

Martin County School District

Bessey Creek 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	23
Budget to Support Goals	23

Bessey Creek Elementary School

2201 SW MATHESON AVE, Palm City, FL 34990

martinschools.org/o/bces

Demographics

Principal: Stacy Schmit

Start Date for this Principal: 6/3/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	No
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	28%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Asian Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (74%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southeast
Regional Executive Director	LaShawn Russ-Porterfield
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 Martin 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	23

Bessey Creek Elementary School

2201 SW MATHESON AVE, Palm City, FL 34990

martinschools.org/o/bces

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2020-21 Title I School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>25%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>22%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Martin 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.

Mission: At Bessey Creek we will empower all children using a challenging curriculum focused on growth by creating a positive, connected community of learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision: Educating all students to be receptive, respectful, responsible, and resilient life-long learners.

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
Schmit, Stacy	Principal	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Developing a world-class group of educators to serve the needs of all students and their families 2. Using data to identify gaps and opportunities to ensure student and family needs are met 3. Creating a robust and far-reaching team of empowered leaders on campus to ensure multiple perspectives are taken when making shared decisions 4. Engaging stakeholders to develop school-wide focus on student growth 5. Serving all stakeholders
Roth , Tiffany	Assistant Principal	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Support the Vision and Mission of the school through collaborative, data-driven instructional leadership 2. Lead PLC work, alongside Principal, to ensure supports for students lead to student growth and elimination of the achievement gap 3. Use expertise to help grow teacher practice 4. Support teachers to ensure teacher growth

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 6/3/2019, Stacy Schmit

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.*

3

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.*

11

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

34

Total number of students enrolled at the school

546

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

6

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

5

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	70	99	90	72	99	108	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	538
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	17	34	36	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	119
Level 1 on 2021 statewide FSA ELA Assessment	0	0	0	0	14	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2021 statewide FSA Math Assessment	0	0	0	0	10	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	17

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	9	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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 7/29/2021

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	80	83	72	98	95	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	523
Attendance below 90 percent	6	7	4	2	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

2020-21 - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	80	83	72	98	95	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	523
Attendance below 90 percent	6	7	4	2	5	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data Review

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

School Grade Component	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				77%	58%	57%	77%	59%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				70%	59%	58%	67%	57%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				55%	56%	53%	49%	49%	48%
Math Achievement				76%	65%	63%	81%	66%	62%
Math Learning Gains				72%	65%	62%	70%	59%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				59%	53%	51%	71%	43%	47%
Science Achievement				63%	58%	53%	74%	59%	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	77%	54%	23%	58%	19%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	73%	57%	16%	58%	15%
Cohort Comparison		-77%				
05	2021					
	2019	79%	55%	24%	56%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-73%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	75%	58%	17%	62%	13%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	74%	67%	7%	64%	10%
Cohort Comparison		-75%				
05	2021					
	2019	80%	64%	16%	60%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-74%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	64%	53%	11%	53%	11%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Reading and Math data has been pulled from 2020-2021 iReady Diagnostics. Science 5 data has been pulled from 2020-2021 Science 05 PM1, PM2, and PM3.

Grade 1				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	43.24	63.41	81.24
	Economically Disadvantaged	36.72	52.46	66.38
	Students With Disabilities	40.98	55.37	67.5
	English Language Learners	47.06	50	57.14
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	28.19	54.2	86.22
	Economically Disadvantaged	21.88	39.17	70.69
	Students With Disabilities	33.33	52.94	70.34
	English Language Learners	17.65	50	78.57
Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	46.76	65.45	80.55
	Economically Disadvantaged	39.29	58.88	71.15
	Students With Disabilities	40.57	52.38	65.69
	English Language Learners	40	38.46	38.46
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	29.81	53.56	81.75
	Economically Disadvantaged	25	42.06	74.04
	Students With Disabilities	32.38	48.08	68.32
	English Language Learners	13.33	38.46	76.92

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	51.71	67.83	78.27
	Economically Disadvantaged	44.79	67.39	68.89
	Students With Disabilities	30.95	39.76	50.62
	English Language Learners	50	50	44.44
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	31.52	53.24	78.21
	Economically Disadvantaged	29.17	45.05	72.22
	Students With Disabilities	22.89	34.15	51.25
	English Language Learners	16.67	55.56	77.78
Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	52.6	68.77	78.72
	Economically Disadvantaged	41.33	66.22	65.28
	Students With Disabilities	29.82	38.6	49.12
	English Language Learners	33.33	27.27	30
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	33.33	57.5	82.21
	Economically Disadvantaged	26.67	42.47	73.61
	Students With Disabilities	21.43	32.14	58.93
	English Language Learners	16.67	30	70

Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	44.71	63.29	74.02
	Economically Disadvantaged	32.65	54.17	52.17
	Students With Disabilities	24.39	36.59	48.78
	English Language Learners	42.86	33.33	50
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	39.13	58.33	81.77
	Economically Disadvantaged	30.61	43.75	69.57
	Students With Disabilities	25	27.5	55
	English Language Learners	57.14	50	66.67
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	37.38	60.38	37.38
	Economically Disadvantaged	12	33.33	12
	Students With Disabilities	25	50	25
	English Language Learners	33.33	33.33	33.33
	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	43	47	50	53	53		38				
HSP	84	75		81	83		83				
WHT	79	74	61	78	68	48	73				
FRL	75	59		69	76		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	59	60	50	67	68	45	47				
HSP	81	73		73	73		75				
WHT	77	70	56	78	73	62	62				
FRL	63	63	67	63	56	37	43				

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	58	56	42	66	56	53	41				
HSP	76	78		68	55						
WHT	76	65	47	82	72	74	74				
FRL	63	56		65	57		47				

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	69
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	483
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	98%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	47
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	

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	81
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 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	69
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	67
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?

We have had an overall slight upward trend when looking at data contributing to overall school grade. That said, when looking at students identified as being proficient coming into Kindergarten and then using overall school grade percentage, there is a decrease in performance around 10%.

When looking at ONLY 20-21 proficiency data from grade three to grade 4 to grade 5 in Math, there is an upward trend, from 70% proficient to 80% proficient, to 84% proficient, which aligns to a focus on growth year over year. In a growth model, we would expect to have a higher percentage of proficient students each year they attend our school. When looking at the same data for Reading, there is an increase from grade 3 to grade 4, but a decrease from grade 4 to grade 5.

Growth tracked across single grade levels using benchmark assessments shows an increase in percent proficient in all grades, as comparisons are made based on end of year expectations. Additionally, while there was a slight increase in growth for students in the bottom quartile in reading based on the 2021 FSA data, there was an 11 percentile point drop for students in the bottom quartile in math based on the 2021 FSA data. Something to point out is this data set is smaller than normal, as growth was measured ONLY for students who had a 2019 Grade 3 or Grade 4 score AND a 2021 Grade 4 or Grade 5 score to compare.

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

Learning gains for the bottom 25% of students taking FSA with a prior FSA score in Reading and Math are areas for improvement. The percentage of students in the bottom 25% of students taking FSA with a prior FSA score in reading increased from 2019 to 2021 overall by 2%, however only 57% of those students in this category made learning gains.

In mathematics, there was an overall decrease for this targeted subgroup, of 11%, with only 48% of students making learning gains.

The lowest 25% of students in Reading and Math is an important subgroup to target, as these students are generally behind their grade level peers and need to make more than a years worth of growth each year to catch up to their peers.

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

COVID19 has had an uneven impact on students in terms of learning. Students having risk factors, including those in poverty, those whose families are split/divorced, those lacking supports for education at home, those whose home language is not English, and those whose families were not able to have their students attend in person, as a group, had learning gains lower than grade level peer without the same risk factors or with fewer risk factors.

To address this need for improvement, the school needs to identify the students within each group, identify the specific foundational skills needed to grow each student, and tailor a learning plan individualized for each student.

Additionally, the school needs to track progress for these students and move along from mastered skills to those yet unmastered.

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

Science achievement showed the most improvement, with an 11% change over 2019 scores.

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

We added Science into our Related Arts rotation for grades k-5, and added extra science on Day 2 of Computer Lab Related Arts for 5th grade students. Additionally, our PTA worked to add grade level experiences for each grade level of students, many of these being science experiences.

Our science teacher tracked standards covered during her related arts time and communicated with 5th grade teachers about which of these they should continue to teach.

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

To accelerate learning, students need continued exposure to academics on grade level, even when there are deficiencies with content that should have been mastered in previous academic years. Additionally, students need to engage in more complex learning, such as problem-solving applied to situations within the context of standards being learned.

To this end, Bessey Creek applied to become a Cambridge school, and we will be focused on the Global Perspectives course in all grade levels for all students. This will afford all student an opportunity to grow in the five learner attributes of confidence, responsibility, innovation, engagement, and reflection, by giving them a challenge problem to work through from the perspective of how they connect with it personally, how their community connects to the problem, and how the world connects to it.

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.

Bessey Creek teachers and administrators will participate in ongoing professional development around Cambridge Global Perspective as well as how to grow students in the 5 learner attributes.

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

Through an improved PLC process, grade levels will ensure timely review of formative and summative data as new data becomes available. For ELA, with the new Benchmark Advance curriculum adoption, the PLC process will be focused on data gathered each three weeks, as each of the 10 units of instruction are three weeks in length.

For mathematics and science, common data will be analyzed as it is available, at least three times per year.

Baseline data will be collected in each subject area, and subsequent pieces of data will be evaluated and compared to previous data, when applicable, to ensure student growth and mastery of standards.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: We will implement a process for teaching, assessing, and monitoring students scoring in the lowest 35% of students per grade level. Data shows these students are learning and growing at a slower rate than peers not scoring in the lowest 35% of students per grade level. This is causing these students to fall further behind their peers with each grade level they enter.

Measurable Outcome: At least 75% of students scoring in the lowest 35% of students in each grade level in ELA will meet or exceed overall growth equivalent to at least 1.5 school years.

Monitoring: This Area of Focus will be monitored using data from Benchmark Advance unit assessments as well as by APMs taken by students in grades 3 through 5.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Stacy Schmit (schmits@martin.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers in grades K through 5 will implement Benchmark Advance with fidelity.

Ensuring teachers have access to, and implement, a rigorous, standards-aligned comprehensive curriculum is

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: A guaranteed and viable curriculum is the variable most strongly related to student achievement at the school level. Research shows one of the most powerful things a school can do to help enhance student achievement is to guarantee that specific content is taught in specific courses and grade levels.

Implementing Benchmark Advance with fidelity will ensure all students are given an opportunity to work toward mastery of grade level standards in English Language Arts.

Action Steps to Implement

Teachers will attend professional development in the structure and implementation of Benchmark Advance, attending all three PD sessions.

Person Responsible Tiffany Roth (rotht@martinschools.org)

Teachers will implement Benchmark Advance following the district scope and sequence.

Person Responsible Stacy Schmit (schmits@martin.k12.fl.us)

Teachers will follow the district testing calendar to ensure students are testing within the testing windows.

Person Responsible Tiffany Roth (rotht@martinschools.org)

Teachers will participate in the PLC process, ensuring data from Benchmark Advance is evaluated during grade level CLTs.

Person Responsible Tiffany Roth (rotht@martinschools.org)

Individual grade levels will focus on strategies specifically aligned to needs of students in their lowest 35%:

Kindergarten - focus on pre-literacy skills in an intensive intervention classroom

First grade - focus on emerging literacy skills in an intensive intervention classroom; use small group instruction to teach, model, and provide opportunities for students to practice visualizing strategies to

enhance reading comprehension

2nd grade - focus on providing background knowledge/supports to fill gaps

3rd grade - focus on skills within classrooms to support students with phonics deficits; annotating text to strengthen grade level comprehension

4th grade - additional hour of instruction in the school day focused on literacy support - small group LLI, word attack skills

5th grade - small group reading support to ensure student growth; utilize success block to provide differentiated reading materials to address academic levels of students

Person Responsible Stacy Schmit (schmits@martin.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: We will implement a process for teaching, assessing, and monitoring students who are identified as being in the subcategory of Economically Disadvantaged. Data shows these students are learning and growing at a slower rate than peers not scoring in the subcategory of Economically Disadvantaged. This is causing these students to fall further behind their peers with each grade level they enter.

Measurable Outcome: At least 75% of students scoring in the lowest 35% of students in each grade level in ELA will meet or exceed overall growth equivalent to at least 1.5 school years.

Monitoring: This Area of Focus will be monitored using data from Benchmark Advance unit assessments as well as by APMs taken by students in grades 3 through 5.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Stacy Schmit (schmits@martin.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Text message campaign will be used to engage all parents, focusing on strategies shown by research to be most impactful with families qualifying for free or reduced-price lunches. Parents will be texted multiply times per week with tips for engaging with their own children and boosting school readiness and overall wellness.

Our overall percentage of students meeting the criteria for free or reduced-price lunches (FRL) has been increasing by 3 to 5% annually for the past 3 years. This group, while not identifiable unless the family self-identifies to the school, now includes 155 students at the school, and accounts for the lowest growth percentages of our tracked subgroups.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Additionally, the FRL group has been shown to be of the most adversely effected by the COVID-19 pandemic. Students in this subgroup often have additional risk factors, and the higher the number of risk factors a student has, the more likely the negative impact the pandemic has had on student achievement for a student.

Because we cannot identify student in this category, it is impossible to identify all students in this group, and efforts must be made to impact ALL students in the school with practices that will be helpful for this subgroup.

Action Steps to Implement

Create a text message campaign to provided tips and engagement strategies for parents that will bolster student wellness and readiness for school. Tips will include literacy, mathematics, and overall wellness.

Person Responsible Stacy Schmit (schmits@martin.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

We will implement a process for teaching, assessing, and monitoring students to ensure all students are making gains in Math. Data shows our students are not consistency reaching growth goals year over year. While students in some grade levels are making gains overall, all students are not making gains, and there is inconsistency when looking at subgroup by grade level, as well. This is causing these students to fall further behind their peers in certain grade levels and then having to play catch-up in subsequent years.

Measurable Outcome:

By May of 2022, in grade levels where fewer than 75% of students made their growth goals previously, at least 75% of students will reach those goals. In grade levels where more than 75% of students made their growth goals, the number of students NOT reaching their growth goals will be reduced by at least 5%.

Monitoring:

This area of focus will be monitored three times per year using iReady Math Benchmark Assessments for grades K through 5.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tiffany Roth (rotht@martinschools.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

We will implement our math curriculum with fidelity: MyMath in K-2 and Go Math in 3-5. iReady Math, also part of our curriculum, will be utilized to individualize supports for all students.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Implementing a guaranteed and viable curriculum, aligned to grade level standards, has the greatest impact on student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

Individual grade levels will focus on strategies specifically aligned to needs of students in their grade level:
 Kindergarten - focus on pre-numeracy skills for struggling students and engaging in math talks in all classrooms
 First grade - focus on implementing individual, teacher-assigned math lessons to facilitate growth in all students; enhance number sense by using manipulatives to solidify student understanding of math concepts and skills; practice explicit procedures for solving word problems
 2nd grade - focus on implementing individual, teacher-assigned math lessons to facilitate growth in all students
 3rd grade - focus on implementing individual, teacher-assigned math lessons to facilitate growth in all students
 4th grade - utilize math intervention block daily to provide spiral math review and remediate students as needed
 5th grade - utilize math intervention block daily to provide spiral math review and remediate students as needed

Person Responsible

Stacy Schmit (schmits@martin.k12.fl.us)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Across the grades and ESSA subgroups, Bessey Creek has pockets where students are not making the gains they need to be considered to be growing at least one school year. This means for some students, the achievement gap is growing between themselves and their peer group. If this is happening year over year, it becomes extremely difficult for kids to ever catch up to their peers, and pushes kids to consider dropping out of school.
Measurable Outcome:	As a Cambridge School, we will expose our students to the 5 Cambridge Learner attributes by having them participate in at least 1 Cambridge challenge during the 2021-2022 school year.
Monitoring:	We will monitor this Area of Focus by looking at grade level work in CLTs and as evidenced within teacher lesson plans.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Stacy Schmit (schmits@martin.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	All grade levels will provide an opportunity to students to engage in at least one Global Perspectives Challenge during the 2021-2022 school year.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The learner attributes practiced within each challenge in the Global Perspectives course are habits of effective learners and can be applied by students throughout their lives. Global Perspectives will give ALL students in the school exposure to challenging, cooperative learning to enrich their academic lives and allow them to see the impact they have on the environment and others.

Action Steps to Implement

Professional learning in the area of Cambridge and particularly for teaching Global Perspectives.

Person Responsible Stacy Schmit (schmits@martin.k12.fl.us)

Work in grade level teams to decide on challenge and implementation of that challenge.

Person Responsible Tiffany Roth (rotht@martinschools.org)

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.

Bessey Creek ranks among the lowest in the state for incidents of discipline, across all micro-areas.

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.

The school uses survey data from the Fall Principal Survey as well as the Spring School Surveys to help focus on areas needing support as well as to understand what is going right to build a positive school culture. Both surveys are a window into school climate, and climate has been a strong focus for the school for each of the previous two years.

To help bolster school culture, the following structures are growing to enable stakeholders to voice their opinions and connect for the purpose of supporting our school family:

- School leadership team members from all grade levels; Twice monthly leadership team meetings
- School literacy leaders team to help with schoolwide implementation of new curriculum, which has caused some angst among faculty
- Increased communication with the broad school family through a new app with ties to social media, text, and the web
- "Next Week in the Creek" communication for school staff every Friday
- Monthly celebration school-wide for school staff
- PBIS celebrations monthly for students
- Revitalized PTA planning community events for our extended school family and community

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

Stacy Schmit, Principal - Messaging to the public and the school staff regarding positive programs and happenings at the school; promoting school for enrollment

Tiffany Roth, Assistant Principal - Next Week in the Creek; messaging to staff and stakeholders to support and promote positive school programming. Communication with PTA communication liaison to ensure a single message from school and PTA

Nicole Zech, Martin Mentor, Co-teacher, Literacy Coach - embracing those new to the staff to ensure support and connection on campus

Carolyn Herman, PTA President - aligning vision of PTA to support school growth goals, mission, vision, and values. Promoting events and communicating those to the larger school community. Ensuring teachers feel PTA support through donations of money, time, and events for staff and students.

Allison Papsidero, PTA Secretary & Communication Liaison - Ensuring all communications are thorough and support the mission, vision, and values of the school and the school PTA partnership

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: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00