading program to all K-5 classrooms. Guided reading differs from other approaches to reading instruction. Students will be assessed in running records utilizing the Next Step Forward in Guided Reading Assessment. Teachers will form instructional groups based on students current levels and strategically pull their small groups to build up reading gains, proficiency, and stamina.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 2021-2022 school year, grades 3-5 FSA ELA data will increase to 40% proficiency, 65% learning gains, and 75% L25 gains. By the end of the 2021-2022 school year 40% of students in grades K-2 will be performing on grade level as measured by Next Step Forward in Guided Reading running record data.
Monitoring:	This area of focus will be monitored through the Next Step Forward in Guided Reading running records assessments. Progress towards desired outcome will be monitored through District assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mary "Katie" Fradley (fradleym@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The Literacy Footprints guided reading program is evidence-based small-group differentiated instruction that supports students in developing reading proficiency. It acknowledges that children bring different backgrounds and instructional experiences to the reading process and therefore move forward at different rates. This small-group model allows teachers to target learning needs, provide appropriate scaffolding, and gradually reduce support to promote independence. With the implementation of this program, teachers will create instructional groups based on each student's individual needs. As students progress participate, they will be working towards reading proficiency while achieving their individual learning gains. Students with disabilities participate in grade-level general education as much as possible and provided with small group instruction. Students below grade level will receive additional intervention using i-Ready, the Literacy Footprints grade level kits and the Literacy Footprints Intervention kits. All students are provided with an additional hour of daily reading instruction focusing on an individualized needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Literacy Footprints supports differentiated instruction for students with disabilities. It will be utilized as our school-wide intervention system, geared towards improving reading fluency in an individualized learning environment. Students with disabilities, Tier II and Tier III students will receive, explicit, systematic, and multisensory interventions included, but are not limited to: Literacy Footprints and the Literacy Footprints Intervention Kit. The Literacy Footprints/Intervention Partner Kit: Three of the four recommendations in the Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten through 3rd Grade Guide (What Works Clearing House and Institute of Education Sciences-IES, 2016) are supported within this program. Recommendation 2 and 3 have strong evidence and recommendation 4 has moderate evidence. The frameworks and lessons are also

grounded in Reading Recovery which has a strong rating according to the Evidence for ESSA website.

Action Steps to Implement

a. Train teachers and support personnel on Literacy Footprints guided reading program and Next Step Forward in Guided Reading assessment kits.

b. Assess students with running records to determine guided reading level.

c. Implement small group instruction in all classrooms during the core ELA utilizing the Literacy Footprints kits.

d. Implement small group instruction in all classrooms during the ELA extended day utilizing the Literacy Footprints kits and Intervention kits.

e. Monitor usage and student progression throughout the program.

Person Responsible   Mary "Katie" Fradley (fradleym@manateeschools.net)

#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our data from 2020-2021 FOCUS data shows that 59% of disciplinary referrals were [IN] inappropriate behavior (15 referrals of 85) and [AG] aggression (35 referrals of 85). We want to look deeper into Tiered II/III intervention systems to implement and practice preventative strategies and build a more positive environment. Tier II: Interventions on a class basis, specialized instruction through SEL aimed towards classrooms. Tier III: Interventions on an individual basis, specialized instruction catered to individual behavioral needs of the student. Analysis of social/emotional gains, school environment and referral data will be used to assess progress.
Measurable Outcome:	By end of 21/22 school year, Ballard students will consistently demonstrate behaviors that reflect a respectful, responsible and safe school climate - Measurable through disciplinary referrals. Demonstrating at least a 10% decrease in [IN] inappropriate behavior and [AG] aggression referrals compared to 20/21 data.
Monitoring:	Check-in and in class implementation of SEL in daily announcements and review. Student participation of House Systems, and progress monitoring through SEL CharacterStrong usage and assessments. Quarterly FOCUS data review, analyze need for support.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mary "Katie" Fradley (fradleym@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Utilizing high yield, rapid response social/emotional practices such as PBIS, the Ron Clark House System, restorative practices, daily check-ins and SEL survey of students, has been proven to be effective strategies to address student behavior. Students will be utilizing CharacterStrong lessons and assessments. Research shows that behavior improves when SEL strategies are practiced and implemented into curriculum consistently. Students have shown a positive trend in behavior when provided with multiple strategies to utilize in class or independently.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These strategies are selected based on student data and need, indicating that students consistently struggle with appropriate decision-making and emotional well-being and handling.

Action Steps to Implement	

a. Classroom teachers in K-5 will incorporate CharacterStrong lessons into their instruction.
b. Professional developments will be help centered around Growth Mindset and tiered intervention systems.
c. PBIS and Ron Clark House System will be utilized school wide to increase student engagement, motivation and positive supports.
d. Utilize taught de-escalation strategies (restorative practices, PBIS) to shape behavior.

Person Responsible	Mary "Katie" Fradley (fradleym@manateeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to 2020-2021 FSA data, 36% of our fifth grade students showed proficiency in science. As a WOZ school, we are striving to integrate pathways for our students in the areas of science and technology. Ballard will incorporate standards-based science instruction at all grade levels. We will also integrate science across all content areas by exposing students to real-life investigations within our Science Lab.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 2021-2022 school year, Science proficiency will increase from 36% to 37% as measured by SSA.
Monitoring:	Science progress will be monitored using Acaletics Science Scrimmage Data, Common Formative Assessments as well as District Benchmark Assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mary Oliva (olivam@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	In order to increase our science proficiency from 36% to 37%, we will implement daily Acaletics Science instruction for all fifth grade students. Science scrimmages will be administered once per month and teachers will consistently regroup students based on data. In addition to standards-based science instruction, teachers will work with the instructional coach to embed science across all content areas.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We have had a great deal of success with Acaletics and Math instruction. Using Acaletics for Science will not only expose our students to Science content, but to Science Vocabulary as well which is an area where they have struggled in the past on FSA.

Action Steps to Implement

a. Teachers will take 10-15 minutes daily to do Science Quick Picks in Class.
b. Teachers will administer a Science Scrimmage monthly.
c. Teachers and the instructional coach will review data to determine student needs.
d. Teachers will review the monthly scrimmage with students over one class period.

Person Responsible Mary Oliva (olivam@manateeschools.net)

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Based on the 20-21 FSA math assessment data, our school met our math proficiency goal of 49%. In 20-21, our goal for math in the lowest 25% category was 65%, and we earned 41% in this category. Barriers identified include students enrolled as eLearners due to the pandemic as well as the small number of students identified as L25 based on 2018-2019 FSA scores and the lack of 2019-2020 FSA scores.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the 2021-2022 school year, math achievement will increase to 70% in the lowest 25% category as evidenced by state assessments.
Monitoring:	Math achievement will be monitored using data from monthly Acaletics Math Scrimmage, common formative assessments, Quarterly District Benchmark Assessments, and i-Ready. Teachers will participate in the gap eliminator data analysis process after each Quarterly District Benchmark Assessment in order to determine strategies specific to individual students in order to increase student achievement to meet the SIP goals.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Mary Oliva (olivam@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Math spiral review will be provided using the Acaletics program in grades 3-5. Each month, students will complete the monthly Acaletics Scrimmage assessment. At the beginning of the school year, teachers will use the data from the Scrimmage to create differentiated instructional groups. Teachers across each grade-level will teach the same Acaletics lessons/content for 30-minutes daily using different resources and strategies to meet their groups' needs. Students will be regrouped throughout the school year based on assessment data from monthly Scrimmages and Quarterly District Benchmark data. Resource teachers will support small group Acaletics instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Acaletics Math will be utilized in grades 3-5, geared towards previewing and reviewing grade-level standards that spiral throughout the school year. Acaletics student groups will be by ability level, and our math resource teacher will support small group instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Teachers will administer the first monthly Acaletics Math Scrimmage in August.
2. Administration will monitor Scrimmage data and collaborate with teachers monthly to review data to inform instructional groupings.
3. Following each Scrimmage, teachers will review the Scrimmage with the students in class over 5 days and reteach based on student need.
4. After the review days, teachers will teach Math Quick Piks to their Acaletics groups for 30-minutes daily.
5. Teachers will analyze quarterly district benchmark data through the gap eliminator process to determine strategies specific to individual students in order to increase student achievement to meet the SIP goals.

Person Responsible	Mary Oliva (olivam@manateeschools.net)

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.

Ballard Elementary had .2 incidents per 100 students. The school ranked 365 out of 1.395 schools in the state in regards to discipline data. The primary area of concern is aggression.
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our data from 2020-2021 FOCUS data shows that 59% of disciplinary referrals were [IN] inappropriate behavior (15 referrals of 85) and [AG] aggression (35 referrals of 85). We want to look deeper into Tiered II/III intervention systems to implement and practice preventative strategies and build a more positive environment. Tier II: Interventions on a class basis, specialized instruction through SEL aimed towards classrooms. Tier III: Interventions on an individual basis, specialized instruction catered to individual behavioral needs of the student. Analysis of social/emotional gains, school environment and referral data will be used to assess progress.

Measurable Outcome
By end of 21/22 school year, Ballard students will consistently demonstrate behaviors that reflect a respectful, responsible and safe school climate - Measurable through disciplinary referrals. Demonstrating at least a 10% decrease in [IN] inappropriate behavior and [AG] aggression referrals compared to 20/21 data.

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.

Building relationships between students, parents, and teachers is a collaborative effort of all Ballard staff and community. Parents and students are invited to Open House before school starts to begin building a partnership with the school. The school partners with community organizations and churches to provide parents with free backpacks, supplies, shoes and resources. Other activities that help build relationships with students are Ballard Parent events focusing on strategies parents can use with their children to improve relationships and academics, Fall/Spring Activities such as Literacy Night and Spring Fling, Ballard Family Association, and Parent-Teacher conferences. Parents are also invited to attend our School Advisory Council meetings every other month. Parents receive communication about events via Classroom DoJo, Connect Ed and flyers. Communicating to parents is vital to our success with parent involvement. Teachers and administration utilize Classroom DoJo to communicate with parents regarding school activities, news, events and follow a 3/1 mindset (three positive phone calls for very negative). ConnectEd phone calls are made to families on a regular basis to remind parents of upcoming events.

Ballard also sends home folders with graded work, flyers, and communication about important school events every Wednesday. PBIS is utilized as the foundation of the schools positive culture and positive behavioral incentives and management strategies are used throughout the school. Restorative practices are used when processing and reacting in situations with our students. Social/Emotional Learning and Curriculum are

implemented daily, and practiced school-wide. SEL practices are also implemented with our staff and surveying to gain insight on social/emotional well-being. Ballard will be participating in a whole school Housing System, based on the Ron Clark Houses. With this system, we will continue to build a positive, inclusive and equitable setting, that empowers all learners and cultivates an effective learning environment. The school website also offers links to our school calendar specific to Ballard. Items include: student behavior and school behavior expectations, uniforms, and teacher and district information sites. The Graduation Enhancement Technician makes positive home visits to encourage good attendance.

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

Our Dean/Student Support Specialist Victoria Adriano is the PBIS chair, SEL coordinator for Ballard Elementary. PBIS team consists of a representative from each grade level, a fine arts representative, Guidance Counselor and Administration. Each team member is driven in creating and promoting an equitable, effective and positive learning environment for our students. This is done through school-wide incentives, positive behavior intervention system, implementing SEL curriculum with fidelity, monitoring student behaviors and each staff modeling/practicing expectations. Each staff member embodies our vision of empowering all students to achieve their highest level of academic excellence, while establishing a respectful, supportive and safe learning environment.

Part V: Budget

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

1	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**				**$64,712.54**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0051 - Ballard Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	$48,797.28
		Notes: The reading resource teacher is responsible for delivering differentiated small group instruction to struggling students in grades K-5.				
	5100	210-Retirement	0051 - Ballard Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$5,249.83
		Notes: Retirement factored in as board approved rates.				
	5100	220-Social Security	0051 - Ballard Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$3,853.02
		Notes: FICA is factored in as board approved rates.				
	5100	231-Health and Hospitalization	0051 - Ballard Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$6,099.66
		Notes: Group health factored in as board approved rates.				
	5100	232-Life Insurance	0051 - Ballard Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$107.36
		Notes: Group life insurance factored in as board approved rates.				

		Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
		5100	240-Workers Compensation	0051 - Ballard Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$605.39
				Notes: Workers Compensation factored in as board approved rates.			
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning**					**$0.00**
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science**					**$0.00**
4	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**					**$64,712.55**
		Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
		5100	120-Classroom Teachers	0051 - Ballard Elementary School	Title, I Part A	1.0	$48,797.28
				Notes: The math resource teacher is responsible for delivering differentiated small group instruction to struggling students in grades K-5.			
		5100	210-Retirement	0051 - Ballard Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$5,249.84
				Notes: Retirement factored in using board approved rates.			
		5100	220-Social Security	0051 - Ballard Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$3,853.02
				Notes: FICA factored in using board approved rates.			
		5100	231-Health and Hospitalization	0051 - Ballard Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$6,099.66
				Notes: Health insurance factored in using board approved rates.			
		5100	240-Workers Compensation	0051 - Ballard Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$605.39
				Notes: Workers compensation factored in using board approved rates.			
		5100	232-Life Insurance	0051 - Ballard Elementary School	Title, I Part A		$107.36
				Notes: Life insurance factored in using board approved rates.			
						Total:	**$129,425.09**