

Sumter District Schools

# Bushnell Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>18</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>24</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>24</b> |

# Bushnell Elementary School

218 W FLANNERY AVE, Bushnell, FL 33513

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

**Principal: Jaimie Kinney**

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active   |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5  |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education   |
| <b>2020-21 Title I School</b>  | Yes  |
| <b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%   |
| <b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: A (66%)<br>2017-18: C (49%)<br>2016-17: A (64%)   |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |  |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Central  |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>   |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A  |
| <b>Year</b>  |  |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |  |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   |  |

\* 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 Sumter 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](http://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

---

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>18</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>24</b> |

# Bushnell Elementary School

218 W FLANNERY AVE, Bushnell, FL 33513

[ no web address on file ]

## School Demographics

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <p><b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br/>(per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School<br/>PK-5</p> | <p><b>2020-21 Title I School</b></p> <p>Yes</p> | <p><b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br/>(as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>96%</p> |
| <p><b>Primary Service Type</b><br/>(per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>              | <p><b>Charter School</b></p> <p>No</p>          | <p><b>2018-19 Minority Rate</b><br/>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>36%</p>               |

## School Grades History

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

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Sumter 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 mission of Bushnell Elementary is to foster an environment that provides on-going programs to meet the educational needs and differences of all students in our changing society and to help all students realize success and fulfillment in school and community life.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Bushnell Elementary provides a quality staff, an appropriate learning environment and adequate resources to ensure academic, social, and physical growth, enabling students to excel in an ever-changing world.

Our school motto is "A Great Place to Grow".

### 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 |
|-------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|
| Kinley, Kelly     | Principal           |                                 |
| Simmons, Cindy    | Assistant Principal |                                 |
| Douglas, Teri     | Teacher, K-12       |                                 |
| Sommersdorf, Kim  | Teacher, K-12       |                                 |
| Westerkom, Susan  | Teacher, K-12       |                                 |
| Waddell, Brandi   | Instructional Media |                                 |
| McCormick, Jason  | School Counselor    |                                 |
| Perry, Stephanie  | Instructional Coach |                                 |
| Kelly, LaShandra  | Instructional Coach |                                 |
| Johnson, Carol    | Teacher, K-12       |                                 |
| Kinney, Jaimie    | Assistant Principal |                                 |
| Day, Allison      | Teacher, K-12       |                                 |
| Sovercool, Angela | Teacher, K-12       |                                 |
| Camara, Stephanie | Teacher, K-12       |                                 |
| Gorham, Laura     | Teacher, ESE        |                                 |

### Demographic Information

#### Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2015, Jaimie Kinney

**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.*

2

**Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

4

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**

52

**Total number of students enrolled at the school**

738

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

9

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

7

**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                              | 115         | 120 | 98 | 113 | 102 | 109 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 657 |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 11          | 17  | 8  | 12  | 8   | 10  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 66  |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 2           | 15  | 6  | 5   | 6   | 15  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 49  |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 2           | 3   | 0  | 1   | 0   | 2   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 8   |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 1           | 0   | 1  | 0   | 0   | 2   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 4   |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0   | 0  | 0   | 16  | 14  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 30  |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0   | 0  | 0   | 12  | 18  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 30  |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0           | 0   | 1  | 2   | 0   | 0   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 3   |

**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 | 2           | 4 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0     | 33 |

**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           | 12 | 6 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 23    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0  | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Wednesday 9/8/2021

**2020-21 - As Reported**

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

| Indicator                                 | Grade Level |     |     |     |    |     |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|---|-------------|-----|-----|-----|----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|   | K           | 1   | 2   | 3   | 4  | 5   | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Number of students enrolled               | 102         | 100 | 112 | 103 | 89 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 611   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 7   | 6   | 4   | 2  | 6   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 25    |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 1   | 4   | 5   | 4  | 11  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 25    |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 7   | 10  | 4   | 7  | 9   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 37    |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 5   | 2   | 3   | 1  | 7   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 18    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0  | 11  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 11    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0  | 18  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 18    |

**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           | 5 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 27    |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 5 | 5 | 9 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 22    |
| 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               | 102         | 100 | 112 | 103 | 89 | 105 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 611   |
| Attendance below 90 percent               | 0           | 7   | 6   | 4   | 2  | 6   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 25    |
| One or more suspensions                   | 0           | 1   | 4   | 5   | 4  | 11  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 25    |
| Course failure in ELA                     | 0           | 7   | 10  | 4   | 7  | 9   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 37    |
| Course failure in Math                    | 0           | 5   | 2   | 3   | 1  | 7   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 18    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment  | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0  | 11  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 11    |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0           | 0   | 0   | 0   | 0  | 18  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 18    |

**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           | 5 | 3 | 1 | 3 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 27    |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
|                                     | K           | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 |       |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 0           | 5 | 5 | 9 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 22    |
| 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             |        |          |       | 64%    | 56%      | 57%   | 62%    | 59%      | 56%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          |        |          |       | 60%    | 58%      | 58%   | 49%    | 57%      | 55%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  |        |          |       | 52%    | 51%      | 53%   | 39%    | 48%      | 48%   |
| Math Achievement            |        |          |       | 73%    | 61%      | 63%   | 66%    | 62%      | 62%   |
| Math Learning Gains         |        |          |       | 77%    | 68%      | 62%   | 41%    | 53%      | 59%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile |        |          |       | 71%    | 55%      | 51%   | 21%    | 45%      | 47%   |
| Science Achievement         |        |          |       | 63%    | 62%      | 53%   | 68%    | 65%      | 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%    | 66%      | -5%                        | 58%   | 3%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 68%    | 62%      | 6%                         | 58%   | 10%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -61%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 60%    | 65%      | -5%                        | 56%   | 4%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -68%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| MATH              |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 62%    | 64%      | -2%                        | 62%   | 0%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 81%    | 72%      | 9%                         | 64%   | 17%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -62%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 71%    | 69%      | 2%                         | 60%   | 11%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -81%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2021 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 60%    | 66%      | -6%                        | 53%   | 7%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |

**Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments**

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

i-Ready Diagnostic data from the following assessments: BOY (Fall), MOY (Winter), and EOY (Spring)

| Grade 1               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 14   | 49     | 80     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 14   | 49     | 80     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 12   | 37     | 82     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0    | 13     | 88     |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 10   | 26     | 64     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 10   | 26     | 64     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 0    | 19     | 56     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 13   | 0      | 51     |

| Grade 2               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 28   | 56     | 70     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 28   | 56     | 70     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 18   | 45     | 57     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0    | 20     | 40     |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 12   | 44     | 72     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 12   | 44     | 72     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 15   | 48     | 69     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 20   | 20     | 40     |

| Grade 3               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 55   | 66     | 82     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 55   | 66     | 82     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 30   | 35     | 40     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0    | 25     | 50     |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 13   | 44     | 69     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 13   | 44     | 69     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 5    | 16     | 30     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0    | 25     | 75     |

| Grade 4               |                            |      |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|------|--------|--------|
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               | 51   | 62     | 69     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 51   | 62     | 69     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 18   | 19     | 28     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0    | 11     | 0      |
|                       | Number/% Proficiency       | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               | 24   | 56     | 77     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged | 24   | 56     | 77     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities | 6    | 14     | 36     |
|                       | English Language Learners  | 0    | 0      | 22     |

| Grade 5               |                            |                      |       |        |        |
|-----------------------|----------------------------|----------------------|-------|--------|--------|
|                       |                            | Number/% Proficiency | Fall  | Winter | Spring |
| English Language Arts | All Students               |                      | 29    | 40     | 58     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |                      | 29    | 40     | 58     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |                      | 8     | 13     | 24     |
|                       | English Language Learners  |                      | 13    | 11     | 55     |
|                       |                            | Number/% Proficiency | Fall  | Winter | Spring |
| Mathematics           | All Students               |                      | 21    | 46     | 69     |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |                      | 21    | 46     | 69     |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |                      | 11    | 17     | 30     |
|                       | English Language Learners  |                      | 0     | 22     | 66     |
|                       |                            | Number/% Proficiency | Fall  | Winter | Spring |
| Science               | All Students               |                      | 61.4% | 65%    | 65%    |
|                       | Economically Disadvantaged |                      | N/A   | N/A    | N/A    |
|                       | Students With Disabilities |                      | N/A   | N/A    | N/A    |
|                       | English Language Learners  |                      | N/A   | N/A    | N/A    |
|                       |                            | 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                                       | 27       | 42     | 50          | 32        | 43      | 38           | 41       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 30       |        |             | 47        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 41       | 50     |             | 44        | 64      |              | 33       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 57       | 50     |             | 60        | 65      |              | 71       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 61       |        |             | 72        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 69       | 65     | 64          | 69        | 65      | 62           | 72       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 48       | 51     | 50          | 57        | 58      | 47           | 56       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 33       | 50     | 54          | 48        | 65      | 70           | 25       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 38       | 56     |             | 73        | 78      |              | 36       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 53       | 56     |             | 64        | 78      |              | 17       |         |           |                   |                     |

| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |          |        |             |           |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
|---|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Subgroups                                 | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| HSP                                       | 54       | 62     | 64          | 73        | 85      | 80           | 59       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 55       | 43     |             | 57        | 64      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 69       | 61     | 55          | 76        | 77      | 71           | 74       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 59       | 55     | 54          | 68        | 72      | 72           | 54       |         |           |                   |                     |
| 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                                       | 25       | 31     | 21          | 32        | 26      | 17           | 37       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 38       | 54     |             | 52        | 54      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 35       | 25     | 8           | 39        | 33      | 7            | 50       |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 60       | 56     | 64          | 62        | 38      |              | 67       |         |           |                   |                     |
| MUL                                       | 75       | 62     |             | 65        | 46      |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 66       | 51     | 40          | 73        | 43      | 25           | 72       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 56       | 44     | 34          | 59        | 41      | 22           | 60       |         |           |                   |                     |

**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 | 38  |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 468 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8   |
| Percent Tested  | 96% |
| Subgroup Data   |     |
| Students With Disabilities  |     |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 39  |
| 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                                       | 38  |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | YES |

| English Language Learners  |     |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%       |     |
| Native American Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Native American Students                                       |     |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%        |     |
| Asian Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Asian Students   |     |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                         | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                  |     |
| Black/African American Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                | 46  |
| 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  | 57  |
| 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   | 67  |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                   | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%            |     |
| Pacific Islander Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students                                      |     |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%       |     |
| White Students   |     |
| Federal Index - White Students   | 67  |
| 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                                | 51 |
| 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?

Using 20-21 data, ELA proficiency scores slightly decreased in 3rd and 4th grade but remained the same in 5th grade. Math proficiency scores slightly decreased in grades 3-5. Science proficiency scores saw a tremendous growth from 60 to 65%.

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

Both Math and ELA showed a decline in more than one grade level.

#### 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 believe that a contributing factor is the pandemic that began in 2020. During this time, we experienced long term school closures, limited face to face learning, and an abundance of quarantines that affected many of our students and staff members throughout the 20-21 school year.

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

Science showed the greatest increase. In 2019, 60% of our 5th grade students were considered proficient but in 2021 we had a 5% increase. 65% of our 5th grade achieved proficiency.

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

Research based strategies like hands on learning occurred on campus in our 5th grade Science Lab. Teachers and other leadership team members attended monthly PLCs and data chats to share best practice and made data driven decisions.

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

We will continue our use of research based strategies previously discussed and have a renewed focus of key science vocabulary, USA Test Prep, 5th Grade Science Fair, Science 60 Book Challenge, more inquiry lessons, etc.

#### 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.

Professional Development Opportunities:  
 ELA PLC, Math PLC, Science PLC (PLCs occur monthly, i-Ready trainings,- BEST Standards

trainings, HMH Reading Series trainings, Annual Mental Health trainings, AVID trainings/WICOR walks, etc.

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

An "A Team" that consists of admin, coaches, interventionists, staffing specialist, and guidance that progress monitors academic data monthly and makes informed decisions regarding resources using the data presented.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

**#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | Increase Student Achievement in English-Language Arts<br>Teachers will increase their understanding of the Florida Standards; which will in turn, increase student achievement in English-Language Arts in the 2021-22 school year.  |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | Increase student proficiency on the FSA in ELA from 63% to 75%.<br>Increase student learning gains on the FSA in ELA from 60% to 65%.<br>Increase learning gains among the lowest 25% of students on the FSA in ELA from 57% to 60%. |
| <b>Monitoring:</b>                                | We will utilize diagnostic data, monthly PLCs and data chats, as well as formative and summative assessments to monitor this Area of Focus.  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Kelly Kinley (kelly.kinley@sumter.k12.fl.us)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | Teach students to analyze, discuss, and write to text.   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | Research has shown that students who can talk about and write information regarding the text they are reading better understand the information.   |

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. The reading coach facilitates a "flooding" style model with the classroom teacher and the ESE/ESOL paraprofessional in classrooms for grades 3-5 to provide additional academic support.
2. The reading coach also provides supplemental ELA instruction through "PE groups" 2 days a week with signed parental permission and a PE waiver.
3. All students utilize the i-Ready program for ELA 30 to 45 minutes a week.
5. All students participate in the Accelerated Reader Program and Khan Academy.

**Person Responsible** Kelly Kinley (kelly.kinley@sumter.k12.fl.us)

6. Teachers utilize flexible grouping to provide small group instruction for students and provide 120 minutes of dedicated ELA instruction daily.
7. 4th & 5th grade students will utilize Coach as a supplemental resource for ELA instruction.
8. Teachers participate in PLC's and/or data chats twice a month to discuss grade level expectations, refine and extend understanding of high-impact learning strategies, and progress monitor formative student assessments.
9. The school-wide ELA Leadership team meets monthly, and its members serve as a grade level point of contact for school focus areas, stands based instructional practices, and a means of communication between administration and all instructional staff.
10. Student instructional time increased to 8 hour days.

**Person Responsible** Kelly Kinley (kelly.kinley@sumter.k12.fl.us)

**#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** Increase Student Achievement in Mathematics  
Teachers will increase their understanding of the Florida Standards; which will in turn, increase student achievement in Mathematics in the 2021-2022 school year.

**Measurable Outcome:** Increase student proficiency on the FSA in math from 65% to 78%.  
Increase student learning gains on the FSA in math from 65% to 70%.  
Increase learning gains among the lowest 25% of student on the FSA in math from 54% to 60%.

**Monitoring:** We will utilize diagnostic data, monthly PLCs and data chats, as well as formative and summative assessments to monitor this Area of Focus.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** Jaimie Kinney (jaimie.kinney@sumter.k12.fl.us)

**Evidence-based Strategy:** Teach students to view and describe their world mathematically.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** Research has shown that students who can talk and write about math have a better understanding. The understanding is increased when students can articulate their understanding to others.

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. The math coach facilitates a "flooding" style model with the classroom teacher and the ESE/ESOL paraprofessional in the classrooms for grades 3-5 to provide additional academic support.
2. The math coach also provides supplemental math instruction through "PE groups" 2 days a week with signed parental permission and a PE waiver.
3. All students utilize the i-Ready program for math 30-45 minutes a week.
4. All students utilize Khan Academy on a weekly basis.

**Person Responsible** Jaimie Kinney (jaimie.kinney@sumter.k12.fl.us)

5. All students receive a dedicated 90 minute block for math instruction utilizing the district curriculum Go Math!
6. Emphasize and prioritize repeated exposure of mathematical terminology and vocabulary at the primary and intermediate levels.
7. Teachers participate in PLC's and/or data chats twice a month to discuss grade level expectations, refine and extend understanding of high-impact learning strategies, and progress monitor formative student assessments.
8. The school-wide math Leadership team meets monthly, and its members serve as a grade level point of contact for school focus areas, standards based instructional practices, and a means of communication between administration and all instructional staff.
9. Student instructional time increased to 8 hour days.

**Person Responsible** Jaimie Kinney (jaimie.kinney@sumter.k12.fl.us)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Area of Focus</b>                              | Increase Student Achievement in Science   |
| <b>Description and Rationale:</b>                 | Students have limited knowledge of real life science exposure and are unfamiliar with scientific concepts.  |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | Increase student proficiency on the SSA in 5th grade from 66% to 70%.   |
| <b>Monitoring:</b>                                | We will utilize diagnostic data, monthly PLCs and data chats, as well as formative and summative assessments to monitor this Area of Focus.   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Cindy Simmons (cynthia.simmons@sumter.k12.fl.us)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | Students will be taught with hands on instruction which research has shown to increase a students knowledge of the skill being taught. Along with hands on instruction, experiments and videos will be used to reinforce their understanding. |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | Research has shown that a hands on approach to learning will increase a student understanding of the skill.   |

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Teachers will integrate and prioritize hands on experimentation in the classroom.
2. Students will participate in the weekly integration of STEAM activities into science lessons.
3. 2nd and 4th grade students partake in a "in the field" type of science program at the Sumter Environmental Education Center.
4. Guest speakers will be acquired and targeted to grade level standards in 5th grade.
5. Gizmos are used as a digital resource for science instruction.
6. A school-wide STREAM night is held in the spring.
7. Students will participate in the Science Explorers and Science Superstars.
8. All teachers utilize the Pearson Interactive materials that accompany the district provided curriculum.
9. 4th and 5th grade students will utilize Coach Science as a supplemental resource for science instruction.
10. Student instructional time increased to 8 hour days.

**Person Responsible**      Cindy Simmons (cynthia.simmons@sumter.k12.fl.us)

**#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | Improve Student Attendance<br>Utilizing the district's elementary attendance plan and thorough parent education, incentives, and inter-agency collaboration, student attendance rates improve.                                  |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | Reduce the number of students with 5 or more unexcused absences to under 50 students. Reduce the number of chronically absent students (more than 10% of school for any reason) to under 50 students.                           |
| <b>Monitoring:</b>                                | This focus area will be monitored using skyward attendance reports on a weekly, monthly, and quarterly basis. These reports also help determine the need for Child Study Team Meetings for individual students.                 |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Cindy Simmons (cynthia.simmons@sumter.k12.fl.us)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | Students that are absent are missing valuable lessons. To increase daily attendance, daily calls to parents will be made. A Child Study Team Meeting will be held on students with more absences than the district plan allows. |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | Monitoring and supporting families with high absence will encourage daily attendance which will improve academic proficiency.   |

**Action Steps to Implement**

1. Utilization of a 3 tier system of support.
2. Parent Communication (phone calls, attendance letters, parent conferences)
3. Utilization of attendance mentors for tier 2 and tier 3 students
4. Creation of an Attendance Success Plan with parent input for tier 2 students
5. Student incentives (individual and class weekly, individual quarterly)

**Person Responsible**                      Cindy Simmons (cynthia.simmons@sumter.k12.fl.us)

### #5. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | Increase Parental Involvement<br>When parents are actively involved in their student's education, student success improves academically and behaviorally. |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | 50% or more of parents of MTSS tier 3 students will attend a BES Florida Standards Training for Parents.  |
| <b>Monitoring:</b>                                | To monitor this area of focus, parent sign in sheets will be collected after each parental involvement event on campus and charted.                       |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Cindy Simmons (cynthia.simmons@sumter.k12.fl.us)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | Research shows an increase in performance of students who have actively engaged parental support.   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | Engaging and educating parents of the Florida Standards will support the school's academic performance.   |

#### Action Steps to Implement

1. More frequent, varied means of parent communication
2. Advertise events through local media outlets
3. Conscientious planning/scheduling, taking into consideration competing community event.

**Person Responsible** Kelly Kinley (kelly.kinley@sumter.k12.fl.us)

### #6. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Discipline

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | Decrease the number of long forms.<br>Increasing parental communication, integrating a social/emotional curriculum, and implementing greater teacher-initiated interventions at the classroom level, student discipline will decline. |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | Decrease the number of long forms from to less than 200 for this school year.   |
| <b>Monitoring:</b>                                | This focus area will be monitored using weekly, monthly and quarterly discipline reports. Admin will review data monthly and discuss adjustments as needed.   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Jaimie Kinney (jaimie.kinney@sumter.k12.fl.us)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | Teaching students appropriate social skills will lower the amount of discipline incidents.  |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | Sandford Harmony will help decrease the number of incidents resulting in a long form being written.   |

#### Action Steps to Implement

1. Implementation of Sandford Harmony, a social emotional curriculum, school wide.
2. Utilization of parent communication means to highlight positive student behavior on a routine basis.
3. Increase classroom level behavior interventions.
4. School-wide implementation of our PBIS system.

**Person Responsible** Kelly Kinley (kelly.kinley@sumter.k12.fl.us)

### 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.

**The school principal will assign members of the leadership team to assist with monitoring the improvement of all areas of the school.**

### 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.

At BES we understand the importance of all stakeholders being involved in the learning process to ensure a positive school culture. We are always trying to increase parent participation and improve the quality of parental involvement in school related activities. In order to accomplish this, parent activities are scheduled throughout the year at varying times to accommodate parent's schedules. BES annually reviews parent involvement data and

writes a Parent and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) that incorporates strategies to build positive relationships with families. Please see the PFEP to examine the activities and strategies utilized at BES to increase parent involvement to build a positive school culture and environment.

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

BES Stakeholders are extremely active in their support our of school. Our Student Advisory Council is comprised of teachers, students, parents, education support employees, the principal and other community citizens who represent the ethnic, racial, and economic community. This committee provides all stakeholders an opportunity to actively participate in the development of educational priorities, assessment of the school's needs and identification of resources. All of these factors work together to promote a positive culture and environment at our school.

### 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        |
| 4             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance | \$0.00        |
| 5             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement | \$0.00        |
| 6             | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Discipline         | \$0.00        |
| <b>Total:</b> |        |   | <b>\$0.00</b> |