The School District of Lee County

Bayshore Elementary School

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Bayshore Elementary School

17050 WILLIAMS RD, North Ft Myers, FL 33917

http://bay.leeschools.net//

Demographics

Principal: Benjamin Ausman

Start Date for this Principal: 9/20/2021

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	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	91%
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* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (58%) 2016-17: A (62%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
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 Lee 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

17050 WILLIAMS RD, North Ft Myers, FL 33917

http://bay.leeschools.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-5	No	75%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	39%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Lee 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.

The purpose of Bayshore Elementary School is to provide all students an educational foundation that builds skills for independent thinking, instills a love of learning for life, and develops the attitude and character to be respectful and responsible citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Please refer to the mission statement section. Our school purpose is listed there.

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	99	105	95	115	93	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	602
Attendance below 90 percent	4	15	14	14	15	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	13	8	18	11	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Course failure in Math	0	5	4	14	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	12	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	6	13	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
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	9	7	16	11	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58

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	1	4	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 9/20/2021

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	89	87	98	93	103	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	566
Attendance below 90 percent	4	11	12	11	18	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
One or more suspensions	0	4	0	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	3	10	6	15	18	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Course failure in Math	2	4	5	12	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	3	7	6	11	17	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62

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	4	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	89	87	98	93	103	96	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	566
Attendance below 90 percent	4	11	12	11	18	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
One or more suspensions	0	4	0	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Course failure in ELA	3	10	6	15	18	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	64
Course failure in Math	2	4	5	12	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	40
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	8	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	7	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	3	7	6	11	17	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	62

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	4	6	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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				54%	57%	57%	58%	55%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				49%	56%	58%	54%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				49%	50%	53%	51%	47%	48%
Math Achievement				67%	62%	63%	65%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains				69%	65%	62%	63%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				63%	54%	51%	58%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				55%	52%	53%	60%	54%	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	62%	58%	4%	58%	4%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	41%	55%	-14%	58%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2021					
	2019	50%	54%	-4%	56%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	66%	61%	5%	62%	4%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	63%	62%	1%	64%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
05	2021					
	2019	65%	58%	7%	60%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	53%	50%	3%	53%	0%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Data was collected through a quarterly progress monitoring cycle, which included instruments such as STAR, iReady. and district-created progress monitoring assessments.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	9/11.1	27/32.5	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/10	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	3/3.8	19/22.9	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/10	1/10	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	2/22.2	0/0

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	16/16.8	33/32.7	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/7.1	3/18.8	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	2/2.1	15/15.3	0/0
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/10	1/10	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0

Grade 3				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	20/23	36/39.6	40/42.1
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/12.5	1/11.1	2/20
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	10/11.8	27/30.3	45/45.5
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	1/7.1	2/12.5

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	37/37.4	36/35.6	46/46
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	5/5.1	23/23.0	45/45.5
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/7.7	2/20
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	2/9.5

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	31/33.7	42/43.8	47/49.5
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	0/0	0/0
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	1/12.5
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	12/13.0	29/31.2	35/36.8
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	0/0	1/11.1	2/20
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	0/0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	22/27.8	36/39.6	53/59.6
	Economically Disadvantaged			
	Students With Disabilities	1/12.5	0/0	3/33.3
	English Language Learners	0/0	0/0	1/16.7

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	15	13		39	53						
ELL	16	25		33	50						
HSP	31	42	60	46	48	53	24				
WHT	65	38		73	46		64				
FRL	41	35	44	54	43	53	32				

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	48	58	46	70	80	25				
ELL	22	43	62	64	64	50					
BLK	53	31		63	77						
HSP	36	42	55	56	64	55	36				
MUL	30			40							
WHT	66	56	50	75	73	67	70				
FRL	44	40	51	60	65	56	50				

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	20	46	50	25	55	69	54				
ELL	38	43		58	64						
BLK	62	58		62	54						
HSP	48	53	50	55	58	63	54				
WHT	62	52	52	70	64	59	58				
FRL	48	51	50	61	64	61	58				

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	48
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	40
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	382
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
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	33
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	43
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

Pacific Islander Students	
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	57
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	44
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?

In the core content areas, ELA dropped to 51% reading proficiency and this is down from 54% from 2019. The multiracial subgroup fell under ESSA and was the subgroup that struggled the most on state testing. 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade fell short of their goals resulting in a 4% drop from the 2019 FSA. In 2018, Bayshore was 58% proficient in ELA and dropped to 54% in 2019 and 51% in 2021. The trend is that ELA proficiency is declining for the past to FSA state assessments.

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

The greatest needs for improvement on the 2019 state assessments were ELA Learning gains and ELA Learning gains of the bottom 25%. Both ELA learning gains and bottom 25% were 49%. These two data components were the lowest for Bayshore Elementary.

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

As scored dipped in 2019, a strong intervention system was put in place in order to help students reach reading proficiency. Bayshore was on track to have improvement in reading scores that year. Students were not able to receive the same level of intervention in 2020-2021 school year due to safety measures in place. Really Great Reading, Read 180, and small group intervention are all part of the components to address the need for improvement. All level 1 and 2 readers are getting intervention in small group. This allows the instructor to give immediate feedback and help to students. Intervention is consistent and done across grade levels to make sure students get the differentiated instruction that is needed.

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

The components that showed the most improvement based on data in 2019 were math proficiency which increased from 65% in 2018 to 67% in 2019. Math learning gains also increased from 63% in 2018 to 69% in 2019, and math learning gains for the lowest 25% increased from 58% in 2018 to 63% in 2019.

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

PLCs were consistent every week to discuss student data and discussions took place based on what students didn't get it and what students to enrich. Bayshore Elementary had a math coach that helped the 4th and 5th grade classrooms and worked with the students that needed intervention. FSA packets were designed to give students practice on the standards they would be assessed on. Collaboration took place for teachers to share best practices in order to teach the standards. The teachers also used achievement level descriptors on the standards so work was differentiated from level 2 to level 5. Students were receiving intervention if needed or enrichment. Data was analyzed from the exemplars and quarterly assessments to drive the instruction inside the classroom.

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

Differentiated instruction in ELA and Math will be an expectation to accelerate learning. All ELA students have set intervention times in order to enrich students or help them in areas that are needed to be a successful reader. Students who need more support are in small group with an adult to give immediate feedback and support to students who need it most. Giving students the support in reading they need will accelerate their learning in areas they are deficient. Students will work in Really Great Reading and Read 180 if needed as well. Students will be given the opportunity to work in collaboration (Kagan) to help deepen their understanding and talk about the passages they are reading. PLCs will also specifically talk about strategies to use to help students accelerate in Math and ELA.

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.

iReady PD will be given throughout the year so teachers understand the data that available to them. iReady will provide how the data can be used to drive instruction with the resources teachers have available to them.
Differentiated Instruction is a focal point and PD has been given to teachers around this and PD will continue to teachers who need more support throughout the year. The teachers that differentiate will discuss in the PLCs to help others with the activities in their room to make sure they are supporting all learners in the room.
Kagan PD is done one time per month with staff. Kagan strategies are selected by each grade level and feedback is given to the staff based on the observation of the strategy. This builds collaboration in the classroom and a deeper understanding of the standards being taught for the students.
Whole Brain instruction will also be supported through Professional Development. New staff members to Bayshore will receive instruction on whole brain so interactive learning can take place in the classroom. Students teach concepts to each other in order to make sure they understand the content.

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

Ongoing Professional Development will take place with proficiency scales. Proficiency scales that are student friendly let students know exactly what they need to do to be proficient in a standard. Proficiency scales create a level of understanding for students. Students benefit as they know exactly where they are on the scale that relates to the standard. Proficiency scales also lets teachers know

the progress of the students and where they are at in relation to the standard. Scales help teachers drive instruction based on where students are at.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The area of focus was identified due to the drop in our ELA proficiency from 54% in 2019 to 51% in 2021, ELA learning gains from 49% in 2019 to 38% in 2021, and ELA L25 learning gains from 49% in 2019 to 42% in 2021. This is a critical need area as ELA learning gains and ELA learning gains for our L25 were the two areas with the lowest overall percentages in 2021.
Measurable Outcome:	Our school would like to achieve an outcome that increases the percentage of proficiency in ELA from 51% in 2021 to 59% in 2022, our percentage of ELA learning gains from 38% in 2021 to 52% in 2022, and our ELA lowest 25% learning gains in ELA from 42% in 2021 to 50% in 2022.
Monitoring:	The desired outcome will be monitored through I-Ready diagnostic results, i-Ready Mastery Checks, DIBELs, and Bayshore data tracking sheets used to monitor the growth of each individual student.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ben Ausman (benjaminia@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategy approved by the ESSA is intervention (or RtI) with a focus on closing the gaps for all of our students, especially students in the lowest 25%. The small group setting provides opportunities for students to receive differentiated instruction with immediate feedback through Really Great Reading, Read 180 and Wonders intervention materials.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for selecting this specific strategy is due to strong evidence that the strategy is likely to improve student outcomes based on research and approved by the ESSA. Based on the data available from 2019, all student subgroups would benefit from this strategy as well.

Action Steps to Implement

The data will be analyzed in PLC's after every administration of the I-Ready ELA diagnostic assessment.

Person Responsible Ben Ausman (benjaminia@leeschools.net)

Students are grouped based on I-Ready level and Spring FSA ELA level and what each student needs to close achievement gaps or to extend their learning,according to i-Ready diagnostic results.

Person Responsible Ben Ausman (benjaminia@leeschools.net)

Based on overall student level, Read 180 and Really Great Reading were used for students falling in the level 1 and 2 categories and extension activities for students falling in the level 3 or higher categories.

Person Responsible Ben Ausman (benjaminia@leeschools.net)

The data from i-Ready Diagnostic Assessments and the overall student levels according to the Bayshore Data Tracking sheets, will be monitored for growth after each i-Ready assessment.

Person Responsible Ben Ausman (benjaminia@leeschools.net)

Students will be grouped (or regrouped) based on their most recent level according to the most recent ELA diagnostic assessment and areas of need. This cycle will continue throughout the school year.

| **Person Responsible** | Ben Ausman (benjaminia@leeschools.net) |

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Multi-Racial

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This subgroup was identified beginning in 2019 as being below the Federal Index of 41%, as determined by ESSA. As a result, Bayshore Elementary is a R.A.I.S.E and TS&I school that the state is monitoring for improvement.
Measurable Outcome:	In 2019, this subgroup was at 35% proficiency in ELA. Our goal is to raise this percentage above 41% to 50% proficiency in ELA in 2022.
Monitoring:	The desired outcome will be monitored through I-Ready diagnostic results, i-Ready Mastery Checks and the Bayshore data tracking sheets to monitor the growth of each individual student and adjust interventions as needed.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ben Ausman (benjaminia@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategy approved by the ESSA is intervention RtI) with a focus on closing the gaps for all of our students, especially students in the lowest 25%. The small group setting provides opportunities for students to receive instruction through Really Great Reading. Read 180 and Wonders intervention materials. Students that are excelling based on our data would receive higher level work to extend their learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale for selecting this specific area of focus is due to strong ESSA evidence that the strategy is likely to improve student outcomes based on research. Based on the data available from 2019, all students in multi-racial subgroup would benefit from this strategy.

Action Steps to Implement

Identify the multi-racial students in the subgroup and identify the level of intervention they need.

| **Person Responsible** | Andrew Hamstra (andrewjh@leeschools.net) |

Based on levels of FSA/iReady diagnostic results, students were placed in Really Great Reading, Read 180, or placed in settings that enrich and extend the material if the data showed they were performing at a high level.

| **Person Responsible** | Andrew Hamstra (andrewjh@leeschools.net) |

Monitoring of data will take place throughout the year through iReady, teacher exemplar data.

| **Person Responsible** | Andrew Hamstra (andrewjh@leeschools.net) |

PLCs will discuss the progress of the students in the multi-racial subgroup and determine what to re-teach and what to extend/enrich.

| **Person Responsible** | Andrew Hamstra (andrewjh@leeschools.net) |

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Multi-Racial	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	This subgroup was identified beginning in 2019 as being below the Federal Index of 41%, as determined by ESSA. As a result, Bayshore Elementary is a R.A.I.S.E and TS&I school that the state is monitoring for improvement.
Measurable Outcome:	In 2019, this subgroup was at 35%. Our goal is to raise this percentage above 41% to 50%
Monitoring:	The desired outcome will be monitored through student writing samples compared to iReady diagnostic data and exemplars to ensure students are making growth throughout the year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Andrew Hamstra (andrewjh@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teaching students the writing process for a variety of purposes.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Students will learn how to convey information, make an argument, self-reflection all creating a deeper understanding of learning. Students will write to learn and learn to write helping them understand the standards being taught.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers begin teaching the writing process of plan, write, revise/edit.

Person Responsible	Andrew Hamstra (andrewjh@leeschools.net)

During the process of writing teachers introduce the different ways to write such as narrative, describe, inform, persuade/analyze.

Person Responsible	Andrew Hamstra (andrewjh@leeschools.net)

Data of students writing will be compared to how they are performing on exemplars/diagnostics to see the growth of the students during PLCs.

Person Responsible	Andrew Hamstra (andrewjh@leeschools.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.

Bayshore Elementary does not have many discipline areas of concern. Most referrals happen out at PE/recess as students have a possible peer conflict or get upset while playing. PE/Recess area is our primary concern. This year recess has been separated so classes are by themselves and PE is also being monitored. Bayshore Elementary has instituted a house system in order to create a great sense of community between students. Our school counselor also talks on the school news about appropriate behavior in these areas and how to treat people with respect throughout the year.