Bayshore Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Bayshore Elementary School

6120 26TH ST W, Bradenton, FL 34207

https://www.manateeschools.net/bayshoreel

Demographics

Principal: Melinda Lundy

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
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 (45%) 2017-18: C (45%) 2016-17: D (37%)
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

Bayshore Elementary School

6120 26TH ST W, Bradenton, FL 34207

https://www.manateeschools.net/bayshoreel

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	74%

School Grades History

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

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.

Bayshore Mission Statement:
(Student)
Bayshore Elementary School's mission is to prepare each student to be a contributing member of their community and beyond. We will accomplish this through respect of diversity and by fostering a curiosity for learning. \

(Staff) Bayshore Elementary School's staff will build on our achievements and model a culture of trust, commitment, and passion for educating and inspiring all students.
(We felt as a staff that we needed our own mission statement so that we are a cohesive unit for our students and that we operate with respect and trust).

Provide the school's vision statement.

Bayshore Vision Statement:
Bayshore Elementary School's vision is to inspire all student to become lifelong learners. We are champions for all kids, each day, as we sail towards a B!

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
Pletcher, Bernadette	Principal	As the principal, I am the face of the school. I am the instructional leader of teachers and staff and I set goals and ensure students meet their learning objectives. I oversee the school's day-to-day operations, handle disciplinary matters, manage a budget and hire teachers and other personnel. Additionally, I provide leadership, direction and coordination within the school. My main focus is to develop and maintain effective educational programs at Bayshore Elementary and promote the improvement of teaching and learning within my school.
Hemingway-Primous, Samara	Assistant Principal	As an assistant principal Ms. Hemingway-Primous deals with the issues of school management, student activities and services, community relations, personnel, and curriculum instruction. She coordinates with the principal and teachers to assist in defining and enforcing school policies and guidelines for students, staff, and faculty. She is a big part of school-wide discipline and safety at Bayshore Elementary.
Campbell, Beth	Assistant Principal	As an assistant principal Ms. Beth (Margaret) Campbell deals with the issues of school management, student activities and services, community relations, personnel, and curriculum instruction. She coordinates with the principal and teachers to assist in defining and enforcing school policies and guidelines for students, staff, and faculty. She is a big part of school-wide discipline and safety at Bayshore Elementary.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/1/2019, Melinda Lundy

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.*

0

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.*

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

56

Total number of students enrolled at the school

682

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.
9

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	105	104	101	138	101	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	656
Attendance below 90 percent	0	2	3	7	4	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
One or more suspensions	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	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		
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	51	41	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	92
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	37	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	1	5	11	4	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
	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	1	0	4	14	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	1	1	22	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	

Date this data was collected or last updated
Friday 9/10/2021

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	96	103	112	131	105	115	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	662
Attendance below 90 percent	2	3	1	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	58	44	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	34	41	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	58	44	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	34	41	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112

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	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
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	96	103	112	131	105	115	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	662
Attendance below 90 percent	2	3	1	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	12
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	58	44	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	34	41	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	58	44	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	148
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	34	41	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112

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	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
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%	36%	50%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				44%	57%	58%	45%	54%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50%	55%	53%	47%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				54%	63%	63%	50%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains				54%	68%	62%	57%	61%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				51%	53%	51%	41%	47%	47%
Science Achievement				26%	48%	53%	36%	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	34%	51%	-17%	58%	-24%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	30%	56%	-26%	58%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		-34%				
05	2021					
	2019	33%	52%	-19%	56%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		-30%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	56%	60%	-4%	62%	-6%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					

MATH							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	46%	65%	-19%	64%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-56%				
05	2021					
	2019	46%	60%	-14%	60%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				

SCIENCE							
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	24%	48%	-24%	53%	-29%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Grades 1-2 iReady diagnostics

Grades 3-5 Benchmarks 1 and 2, and final FSA

Science grade 5 Benchmarks 1 and 2, and final FSA

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	11.8%	51.7%	67%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9.4%	51.5%	64.2%
	Students With Disabilities	11.1%	44.4%	55.6%
	English Language Learners	4.8%	33.3%	61.9%
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	15.5%	35.6%	64.7%
	Economically Disadvantaged	11.1%	28.8%	62.1%
	Students With Disabilities	0	44.4%	77.8%
	English Language Learners	4.8%	14.3%	45%

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	16%	32.4%	38.9%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9.3%	23%	34.7%
	Students With Disabilities	11.8%	23.5%	41.2%
	English Language Learners	14.8%	28.6%	35.7%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	10.7%	27.9%	51.9%
	Economically Disadvantaged	9.5%	20.3%	40%
	Students With Disabilities	0	17.6%	47.1%
	English Language Learners	0	17.9%	32.%

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	29%	27.3%	34.4%
	Economically Disadvantaged	25.1%	22.9%	29.5%
	Students With Disabilities	8.6%	15.8%	14.1%
	English Language Learners	80.5%	76.3%	59.4%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	35.9%	39.5%	53.1%
	Economically Disadvantaged	35%	37.2%	53.7%
	Students With Disabilities	20%	36.9%	58.8%
	English Language Learners	90.6%	84%	100%

Grade 4				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	39.1%	38.1%	37.7%
	Economically Disadvantaged	34.3%	31.8%	34.2%
	Students With Disabilities	15%	9.6%	18.1%
	English Language Learners	78.9%	89.1%	50.3%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	47.7%	36.5%	44.7%
	Economically Disadvantaged	46.9%	31.5%	45.7%
	Students With Disabilities	25%	27.3%	27.3%
	English Language Learners	82.5%	42.3%	97.2%

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	22.7%	28.9%	33.9%
	Economically Disadvantaged	21.4%	28.6%	29.8%
	Students With Disabilities	5%	9.5%	12.5%
	English Language Learners	40.6%	71.9%	78.8%
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	32.7%	36.9%	50.8%
	Economically Disadvantaged	33.3%	35.1%	50%
	Students With Disabilities	15%	15%	20.9%
	English Language Learners	41.2%	100%	100%
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	18.9%	20.6%	30.6%
	Economically Disadvantaged	16.7%	22.1%	29.8%
	Students With Disabilities	10%	20%	9%
	English Language Learners	69.2%	38.5%	40.6%

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	16	43	57	41	43	47	11				
ELL	30	35	42	51	54	41	19				
BLK	28	43		35	40						
HSP	32	44	56	52	57	50	30				
MUL	36			48							
WHT	49	52		69	57		45				
FRL	30	42	52	53	51	39	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
SWD	8	40	57	34	50	46					
ELL	28	43	62	50	56	54	17				
BLK	20	29		24	35						
HSP	30	43	59	54	54	44	19				
MUL	38	36		53	70						
WHT	51	52		65	59		39				
FRL	34	43	49	52	53	50	27				

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	12	32	39	19	30	26	14				
ELL	24	52	60	41	63	55	9				
BLK	19	27	25	22	42	40	25				
HSP	31	49	55	47	65	54	21				
MUL	40	35		48	41		42				
WHT	47	43		62	50		63				
FRL	34	44	44	48	55	41	29				

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	47
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	61
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	372

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	38
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
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	29
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	48
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	42
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	54
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	45
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?

Black African-American Students.
African American Students were a small population at Bayshore Elementary that have been identified and monitored for growth and progress for the past 2 years. These students were 27% as a subgroup. This is an increase from 14% but well below the expected outcome of 41% for the Federal Index. This is the 2nd year in a row this group has fallen below the 32% mark. We continually monitor these students throughout the year and they are highlighted on our data sheets so that we monitor their progress closely by each teacher and by the school as a whole.

The same is most likely true for ESE students. Due to changes in staff and the number of students identified ESE, we were at 37%, not below 32%, but far below our goal of 41%.
With proper progress monitoring and analysis of the data we hope to be able to make significant gains with these
students. Currently, we have a stronger VE teacher and resource team to help support and monitor these ESE students.

We know that vocabulary is a concern for our 4th and 5th graders as they historically test low in this area. We are currently working with Dr. Evans, Associate Superintendent, to introduce a solid plan for Vocabulary instruction, as we feel currently we piece meal this together. Phonics is also a skill our students score low in, per Iready data. As per FSA data, our achievement levels are not moving upward, they are stagnant.

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

Our Black African American students need to be continually monitored for progress as do our ESE students. We are pushing more VE students into inclusion classrooms in grades 3-4-5. This will be monitored closely by the VE teacher, the regular education teacher and the ESE resource teachers. Within our Black African American community we are working with district contacts to reach our Haitian Creole population and provide them even more opportunities for tutoring support and building relationships within the community.

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

We are working on additional tutoring for these populations as well as mentors within the school to build strong relationships. We are also organizing PD with our Haitian Creole district specialist to learn more about the culture and diversity of these students.

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

Our ESOL students continue to show improvements over the year and, although SWD students and Black African American are a concern, they have shown improvements.

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

Continually monitoring students throughout the year and connecting students and teachers in a mentor relationship as well as providing opportunities to accelerate student learning is a big focus for this academic year.

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

A solid vocabulary program that is based on our current curriculum, as well as using Acaletics Math to accelerate learning for our ESE students and retained students. We have found with many ESE students and retained 3rd graders that math is their strength, so we accelerate the math learning.

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.

We are organizing PD to highlight teaching ESOL students and additional PD with our Haitian Creole district specialist. We have also had PD for ESE inclusion scheduling.

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

Added tutoring after school in the community that is provided for free and would provide one on one help and support for our most fragile students. (homeless, low income, etc...)

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Reading Rationale Historical data for Bayshore demonstrates the reading proficiency has remained stagnant. Focusing on weekly, standards based planning and adhering to District curriculum maps and pacing guides, plus making certain that students produce evidence of learning and planning for strategic small groups will increase instructional integrity, thus raise the Achievement level in not only ELA. Our work with ELA mini-assessments in between district benchmarks has helped us immensely. With these mini-assessments we are able to drill down and find specific standards and parts of standards that students need extra support on. This data helps us create strategic small groups where we reteach and review target standards. We are seeing great gains doing this work as our 5th graders that started with us in their 3rd grade year are reaching higher proficiency levels on these mini-benchmarks each year. We are confident this work with propel us forward in our school grade calculation, determined by FSA this academic year. This same work will be carried into the coming year in grades 3-4-5 even with the BEST standards being introduced. As a new RAISE school this is definitely a worthwhile and critical needs area. The way we see it, L300, RAISE, Title I data, Federal Index and student proficiency are all tied together.
Measurable Outcome:	SIP GOAL 60% of students in grades 3, 4, 5 will meet academic achievement on the 2021-2022 FSA in Reading. This will be accomplished using, *Standards-Based Planning *Strategic Small Groups *Engaging Students by Producing Evidence of Learning
Monitoring:	Throughout the year we will use the district quarterly benchmarks as well as the mini assessments that are planned and produced by our teachers and support staff/Reading Coach. Additionally, black African American students and ESE students will be tracked carefully throughout the year using these monitoring systems. Our L25 students are making gains, however, we will track their data as well to make sure these students academic increase continues as this also impacts our school grade greatly and we do not want go backwards. It is a wrap around, academic, data tracking challenge (school-wide data form) that starts with growing the capacity of our teachers so that they plan with no only the end in mind, but the instructional progression our students need.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Bernadette Pletcher (pletcherb@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Standards Based Planning and ongoing/continuous progress monitoring. Additionally, strategic small groups based on the mini assessment data provides valuable insight we can use plan around.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Following a standards based model for classroom assessment and instruction allows teachers to track student performance and plan focused instruction to meet specific needs of students. The strategic small groups allow all teachers to zoom in on specifically what small groups of students need. They are strategic because they change based on data. They are not haphazard or without thought. We use data to make change. Many times when you can drill down to a specific standard and how it is taught, then provide students

more clarification and specific approaches, you make change. After all, that is what a strategy is...a carefully planned out set of actions.

Action Steps to Implement

Weekly Standards Based Planning-Bernadette Pletcher & Admin. team, ILT team
Strategic Small Group Instruction--Admin. Team along with classroom teachers
Mini Assessments-(ELA) ---Ariana Kennedy-Reading Coach
Text Based Writing across content areas--Instructional Leadership Team, Ariana Kennedy Reading Coach, Admin. Team.

Person Responsible	Bernadette Pletcher (pletcherb@manateeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Historically and from data collected by the district and within our school, Bayshore students have a higher level of proficiency in Math. They are more confident in this area and show more excitement for instruction. Students at Bayshore respond to instruction in Math through strategic small groups equal to Science instruction at 5th grade. We feel building on this confidence is in our best interest and that of our students.
Measurable Outcome:	60% of students at Bayshore Elem. in grades 3, 4, 5 will meet academic achievement on the 2021-2022 FSA in Math.
Monitoring:	Standards-Based Planning, Strategic Small Math Groups, Monthly Acaletics Performance data, District Quarterly Benchmark Assessments.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Bernadette Pletcher (pletcherb@manateeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Using our District Quarterly Math Benchmarks we are able, in grades 3-5, to create strategic small groups that review and reteach needed skills and build math skills, proficiency and fluency. Additionally, the monthly Acaletics data and subsequent Pre/Post review provide students added review and exposure to critical, grade level math standards. Small groups are proven to correct students' procedural errors so that bigger concepts are not lost in computation errors. Additionally, we are using a strategy that involves working a problem, then immediately after, reviewing the same problem with different numbers. This helps students to build a comfort with manipulating numbers.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Strategic small group work in math works. We have found many students that are low in Reading, respond and build confidence in math. We have seen this with our Academy students (retained 3rd graders). Fixing procedural errors quickly, students make academic gains. They begin to see themselves as capable. Building math fluency and automaticity is a worthy goal.

Action Steps to Implement

Review Monthly Acaletics Data-Classroom Teachers, Lisa Lovy -Interventionist, ILT team & Admin. Team
Use Benchmark and Acaletics "Item Analysis" data to review focus standards. --Classroom Teachers, Acaletics Teachers, School Admin. Team.

Person Responsible	Bernadette Pletcher (pletcherb@manateeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Fifth grade Science scores are a big part of our school grade. What we have found at Bayshore is that Science is of great interest to our students. They enjoy the learning. Engagement in this area is critical. We noticed a drop in our overall Science scores when we did not monitor them or offer hands on Science investigations. So, we immediately made a change last year. By providing weekly science experiments and experience with the scientific method and science journaling, we made huge strides in the area of science. Our 3 year proficiency trend in Science was as follows. 26%, 14 % up to 30% in 20-21. This is no doubt due to our focus on science standards and intentional planning for Science with our 5th graders. STEM is a huge part of this as it is part of our Specials rotation and grabs the attention of all of our students.
Measurable Outcome:	45% of 5th Grades students will meet Academic Achievement in Science on the state assessments in the 21-22 academic school year.
Monitoring:	All of this Science work will be monitored by District Quarterly Benchmark results and a focus on Nature of Science which is historically low at Bayshore. Item Analysis tools will allow us to review precisely what areas of science students struggle with.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Weekly Science Experiments Science Acaletics--Monthly assessments and review Review of 3rd and 4th grade Science standards in 5th grade during Media time (on specials rotation) STEM (in specials rotation) focusing on 5th grade Science Standards In depth, strategic, standards based Science plans by our 5th grade team. Incorporation of WOZ science in grades 4/5 Weekly Science Experiments with 5th grade students. Integration of Science in the ELA block
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	This is a very "doable" and attainable goal. The engagement and interest we see with Science at 5th grade is encouraging and helps us to believe, based on our efforts last year, that we can make further strides in this areas and make more significant gains with our overall student achievement and school grade.

Action Steps to Implement

Science Acaletics Monthly Testing--Lisa Lovy-Interventionist
Standards Based Science Planning-5th grade team, Admin. Team
Weekly Science Experiments--5th Grade Team
WOZ Science-Angel Calcorzi (5th) -Carly Brier (4th)
STEM-Helen King -STEM Teacher
Review of Science standards grade 3/4 in Media-Lisa Hammer, Helen King, Lisa Lovy
Science Integration in ELA Block-5th grade teachers

Person Responsible	Bernadette Pletcher (pletcherb@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.

We have looked at our data and discussed with our district specialist how we were incorrectly coding our referrals. We have since changed that practice. Most importantly, we are working school-wide on restorative discipline practices. We feel this will minimize OSS/ISS and help students work on regulating their emotions and making bad situations good again. (Making it right). This is a compliment to our PBIS system. Mentoring is also big part of this as there are Emotional Support corners in each classroom. SEL, using Character Strong and Brain Breaks helps students to learn to self regulate, reducing the need for referrals.

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.

Parents of preschool children who are transitioning from our VPK and other local early childhood programs were invited to a Back to School night in August. During the evening, teachers provided virtual orientation and tours of the school curriculum and facilities.
Our other grade level students and parents were also invited to this special evening for Back to School "meet your teacher."
Parents are invited to attend quarterly virtual trainings and/or evening trainings offered throughout the school year by our ESOL Dept.
Again this year at Bayshore we have a character word each month and use Character Strong. At the end of each month each teacher will pick a student that exemplifies this character trait and they will eat lunch with Administrators. Character Development and Social Emotional Learning are included in the Master Schedule, daily. Videos are approximately 5 min. long. Students have already began to use these strategies around campus.
We are also a PBIS (Positive Behavior and Interventions System) school and use dojo points to award expected behaviors. Student misbehavior has decreased and teachers are able to use dojo in such a way they can communicate with parents.
Restorative Practice Book Study
Looking at Behavior and Attendance data weekly
Business Partners are recruited and encouraged to sign up through our District ePIE system.
Volunteers
Monthly "Fun Days" for staff sponsored by staff to encourage and support comradery.

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

Joe Keogh - SSS (Student Support Specialist) - PBIS and Business Partner Coordinator
Catherine Day - Guidance Counselor
Administration - Weekly newsletter to keep staff informed and INSPIRED to start their week.
Bernadette Pletcher-Principal
Samara Hemingway-Primus-AP
Beth Campbell -AP
Specials Areas Team - Event Planning for PBIS

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	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
		Total:	$0.00