Buck Lake Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Buck Lake Elementary School

1600 PEDRICK RD, Tallahassee, FL 32317

https://www.leonschools.net/bucklake

Demographics

Principal: Ron Wetherington

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

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	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	26%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities Asian Students Black/African American Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: A (72%) 2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: A (70%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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 Leon 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

Buck Lake Elementary School

1600 PEDRICK RD, Tallahassee, FL 32317

https://www.leonschools.net/bucklake

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	No	26%

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

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Leon 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 the Buck Lake School community is to nurture each child regardless of gender, race, creed or ability by providing all students with a safe environment where they can take risks, practice problem solving, and learn to be responsible citizens. Our school community thrives on respect among all of our members. We will work diligently to provide for each student's academic, physical, social, and emotional needs.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Programs in our school community will be designed to meet the needs of all students. Our classrooms will be infused with traditional resources and technology that will help students access curricula and learn about areas of interest. Teachers will use research-based practices, coupled with innovative techniques to prepare students to be productive, respectful members of a larger community. Our students will experience a campus filled with adults who care, are knowledgeable, and will support them to grow into life-long learners and leaders.

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
Millard, William	Principal	Ensures that the vision, mission of the school is communicated to all stakeholders. Provides support to teachers by way of materials, professional development, classroom observations/feedback. Works with grade levels to analyze student data as it relates to proficiency with curricular standards.
Quiggins, Angela	Assistant Principal	Identifies needs of grade levels, individual teachers. Provides support to teachers by way of materials, professional development, classroom observations/ feedback. Ensures that the standards are being taught with fideliy.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2015, Ron Wetherington

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

54

Total number of students enrolled at the school

739

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

4

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

8

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	103	136	108	128	125	122	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	722
Attendance below 90 percent	3	14	10	6	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	48
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	2	6	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	12	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	27
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	1	0	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6

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	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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/24/2022

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	121	98	118	125	121	129	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	712
Attendance below 90 percent	1	8	12	13	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	1	4	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	16	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	2	3	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	121	98	118	125	121	129	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	712
Attendance below 90 percent	1	8	12	13	9	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	55
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	1	4	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	2	16	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	5	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	2	3	1	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	80%	57%	56%				79%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	71%						64%	54%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	53%						49%	47%	53%
Math Achievement	80%	47%	50%				80%	64%	63%
Math Learning Gains	82%						75%	63%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	62%						55%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	73%	57%	59%				77%	52%	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	81%	61%	20%	58%	23%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	78%	57%	21%	58%	20%
Cohort Comparison		-81%				
05	2022					
	2019	79%	56%	23%	56%	23%
Cohort Comparison		-78%				

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	79%	63%	16%	62%	17%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	82%	66%	16%	64%	18%
Cohort Comparison		-79%				
05	2022					
	2019	81%	61%	20%	60%	21%
Cohort Comparison		-82%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	79%	54%	25%	53%	26%
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	57	58	36	54	68	50	43				
ASN	91	90		93	93		92				
BLK	59	63	53	50	64	56	23				
HSP	78	75		85	80						
MUL	83	53		83	73		73				
WHT	82	71	59	82	84	68	78				
FRL	53	60	46	46	71	64	36				

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	45	27		40	27		33				
ELL	80			60							
ASN	94			89							
BLK	44	47		38	12		47				
HSP	77			77			80				
MUL	79			79							
WHT	80	59	54	75	59	18	69				
FRL	64	69		45	38		71				

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	50	52	58	42	48	44	27				
ASN	93	74		95	97		93				
BLK	67	63	58	65	50	38	60				
HSP	72	74		62	53						
MUL	92			92							
WHT	79	62	44	82	78	67	78				
FRL	73	61	63	73	71	50	67				

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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	72
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	501
Total Components for the Federal Index	7

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	52
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

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%	0

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	92
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	53
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	80
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	73
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	75
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	54
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?

The number of proficient students at each grade level in Science, ELA, and Math increased in achievement, learning gains, and the Lowest 25th Percentile for the 2022 FSA and Statewide Science Assessment.

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

In ELA Achievement, ELA Learning Gains, and Science, our Free and Reduced Lunch students showed a decrease in proficiency. For Science, our black students showed a decrease in proficiency on the Statewide Assessment.

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

Many of our students were still suffering from learning loss due to COVID. Those that participated in Digital Learning during the 20-21 school year did not get the hands on science experiences as they would have being in school.

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

Our Students with Disabilities, Asian, Black, Hispanic, Multiracial, and White students all increased in proficiency in ELA Achievement and Math Achievement. Our Students with Disabilities increased Learning Gains in ELA and Math.

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

In ELA, our lowest 25th%ile received supplemental instruction through Lexia. This assisted intermediate students with closing gaps in phonics. Our Tier 2 and Tier 3 students received both ESE services (if applicable) and support from the reading coach in research based supplemental programs, depending on their needs.
In Math, teachers had increased knowledge of iReady to guide instruction, incorporated more small group instruction.

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

With the new progress monitoring system (FAST), we will be able to monitor the strengths and weaknesses of all learners. Our new Savvas ELA curriculum provides opportunities to develop students who need acceleration. Our Accelerated Reading Program will continue to challenge learners to increase their reading levels. Our IReady math program will meet students at their level, providing support for those who need acceleration. For grades 3-5, IXL will be used as well. Teachers will differentiate instruction for all students in the classroom. All students in K-5 will utilize Lexia which will help close learning gaps in early reading milestones.

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.

Collaborative planning, Lexia training, Savvas training, support from Reading Coach.

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

Continuous collaborative planning, support from Reading Coach (e.g. modeling lessons), Interventionist support in both reading and math.

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 B.E.S.T. Standards	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	This year is the second year using the B.E.S.T. standards in K-2 and the first year using the B.E.S.T. standards in grades 3-5. It is critical for teachers to learn, understand, and know the standards so they are able to assist students with mastering them.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	80% of our students will show mastery of the B.E.S.T. standards through F.A.S.T. progress monitoring data.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	FAST progress monitoring
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	William Millard (millardw@leonschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Teachers will use questions to check for understanding within lessons while teaching the standards. However, you should always check for understanding before moving onto the next part of their lesson. Techniques such as exit tickets, student answer-boards and tell-a-friend will help to check for understanding before moving on.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	Understanding of the lesson/standard should always be checked before moving on to the next lesson.

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.

1. B.E.S.T. and Savvas training
2. Grade level unpacking of standards
3. Grade level collaboration with lesson planning
4. Teacher observations/feedback

Person Responsible William Millard (millardw@leonschools.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Our Free and Reduced Lunch students decreased in ELA Achievement, ELA Learning Gains, and Science Achievement, and our Black population of student decreased in Science Achievement.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	65% of FRL students will show proficiency on the FAST Progress Monitoring #3. 70% of our FRL students will show gains in ELA from the 1st to the 3rd FAST Progress Monitoring. 50 % of our black students will show proficiency in Science based on the Florida Statewide Science Assessment.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Progress Monitoring results
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Explicitly teaching students how to use relevant strategies. Strategies may include how to attack unknown words, as well as strategies that will deepen their comprehension.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	From assignments and studying, to characterization, there are strategies underpinning the effective execution of many tasks that you ask students to perform in school. And, just as with content, you need to teach students about these strategies, to show them how to use them and to give them guided practice before asking them to use them independently.

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.

1. Analyze baseline data for subgroups.
2. Plan for differentiation based on needs of students in subgroups.

Person Responsible   William Millard (millardw@leonschools.net)

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

n/a

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

n/a

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)

n/a

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

n/a

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.

n/a

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

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. §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?

n/a

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?

n/a

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

n/a

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.

Buck Lake Elementary is truly a community school. Programs in our school are designed to meet the needs of all students. Classrooms are infused with traditional resources and technology that help students access curricula and learn about areas of interest. Our teachers use research-based practices, coupled with innovative techniques to prepare students to be productive, respectful members of a larger community. Our families are extremely supportive, as evidenced by the thousands of volunteer hours logged, constant presence, and participation on committees such as SAC and PTO. Our students are part of a school family with adults who care, are knowledgeable, and will support them to grow into life-long learners and leaders.

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

Faculty and staff, families of students, volunteers, and students work together to ensure a positive culture and environment at Buck Lake Elementary School.