

Marion County Public Schools

Bellevue Santos Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Belleview Santos Elementary School

9600 SE US HIGHWAY 441, Belleview, FL 34420

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Kim White

Start Date for this Principal: 7/22/2019

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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: C (43%) 2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: F (28%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* 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 Marion 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	11
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Belleview Santos Elementary School

9600 SE US HIGHWAY 441, Belleview, FL 34420

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2021-22 Title I School	2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	48%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	C		C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Marion 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.

Belleview-Santos will develop academically minded learners through the planning and implementation of rigorous and relevant instruction and collaborative teaching in a safe environment.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Belleview-Santos works with all stakeholders to create educational opportunities where all students can learn.

School Leadership Team

Membership

For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
White, Kimberly	Principal	To provide the visionary leadership necessary to design, develop, and implement a comprehensive program of instructional and support services to optimize available resources and to provide successful high quality experiences for students in a safe and orderly environment. She supervises administrative, instructional, and non-instructional personnel assigned to the school.
Warren, ShawnaMae	Assistant Principal	The assistant principal assists the principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, assists in the development of a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of high yield instructional strategies. She further assists the principal in the assessment of school staff, assists with the monitoring of implementation of intervention and necessary documentation, assists with the delivery of professional development for effective instructional delivery. The assistant principal carefully monitors the additional academic support schedule to ensure all personnel are serving in their specified areas.
Haworth, Angelique	Instructional Coach	The content area specialist serves as an academic coach for teachers and paraprofessionals utilizing effective coaching practices to build capacity and support student learning. Additionally, the content area specialist serves as an intervention specialist for targeted students based on need, for the specific content area.
Viles, Teresa	Instructional Coach	The content area specialist serves as an academic coach for teachers and paraprofessionals utilizing effective coaching practices to build capacity and support student learning. Additionally, the content area specialist serves as an intervention specialist for targeted students based on need, for the specific content area.
Polish, Alison	School Counselor	She provides students with educational, personal, and vocational counseling and to identify and coordinate all available resources to empower students to reach full potential.
Suranni, Joseph	Dean	He works to implement disciplinary procedures and policies to ensure a safe and orderly environment. In addition, he works with students and parents in creating educational plans for students that ensure improved academic success.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/22/2019, Kim White

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

45

Total number of students enrolled at the school

571

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

15

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

14

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	106	92	93	105	63	110	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	569	
Attendance below 90 percent	49	26	32	29	22	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	192	
One or more suspensions	5	4	9	19	8	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	78	
Course failure in ELA	6	32	33	35	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	129	
Course failure in Math	7	20	31	24	6	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	124	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	49	25	37	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	111	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	41	22	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	96	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	8	21	29	33	10	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134	

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	8	21	29	33	10	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	134	

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	2	3	23	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 8/4/2022

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	70	89	77	78	102	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	494
Attendance below 90 percent	25	27	27	24	31	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158
One or more suspensions	2	5	9	5	24	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Course failure in ELA	9	21	30	16	26	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108
Course failure in Math	8	17	21	7	23	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	20	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	17	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	3	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	8	17	26	13	34	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113

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	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	70	89	77	78	102	78	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	494
Attendance below 90 percent	25	27	27	24	31	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	158
One or more suspensions	2	5	9	5	24	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Course failure in ELA	9	21	30	16	26	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108
Course failure in Math	8	17	21	7	23	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	20	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	17	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	2	3	0	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11

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	8	17	26	13	34	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	113

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	0	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	32%	46%	56%				50%	47%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	42%						66%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	34%						63%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	41%	50%	50%				47%	51%	63%
Math Learning Gains	63%						57%	58%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	64%						38%	49%	51%
Science Achievement	27%	53%	59%				53%	47%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	37%	44%	-7%	58%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	60%	49%	11%	58%	2%
Cohort Comparison		-37%				
05	2022					
	2019	45%	45%	0%	56%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		-60%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	43%	49%	-6%	62%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	65%	54%	11%	64%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				
05	2022					
	2019	32%	45%	-13%	60%	-28%
Cohort Comparison		-65%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	49%	44%	5%	53%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	9	34	20	20	48	77	13				
ELL	10	17		17	52						
BLK	19	47		23	60		25				
HSP	27	34		32	70	64	21				
MUL	25			50							
WHT	38	47	33	47	58	59	31				
FRL	27	38	27	35	62	66	19				
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	26	33	40	25	38						
ELL	19			15							
BLK	30			30							
HSP	40	35		34	56		26				
WHT	42	45		45	57		43				
FRL	32	38	40	35	48	47	34				
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	19	58	64	22	48	44	25				
ELL	35	70		42	67						
BLK	31	60	60	18	42	55	31				
HSP	48	68		55	72	42	30				
WHT	57	64	44	54	58	27	67				
FRL	39	65	53	36	53	43	44				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	47
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	69
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	372
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	32
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	28
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	1
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%	0
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%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	35
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	45
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	38
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	45
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	42
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

ELA proficiencies have been trending downward for the past three years. When looking at our subgroups students with disabilities have been below the 41% mark for three years in a row and this subgroup of students have been on a downward trend for the same time frame. Additionally, achievement levels in this subgroup are significantly lower than other subgroups.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

The greatest need for improvement is in the area of ELA proficiency. FSA data for the last 5 years for ELA proficiencies are trending downward for grades 3-5. i-Ready data supports the need for improvement in ELA proficiencies in all grade levels. i-Ready proficiencies in 3-5 aligns to 3-5 FSA data.

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

Data from instructional rounds indicate that teachers are not providing student tasks that are aligned to the ELA standards. To address this, professional development will be provided on aligning tasks to the state standards in ELA. Additionally, during weekly ELA collaborations, teachers will agree on and leave with tasks that align to the benchmarks.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Math learning gains have improved from the previous year. Learning gains in math for the lowest quartile are showing an upward trend, and have for the last three years - going from 38% to 64%.

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

At BSE, we have implemented mandatory use of daily kickstarts and Reflex math to provide students with continuous exposure and review to standards and tasks. Small group instruction occurred with select students targeted due to their QSMA data.

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

Our MTSS groups are being revamped with more purposeful groupings to ensure students are placed according to their greatest deficit and need. Instructional coaches will assist with instruction and interventions based on student data. Purposeful and meaningful small group instruction will be implemented in ELA in Tier 1 instruction. This small group instruction will be supported by our instructional coaches as well as our administration team.

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.

In ELA, professional development will be provided on how to align student tasks to benchmark.

Teachers will be provided with professional development on how to identify if tasks align to grade level benchmarks during the 22-23 Pre-planning week. Subsequently, monthly professional development will occur on verifying alignment of tasks, creating tasks that align to benchmarks, and providing direct explicit instruction to ensure students can perform successfully on the benchmark aligned tasks.

Professional development in the areas of small group instruction and interventions will need to be provided. Small group instruction will allow our teachers to work more closely with their students, to provide the opportunity to evaluate students' learning strengths, locate gaps in the student's development and gain a better understanding of the students' skills. This type of instruction allows teachers to check for understanding while also reinforcing skills presented in whole group instruction and allows teachers to break down concepts not easily understood or give students who understand an opportunity to challenge themselves. Professional development in the intervention programs will also be needed. This year the district is offering very specific programs for intervention in order for these to be successful, and for MTSS to be successful, professional development in what the interventions are, the targeted gaps, and how to implement them in the classroom, will be needed.

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

To ensure sustainability of improvement, BSE will implement UFLI to provide K-2 students with necessary foundational skills in reading. New MTSS interventions are being implemented to close the learning gaps in all grade levels. BSE will continue to gather data through instructional rounds to ensure the continuous cycle of improvement.

Areas of Focus

Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	<p>ELA proficiencies have been trending downward for the past three years. When looking at our subgroups students with disabilities have been below the 41% mark for three years in a row and this subgroup of students have been on a downward trend for the same time frame. Additionally, achievement levels in this subgroup are significantly lower than other subgroups.</p> <p>The greatest need for improvement is in the area of ELA proficiency. FSA data for the last 5 years for ELA proficiencies are trending downward for grades 3-5. i-Ready data supports the need for improvement in ELA proficiencies in all grade levels. i-Ready proficiencies in 3-5 aligns to 3-5 FSA data.</p>
--	--

Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	<p>ELA proficiency levels in grades 3-5 will increase from 32% to 50% as measured by the FAST Assessment.</p>
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	<p>This Area of Focus will be monitored via i-Ready diagnostic data, FAST assessments, and district progress monitoring assessments.</p>
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	<p>Kimberly White (kimberly.white@marion.k12.fl.us)</p>
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	<p>BSE will focus on providing Explicit Direct Instruction to learners. This strategy, per John Hattie, has an effect size of 0.60. Hattie describes direct instruction as, "The teacher decides the learning intentions and success criteria, makes them transparent to the students, demonstrates them by modeling, evaluates if they understand what they have been told by checking for understanding, and re-telling them what they have told by tying it all together with closure" (Hattie, 2009, pg. 206)</p>
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	<p>Based upon the root cause analysis conducted by the administrative team, teachers at BSE struggle with providing direct instruction and tasks that are aligned to benchmarks. If teachers provide direct, explicit instruction with tasks that are aligned to the benchmark, then students will have the knowledge and examples needed to master that benchmark.</p>

Action Steps to Implement

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Monthly professional development will be provided to teachers on how to align tasks to the benchmark and also on how to provide direct, explicit instruction to students so that they can successfully master those tasks.

Person Responsible

Kimberly White (kimberly.white@marion.k12.fl.us)

Collaborative Planning in ELA will happen weekly to review upcoming benchmarks, ensure daily instructional tasks in ELA are aligned to the spotlighted benchmark, and then determine effective instructional strategies.

Person Responsible

Kimberly White (kimberly.white@marion.k12.fl.us)

RAISE

The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.
- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

BSE teachers will focus on direct, explicit instruction in Foundational Skills with task alignment utilizing the University of Florida Literacy Institute Foundational Program.

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

BSE teachers will focus on direct, explicit instruction throughout the literacy block with special attention to task alignment to the BEST ELA Benchmarks.

Measurable Outcomes:

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

The number of students in grades K-2 placing on-level or higher will increase by 50% from PM1 to PM3 as measured by FAST.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

ELA proficiency levels in grades 3-5 will increase from 32% as measured by the 2022 FSA to 50% as measured by the FAST Assessment.

Monitoring:

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Students in Kg-5th grades are continuously monitored throughout the school year using i-Ready, FAST, District Progress Monitoring Assessments, MTSS Intervention data, and Benchmark Checks. Teachers meet with the administrative team bi-weekly to review these various data sources to help drive instruction and student progression.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

White, Kimberly, kimberly.white@marion.k12.fl.us

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

BSE will focus on providing Explicit Direct Instruction to learners. This strategy, per John Hattie, has an effect size of 0.60. Hattie describes direct instruction as, "The teacher decides the learning intentions and

success criteria, makes them transparent to the students, demonstrates them by modeling, evaluates if they understand what they have been told by checking for understanding, and re-telling them what they have told by tying it all together with closure" (Hattie, 2009, pg. 206)

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

Based upon the root cause analysis conducted by the administrative team, teachers at BSE struggle with providing direct instruction and tasks that are aligned to benchmarks. If teachers provide direct, explicit instruction with tasks that are aligned to the benchmark, then students will have the knowledge and examples needed to master that benchmark.

Action Steps to Implement:

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Monthly professional development will be provided to teachers on how to align tasks to the benchmark and also on how to provide direct, explicit instruction to students so that they can successfully master those tasks.	White, Kimberly, kimberly.white@marion.k12.fl.us
Collaborative Planning in ELA will happen weekly to review upcoming benchmarks, ensure daily instructional tasks in ELA are aligned to the spotlighted benchmark, and then determine effective instructional strategies.	White, Kimberly, kimberly.white@marion.k12.fl.us

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

A positive school culture and environment is supported through school-wide expectations with positive behavior support systems in place.

School-wide expectations and supports are communicated to families in monthly newsletters and Skylert messages.

Additionally, teachers build a positive school and classroom culture through the implementation of Caring School Communities curriculum to include morning meet-ups and lessons designed to improve their social and emotional learning skills. Students learn how to problem solve and work together as a team.

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

The school works with a variety of stakeholders - parents through our school advisory council, local retirees through reading pals, the teachers, students, faculty, and staff who all work together to play a role in establishing and promoting the culture at BSE. The school works with various local business and churches to collaboratively promote a positive culture both at school and in the community. School leadership communicates regularly with the organizations and the organizations assist the school through monetary donations, materials and supplies, student incentives, and through volunteering on our campus. In addition, BSE's PBIS team, which is comprised of teachers from various grade levels, special area teachers, paraprofessionals, and clerical staff, meets monthly to analyze school data - discipline data, attendance, and various stakeholder surveys. They work to determine next steps to continuously improve the positive culture and environment at the school.