

Bradford County School District

Starke Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	20

Starke Elementary School

1000 W WELDON ST, Starke, FL 32091

bradfordschools.org/starke

Demographics

Principal: Raymond Schaefer

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-6
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (49%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Bradford County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	18
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Starke Elementary School

1000 W WELDON ST, Starke, FL 32091

bradfordschools.org/starke

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-6</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">33%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Bradford 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.

Starke Elementary is committed to providing a safe and healthy environment so each student can grow academically and socially.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Equipping students to excel in the 21st century.

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
Schaefer, Raymond	Principal	School site leader who is responsible for instruction, management, and goal setting.
Rodriguez, Shannon	Assistant Principal	School site leader who supports the instruction, management, and goal setting for the campus.
Hines, Melissa	Curriculum Resource Teacher	Responsible for curriculum supports, coaching, and modeling for grades K-5.
Eison, Heather	Math Coach	Responsible for curriculum supports, coaching, and modeling for K-5 math instruction.
Catherine, Walker	School Counselor	Responsible for supporting the emotional, physical, and mental needs of our students.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Raymond Schaefer

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.*

1

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.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

40

Total number of students enrolled at the school

547

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

2

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

13

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	84	94	73	88	82	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	507
Attendance below 90 percent	14	9	8	11	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	59
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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	6	15	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	32
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	11	28	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	33	29	30	28	32	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	167

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	1	1	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4

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	9	4	8	12	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	38
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 10/7/2021

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	72	82	79	69	90	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	472
Attendance below 90 percent	33	36	32	26	36	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	196
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	7	5	5	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in Math	3	6	5	4	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
K-3 Substantially Reading Deficient	0	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	5	6	3	3	4	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

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	9	5	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

2020-21 - Updated

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	72	82	79	69	90	80	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	472
Attendance below 90 percent	33	36	32	26	36	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	196
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Course failure in ELA	7	5	5	3	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in Math	3	6	5	4	7	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
K-3 Substantially Reading Deficient	0	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	5	6	3	3	4	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35

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	9	5	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				58%	53%	57%	44%	48%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				53%	49%	58%	46%	49%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50%	46%	53%	45%	52%	48%
Math Achievement				59%	55%	63%	58%	60%	62%
Math Learning Gains				53%	50%	62%	56%	50%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				40%	35%	51%	41%	45%	47%
Science Achievement				41%	43%	53%	34%	41%	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	61%	59%	2%	58%	3%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	49%	47%	2%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
05	2021					
	2019	52%	42%	10%	56%	-4%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-52%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	64%	60%	4%	62%	2%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	46%	49%	-3%	64%	-18%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
05	2021					
	2019	57%	46%	11%	60%	-3%
Cohort Comparison		-46%				
06	2021					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		-57%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	38%	39%	-1%	53%	-15%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

STAR Reading- Grades K-5
iReady Math- Grades K-5
iReady Reading- Grades K-5

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	53	41	27
	Economically Disadvantaged	53	41	27
	Students With Disabilities	0	33	18
	English Language Learners	50	50	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	9	18	51
	Economically Disadvantaged	9	18	51
	Students With Disabilities	3	27	23
	English Language Learners	50	50	50

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	59	59	48
	Economically Disadvantaged	59	59	48
	Students With Disabilities	28	44	31
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	7	23	58
	Economically Disadvantaged	7	23	58
	Students With Disabilities	4	38	27
	English Language Learners	0	0	0

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	50	48	27
	Economically Disadvantaged	50	48	27
	Students With Disabilities	33	53	30
	English Language Learners	50	50	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	11	23	47
	Economically Disadvantaged	11	23	47
	Students With Disabilities	11	18	15
	English Language Learners	50	50	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	60	59	32
	Economically Disadvantaged	60	59	32
	Students With Disabilities	25	42	24
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	10	39	70
	Economically Disadvantaged	10	39	70
	Students With Disabilities	8	33	31
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	50	52	43
	Economically Disadvantaged	50	52	43
	Students With Disabilities	20	31	26
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	15	45	63
	Economically Disadvantaged	15	45	63
	Students With Disabilities	9	28	35
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	N/A	N/A	42
	Economically Disadvantaged	N/A	N/A	42
	Students With Disabilities	N/A	N/A	21
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring

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	30	50		33	42		43				
BLK	36	43		50	64		33				
HSP	64			45							
MUL	50			30							
WHT	62	50		67	76		60				
FRL	52	53		55	70		45				
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	40	38	24	42	58	43	27				
BLK	39	42	40	37	35	46	18				
HSP				50							
WHT	64	56	52	67	57	35	46				

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
FRL	53	55	54	54	53	50	34				
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	27	27	33	38	38	29	31				
BLK	22	32	31	40	50		28				
WHT	50	53	59	64	57	40	42				
FRL	40	44	47	54	50	36	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	59
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	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	410
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	40
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	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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

Native American Students	
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	45
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	55
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	40
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	63
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	55
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?

Across grade levels, the STAR Reading progress monitoring data analysis demonstrates that our school-wide at/above benchmark proficiency is 50% for Diagnostic #1. Across grade levels, the iReady Math progress monitoring data analysis demonstrates that 63% of our students demonstrated proficiency.

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

Via the 2019 FSA data results, our greatest need for improvement was grade 4 in the categories of ELA and math proficiency. ELA proficiency was 49% and math proficiency was 46%. The proficiency result was 1% below the district average and the math proficiency result was 8% below the district average.

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

Since the 2021 FSA data results for grade 4 ELA and math proficiency were released, we have seen greater increases in overall proficiency for the FSA 2020 testing year. ELA proficiency grew by 14% (63%) and math proficiency grew by 15% (61%). Not only did proficiency increase on both levels, but the data results beat the district average by 14% in ELA and 20% in math. New actions that occurred included small group math instruction with a focus on standards based skill remediation and the inclusion of Top Score Writing curriculum that increase the students abilities to perform at a higher level on the FSA Writes assessment.

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

The data components that have shown the most improvement are the grade 4 and grade 5 math proficiency categories. Grade 4 has grown 15% and grade 5 has grown 6% from the 2021 FSA data analysis.

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

The school has placed a large focus on teacher-led small group instruction within the classroom. We also use grade level paras to work with Tier 2 students to remediate and support instruction.

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

We will need to continue to implement our math and literacy coach supports to assist with guided instruction and small group instruction.

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 including HMH curriculum coaching cycles for PD opportunities. We have three teachers who will participate in this professional development that included on-site and virtual coaching sessions with HMH curriculum experts.

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

We will continue to implement the school district instructional framework focus within instructional practices and teacher supports. We will also continue to provide grade level planning times that support HMH lesson planning and curriculum pacing focused on the B.E.S.T standards.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

No activities were entered for this section.

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforAlex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Via the safeschoolsforAlex.org information for Starke Elementary, our rating of "moderate" reflects any reported SESIR discipline referrals for the 2019 school year. In 2017, the discipline referrals for action code OSS (Out of School Suspension) were 44 events. In 2018, the same action code total for OSS was 17 events, and in 2019, the same action code total for OSS was 19 events. This improvement demonstrated the importance of classroom management instruction and any classroom management supports with our PBIS program campus-wide.

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.

We offer a variety of events to build positive relationships with parents, families and the community. Events will include virtual options and face to face based on BCSD Reopening Guidance. The Parent Involvement Plan includes events that enhance the desire to come to school and be an active participant in each students education.

Guidance Counselor: providing support services for students, teachers, and classrooms with identified needs in

PBS. Working with the team to interpret data and devise plans for students and teachers, assisting with professional development, provide individual and small group counseling for students.

PBS Team: coordinating the implementation of school-wide positive behavior support

Bullying Prevention Education Programs (TRA – Take Responsibility for your Actions) and Character Education Programs (Character Counts, Positive Action) are implemented to help with positive behaviors and decrease discipline referrals.

College is encouraged and introduced early by having Santa Fe College speak to our students about their program College for Kids. During "Real Men Read", the readers will share with the classes their careers and the requirements needed for that career. The fifth grade students will also have an opportunity to tour Santa Fe College in Bradford County to be exposed to the college by taking a tour of the college. An instructor will speak to the students about what Santa Fe College has to offer. At the end of the year the 5th grade students will visit Bradford Middle School to take a tour of the campus pending BCSD Reopening Guidance.

The student success team attends MTSS meetings to discuss and monitor the program and events. Raymond Schaefer-Principal: oversees the entire process, ensures that the Student Success team is implementing it with fidelity, completes process checks to ensure implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures that there is adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation, communicates with parents regarding school wide MTSS plan and activities.

The classroom teacher: provide information about core instruction, participate in student data collection, deliver Tier 1 instruction and intervention, collaborate with other staff to implement Tier 2 intervention, integrate Tier 1 materials and instruction with Tier 2 & Tier 3 activities.

ESE Teachers: participate in student data collection, integrate core instructional activities and materials into Tier 3 instruction, collaborate with General Education teachers through activities such as co-teaching

Curriculum Resource Teacher: work with the Principal to provide support for the implementation of MTSS process, facilitate and support data collection activities, assisting in data analysis, provide professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data based instructional planning, supporting the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans.

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

Guidance Counselor: providing support services for students, teachers, and classrooms with identified needs in

PBS. Working with the team to interpret data and devise plans for students and teachers, assisting with professional development, provide individual and small group counseling for students.

The student success team attends MTSS meetings to discuss and monitor the program and events. Raymond Schaefer-Principal: oversees the entire process, ensures that the Student Success team is implementing it with fidelity, completes process checks to ensure implementation of intervention support and documentation, ensures that there is adequate professional development to support MTSS implementation, communicates with parents regarding school wide MTSS plan and activities.

PBS Team: coordinating the implementation of school-wide positive behavior support

The classroom teacher: provide information about core instruction, participate in student data collection, deliver Tier 1 instruction and intervention, collaborate with other staff to implement Tier 2 intervention, integrate Tier 1 materials and instruction with Tier 2 & Tier 3 activities.

ESE Teachers: participate in student data collection, integrate core instructional activities and materials into Tier 3 instruction, collaborate with General Education teachers through activities such as co-teaching.

Curriculum Resource Teacher: work with the Principal to provide support for the implementation of MTSS process, facilitate and support data collection activities, assisting in data analysis, provide professional development and technical assistance to teachers regarding data based instructional planning, supporting the implementation of Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 intervention plans.

Part V: Budget

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

Total:	\$0.00
---------------	---------------