

Manatee County Public Schools

Ballard 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	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Ballard Elementary School

912 18TH ST W, Bradenton, FL 34205

<https://www.manateeschools.net/ballard>

Demographics

Principal: Rudy Keezer

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-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 (49%) 2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: D (38%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
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 Manatee 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	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Ballard Elementary School

912 18TH ST W, Bradenton, FL 34205

<https://www.manateeschools.net/ballard>

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School PK-5</p>	<p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">Yes</p>	<p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="font-size: 24px;">79%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Manatee 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.

We believe that all students are important and valuable.
 We believe that challenge does not break us but is the foundation for our success.
 We believe that our dreams and goals will be reached through hard work and effort.
 We believe that effort is the key to our success.
 We believe that all students will be successful everyday who work hard and try.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Ballard will be a collaborative learning community of students, families, and staff aspiring to create leaders and positive role models who will serve as anchors for the future. We will empower all students to achieve their highest level of academic excellence, and we will work cooperatively to establish a respectful and supportive learning environment.

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
Keezer, Rudy	Principal	Lead the Senior Leadership Team, delegate, and monitor all aspects of the school with a priority in student achievement, student behavior, and school safety. Develop capacity and future school leaders.
Oliva, Mary	Assistant Principal	Lead MTSS and ILT teams, lead and monitor state assessments, implement core instruction, monitor and plan Title 1 initiatives.
Brumby, Jessica	Instructional Coach	Create and analyze assessments that drive instruction, expert in curriculum, model, coach, and support implementation of instruction.
Adriano, Victoria	Dean	Assessment coordinator, life skills coordinator, attendance monitor, MTSS chair, monitor implementation of interventions (academic and behavior).
Miller, Nancy	Dean	Cooperative learning, modeling, coaching, and monitoring of academic, attendance, and behavior data.
Carrilo, Mariela	Curriculum Resource Teacher	IST chair, support teachers as expert in curriculum.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/1/2021, Rudy Keezer

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.*

3

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.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

23

Total number of students enrolled at the school

394

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

3

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

4

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	64	47	53	68	57	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	363
Attendance below 90 percent	2	16	19	22	19	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	99
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	3	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9
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	12	27	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	75
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	12	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	5	14	27	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82

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	0	5	14	27	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	82

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Friday 9/2/2022

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	57	53	54	74	68	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	364
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	57	53	54	74	68	58	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	364
Attendance below 90 percent	0	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	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 FSA ELA assessment	0	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	0
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Students retained two or more times	0	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	37%	55%	56%				35%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	47%						47%	57%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	59%						53%	55%	53%
Math Achievement	45%	50%	50%				52%	63%	63%
Math Learning Gains	56%						69%	68%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	53%						63%	53%	51%
Science Achievement	45%	65%	59%				29%	48%	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	35%	51%	-16%	58%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	25%	56%	-31%	58%	-33%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				
05	2022					
	2019	40%	52%	-12%	56%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-25%				

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	51%	60%	-9%	62%	-11%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	43%	65%	-22%	64%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-51%				
05	2022					
	2019	54%	60%	-6%	60%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	26%	48%	-22%	53%	-27%
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	23	31	17	47	50	30				
ELL	29	50	67	35	51	50	37				
BLK	31	48		34	54						
HSP	31	45	60	40	48	50	36				
MUL	50			40							
WHT	52	45		66	78		58				
FRL	38	49	58	44	55	52	43				
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	14	29		26	35	27	38				
ELL	26	38	40	54	54		30				
BLK	28	42		37	50		16				
HSP	30	40	42	54	63		45				
MUL	36			45							
WHT	54	42		54	42		42				
FRL	30	39	45	46	58	40	41				
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	17	28	44	26	53	50	10				
ELL	32	53	54	50	73	73	45				
BLK	27	37	33	42	64	64	12				
HSP	30	45	65	55	71	63	30				
MUL	47	60		71	80						
WHT	56	59		56	68		27				
FRL	33	50	54	49	68	69	25				

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	51
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	63
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	405
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	97%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	30
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	48
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	
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	42
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	47
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	45
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	
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	60
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	51
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?

After analyzing our 2021-2022 school grade data, a common trend with our L25 students became apparent. We did not meet our school goal for lowest quartile student learning gains in both ELA and Math. ELA L25 learning gains were 59%, which was an 11% deficiency from our goal of 70%. Math L25 learning gains were 53%, which was a 17% deficiency from our goal of 70%. In addition, our 4th grade ELA proficiency was only 22%, which was significantly below the other grade levels. 5th grade math proficiency was 37%, which was 13% below our overall achievement goal of 50% in math. We exceeded our Science proficiency goal of 37% as 45% of our students were proficient.

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

For the 2021-2022 school year, overall ELA proficiency was 37%, overall ELA learning gains was 47% and overall ELA lowest quartile was 59%. Our 3rd grade ELA proficiency was at 39%, 4th grade proficiency was at 24%, and 5th grade proficiency was at 51%. ELA Learning Gains were as follows: 3rd 64%, 4th 29%, and 5th 67%. ELA Lowest Quartile Learning Gains were as follows: 3rd 78%, 4th 44%, and 5th 55%. This data supports the need for overall improvement in the ELA buckets, specifically 4th grade.

We did not meet our overall goals for Math proficiency (45% vs. 50%), learning gains (56% vs. 65%), or lowest quartile learning gains (53% vs. 70%). However, when we look at specific grade-levels, we determined that 3rd grade was our strength. 3rd grade exceeded our overall school goals in proficiency, learning gains, and lowest quartile learning gains. In addition, our 5th grade learning gains was 64%, which is just 1% shy of our overall goal. This data supports the need for overall improvement in Math lowest quartile gains (4th & 5th) and 5th grade proficiency (37%).

The 2021-2022, Science scores revealed a proficiency score of 45%. This exceeded our goal of 37% by 8%.

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

In 2021-2022, we moved 2 of our 3rd grade teachers to 4th grade to help support the students' transition. The year prior, many of the 3rd graders had been eLearners and worked with these teachers. During the fall semester, one of these teachers, who was also the 4th grade team leader, unexpectedly moved out of state. Around the same time, one of our 3rd grade teachers resigned her position due to personal circumstances. In January, another 3rd grade teacher had to take medical leave. These 3 positions represented 30% of our teachers in grades 3-5. Although we posted the positions throughout the school year, we were not able to fill the 3rd grade positions until February 2022. We were not able to fill the 4th grade teacher position and had to rely on school staff to fill this need. At the end of the 2021-2022 school year, the 2 remaining 4th grade teachers resigned and found jobs at schools closer to their homes. This year, we were able to fully staff our 4th grade teaching positions. We will be able to close the achievement gap for ELA by providing daily small group instruction utilizing the guided reading framework. In addition, we are following the walk to read model during extended hour. In math, students are ability grouped during core instruction and we are providing the accelerated math course. Students will be ability grouped for Math Club based on Acaletics Scrimmage data.

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

The areas that showed the most improvement from 2020-2021 to 2021-2022 were ELA Lowest Quartile Learning Gains (+12%), Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains (+12%), and Science Achievement (+9). Additionally, we increased 3% in ELA Achievement.

ELA Achievement

2021-2022 37%

2020-2021 34%

ELA Lowest Quartile Learning Gains

2021-2022 59%

2020-2021 49%

Math Lowest Quartile Learning Gains

2021-2022 53%

2020-2021 41%

Science Achievement

2021-2022 45%

2020-2021 37%

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

Students in 3rd and 4th grade have been placed into Math Acceleration courses during math core instruction based on achievement data (FSA & Benchmark Assessments). In ELA, students are ability grouped during Extended Hour where we have implemented the Walk to Read model. All teachers follow the ELA and Math Instructional Framework, and we have placed an emphasis on targeted small group instruction.

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

In order to accelerate learning in all academic areas, the main instructional focus will be targeted small group instruction for ELA and Math. We will analyze assessment data during TCTs and adjust groups and instruction accordingly. We will implement a Walk to Read model during Extended Hour and follow the District's Accelerated Math Curriculum. We will utilize all instructional staff to support small group learning. Teachers will participate in vertical grade-level planning.

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.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies previously identified, ongoing professional development will occur throughout the school year. Our instructional staff will participate in the District's Professional development (Benchmark Advance, Envision, Acaletics, Successmaker, First in Math, STAR CBM Progress Monitoring, K/1 Literacy Footprints etc.). Our reading coach, SSSs, and Resource Teacher will facilitate site-based professional development throughout the year through facilitated TCTs, PLCs, etc. Additionally, K-5 teachers will participate in 'Gap Eliminator' professional development sessions to close the achievement gap in ELA and math (following Benchmark Assessments and running record assessments).

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

In order to ensure the sustainability of improvement for the 2022-2023 school year and beyond, we will strengthen our school community by continuing to implement our schoolwide PBIS framework, House System, and our mentoring program, Ballard Cubs Club. We have had very low staff turnover, and we strive to build teacher capacity.

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.

For the 2021-2022 school year, overall ELA proficiency in grades 3-5 was 37%, overall ELA learning gains was 47% and ELA lowest quartile learning gains was 59%. In order to increase overall achievement in ELA, our main instructional focus will be targeted small group instruction for ELA . We will analyze assessment data during TCTs and adjust groups and instruction accordingly. We will implement a Walk to Read model during Extended Hour. We will utilize all instructional staff to support small group learning. Teachers will participate in vertical grade-level planning.

Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By the end of the 2022-2023 school year, 40% or more of students in grades K-5 will be performing on grade level in ELA as evidenced by state assessments. Last year we increased our proficiency in 3rd grade from 29% to 39%. This year our goal is to move 3rd grade proficiency to 40%.

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

This area of focus will be monitored through the Next Step Forward in Guided Reading running records assessments (K/1), common formative assessments, Benchmark Advanced Unit Assessments, SRA Mastery Tests, District Benchmark Assessments, and state assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Nancy Miller (millern@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being

During ELA core, teachers follow the ELA Instructional Framework. We have placed an emphasis on targeted small-group instruction and guided reading. In addition, all students are provided with an additional hour of daily reading instruction focusing on an individualized needs. Students are ability grouped during Extended Hour where we have implemented the Walk to Read model. Small-group differentiated guided reading instruction is evidence-based and supports students in developing reading proficiency. It acknowledges that children bring different backgrounds and instructional experiences to the reading process and therefore move forward at different rates. This small-group model

implemented for this Area of Focus. allows teachers to target learning needs, provide appropriate scaffolding, and gradually reduce support to promote independence. With the implementation of this framework, teachers will create instructional groups based on each student's individual needs. As students progress participate, they will be working towards reading proficiency. Students below grade level will receive additional intervention based on their needs.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy. Our focus is to improve reading fluency and comprehension in an individualized learning environment. Students with disabilities, Tier II and Tier III students will receive, explicit, systematic, and multisensory interventions included, but are not limited to: Literacy Footprints, Literacy Footprints Intervention Kit, SRA Corrective Reading, and Benchmark Advance Tier 3 Phonics Intervention Kits. The Literacy Footprints/Intervention Partner Kit: Three of the four recommendations in the Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten through 3rd Grade Guide (What Works Clearing House and Institute of Education Sciences-IES, 2016) are supported within this program. Recommendation 2 and 3 have strong evidence and recommendation 4 has moderate evidence. The frameworks and lessons are also grounded in Reading Recovery which has a strong rating according to the Evidence for ESSA website. SRA Corrective Reading: According to WWC (2007), Corrective Reading was found to have potentially positive effects on alphabets and fluency.

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. Train instructional staff on B.E.S.T. standards and new curriculum that supports these standards during PLCs and Collaborative planning. Curriculum would include state approved textbooks, district and school purchased resources such as Benchmark Advance, iReady, Reading Eggs, Imagine Learning, and Literacy Footprints that support the state standards.
2. Administer beginning of year assessments.
3. Analyze assessment data to form groups.
4. Implement instruction during core and extended hour.
5. Progress monitor
6. Analyze data and regroup as necessary.

Person Responsible Nancy Miller (millern@manateeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Based on the 21-22 FSA Math assessment data, our school did not meet our overall goals for Math proficiency (45% vs. 50%), learning gains (56% vs. 65%), or lowest quartile learning gains (53% vs. 70%). Barriers identified include 3 of our intermediate teachers resigned for personal reasons by the middle of the school year, and we were unable to initially hire for these positions. We had to use school support staff to fill these needs.

Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By the end of the 2022-2023 school year, 50% or more of students in grades K-5 will be performing on grade level in Math as evidenced by state assessments.

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Math achievement will be monitored using data from monthly Acaletics Math Scrimmage, common formative assessments, Quarterly District Benchmark Assessments, and state assessments. Teachers will participate in the gap eliminator data analysis process after each Quarterly District Benchmark Assessment in order to determine strategies specific to individual students in order to increase student achievement to meet the SIP goals.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mary Oliva (olivam@manateeschools.net)

In order to accelerate learning and increase proficiency in core Math, we will implement the District's Accelerated Math Curriculum. We will analyze assessment data during TCTs and adjust groups and instruction accordingly. We will utilize instructional staff to support small group learning. Teachers participate in vertical grade-level planning.

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

Spiral review will be provided using the Acaletics program in grades 2-5. Each month, students will complete the monthly Acaletics Scrimmage assessment. Teachers will use the data from the Scrimmage to create differentiated instructional groups. Teachers across each grade-level will teach the same Acaletics lessons/content for 30-minutes daily. Students will be regrouped throughout the school year based on assessment data from monthly Scrimmages and Quarterly District Benchmark data. Resource teachers will support small group instruction.

As a Learning-Focused school, we implement high yield evidence based strategies. This includes explicit vocabulary instruction, higher order thinking, writing across content areas, and using graphic organizers.

Rationale for Evidence-based

Acaletics Math will be utilized in grades 2-5, geared towards previewing and reviewing

Strategy: grade-level standards that spiral throughout the school year. Acaletics student groups will

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. be by ability level, and our math resource teacher will support small group instruction.

Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy. According to The High-Performance Learning-Focused Lesson V9 (2018), the Learning-Focused Instructional Framework integrates and connect the following top research-based learning strategies in every Learning-Focused Lesson: Higher Order Thinking 1.61 effect size, Vocabulary Instruction .85 effect size, Writing to Raise Achievement .82 effect size, and advanced organizers .73 effect size.

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. Train instructional staff on Acaletics.
2. Administer first monthly Acaletics Scrimmage.
3. Following each Scrimmage, teachers will review the Scrimmage with students in class over 5 days and reteach based on student need.
4. Analyze assessment data to form groups.
5. After the review days, teachers will teach Math Quik Piks 30-min. daily.
6. Repeat steps 2-5 monthly.
7. Teachers will analyze quarterly district benchmark data through the gap eliminator process to determine strategies specific to individual students in order to increase student achievement to meet the SIP goals.

Person Responsible Mary Oliva (olivam@manateeschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus

Description and Rationale:

According to 2021-2022 SSA data, 45% of our fifth grade students showed proficiency in Science. As a WOZ school, we are striving to integrate pathways for our students in the areas of science and technology. Ballard will incorporate standards-based science instruction at all grade levels. We will also integrate science across all content areas by exposing students to real-life investigations within our Science Lab.

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

By the end of the 2022-2023 school year, 40% or more of 5th grade students will be performing on grade level in Science as evidenced by the state assessment.

Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Science progress will be monitored using Acaletics Science Scrimmage Data, Common Formative Assessments as well as District Benchmark Assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mary Oliva (olivam@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.

We will implement daily Science instruction for all fifth grade students. Science scrimmages will be administered once per month and teachers will consistently regroup students based on data. In addition to standards-based science instruction, teachers will work with the instructional coach to embed science across all content areas

As a Learning-Focused school, we implement high yield evidence based strategies. This includes explicit vocabulary instruction, higher order thinking, writing across content areas, and using graphic organizers.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

We have had a great deal of success with Acaletics in Math and Science instruction. Continuing to use Acaletics for Science will not only expose our students to Science content, but to Science Vocabulary, which is an area where they have struggled in the past on SSA.

According to The High-Performance Learning-Focused Lesson V9 (2018), the Learning-Focused Instructional Framework integrates and connect the following top research-based learning strategies in every Learning-Focused Lesson: Higher Order Thinking 1.61 effect size, Vocabulary Instruction .85 effect size, Writing to Raise Achievement .82 effect size, and advanced organizers .73 effect size.

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. Administer beginning of year assessments.
3. Analyze assessment data to form groups.
4. Implement instruction.

5. Progress monitor
6. Analyze data and regroup as necessary.

Person Responsible Mary Oliva (olivam@manateeschools.net)

#4. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Positive Behavioral Interventions and Support

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Our data from 2021-2022 FOCUS data shows that 44% of disciplinary referrals were [AG] aggression (31 referrals of 70). We want to look deeper into Tiered II/III intervention systems to implement and practice preventative strategies and build a more positive environment. Tier II: Interventions on a class basis, specialized instruction through character education aimed towards classrooms. Tier III: Interventions on an individual basis, specialized instruction catered to individual behavioral needs of the student. Analysis of social gains, school environment and referral data will be used to assess progress.
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Measurable Outcome:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.
 By end of 22/23 school year, Ballard students will consistently demonstrate behaviors that reflect a respectful, responsible and safe school climate - Measurable through disciplinary referrals. Demonstrating at least a 10% decrease in [AG] aggression referrals compared to 2021-2022 data.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.
 Check-in, in class implementation of lifeskills in announcements and daily review. Student participation of House Systems, and progress monitoring through usage and assessments. Quarterly FOCUS data review, analyze need for support.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
 Victoria Adriano (adrianov@manateeschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.
 Utilizing high yield, rapid response practices such as PBIS, the Ron Clark House System, restorative practices, daily check-ins and climate survey of students, has been proven to be effective strategies to address student behavior. Research shows that behavior improves when lifeskills strategies are practiced and implemented into curriculum consistently. Students have shown a positive trend in behavior when provided with multiple strategies to utilize in class or independently.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific
 These strategies are selected based on student data and need, indicating that students consistently struggle with appropriate decision-making and emotional well-being and handling.

**strategy.
Describe the
resources/
criteria used for
selecting this
strategy.**

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.

- a. Classroom teachers in K-5 will incorporate lifeskills lessons into their instruction.
- b. Professional developments will be help centered around Growth Mindset and tiered intervention systems.
- c. PBIS and Ron Clark House System will be utilized schoolwide to increase student engagement, motivation and positive supports.
- d. Utilize taught de-escalation strategies (restorative practices, PBIS) to shape behavior.

Person Responsible Victoria Adriano (adrianov@manateeschools.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

We follow the School District of Manatee County's Assessment/Curriculum Decision Tree and implement the ELA Instructional Framework. All students receive Tier 1 instruction, which is standards-aligned. Our core resource is Benchmark Advance. For Tier 2 & Tier 3 instruction, students received small-group guided reading instruction (Literacy Footprints, Literacy Footprints Intervention, Benchmark Advance Differentiated Lessons). ELL students (new or with 2.9 or below ACCESS) utilize Imagine Learning Language and Literacy. In addition, all students are provided with an additional hour of daily reading

instruction focusing on an individualized needs. Students are ability grouped during Extended Hour where we have implemented the Walk to Read model. Small-group differentiated guided reading instruction is evidence-based and supports students in developing reading proficiency.

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

We follow the School District of Manatee County's Assessment/Curriculum Decision Tree and implement the ELA Instructional Framework. All students receive Tier 1 instruction, which is standards-aligned. Our core resource is Benchmark Advance. For Tier 2 & Tier 3 instruction, students received small-group guided reading instruction (Benchmark Advance Differentiated Lessons, SRA Corrective Reading). ELL students (new or with 2.9 or below ACCESS) utilize Imagine Learning Language and Literacy. In addition, all students are provided with an additional hour of daily reading instruction focusing on an individualized needs. Students are ability grouped during Extended Hour where we have implemented the Walk to Read model. Small-group differentiated guided reading instruction is evidence-based and supports students in developing reading proficiency.

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)

2021-2022 Running Records (May)
 Kindergarten 23/49=47%, 53% below L3
 Grade 1 19/52=37%, 63% below L3
 Grade 2 24/55=44%, 56% below L3

2021-2022 ELA i-Ready Spring
 Kindergarten 42/49=86% on level, 14% below level
 Grade 1 22/52=42% on level, 58% below level
 Grade 2 25/55=45% on level, 55% below level

By the end of the 2022-2023 school year, 40% of students in grades K-5 will be performing on grade level in ELA as evidenced by state assessments.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

2021-2022 ELA FSA Proficiency:
 Grade 3 25/64=39%, 61% below L3
 Grade 4 15/62=24%, 76% below L3
 Grade 5 25/49=51%, 49% below L3

By the end of the 2022-2023 school year, 40% of students in grades K-5 will be performing on grade level in ELA as evidenced by state assessments.

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.

Our Reading Coach, SSSs, and Resource Teachers will work with grade-level team leaders to plan and facilitate weekly collaborate planning and PLCs. Team leaders submit meeting notes to administration as evidence of their meetings. This area of focus will be monitored through the Next Step Forward in Guided Reading running records assessments (K/1), common formative assessments, Benchmark Advanced Unit Assessments, SRA Mastery Tests, District Benchmark Assessments, and state assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Brumby, Jessica, brumbyj@manateeschools.net

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?

During ELA core, teachers follow the ELA Instructional Framework. We have placed an emphasis on targeted small-group instruction and guided reading. In addition, all students are provided with an additional hour of daily reading instruction focusing on an individualized needs. Students are ability grouped during Extended Hour where we have implemented the Walk to Read model. Small-group differentiated guided reading instruction is evidence-based and supports students in developing reading proficiency. It acknowledges that children bring different backgrounds and instructional experiences to the reading process and therefore move forward at different rates. This small-group model allows teachers to target learning needs, provide appropriate scaffolding, and gradually reduce support to promote independence. With the implementation of this framework, teachers will create instructional groups based on each student's individual needs. As students progress participate, they will be working towards reading proficiency. Students below grade level will receive additional intervention based on their needs.

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?

Our focus is to improve reading fluency and comprehension. SWD, Tier II and Tier III students will receive, explicit, systematic, and multisensory interventions included, but are not limited to: Literacy Footprints, Literacy Footprints Intervention Kit, SRA CR, Benchmark Advance Tier 3 Phonics Intervention Kits. The

Literacy Footprints/Intervention Partner Kit: Three of the four recommendations in the Foundational Skills to Support Reading for Understanding in Kindergarten through 3rd Grade Guide (WWC, 2016) are supported within this program. The frameworks and lessons are grounded in Reading Recovery which has a strong rating according to the Evidence for ESSA website. SRA CR: According to WWC (2007), CR was found to have potentially positive effects on alphabets and fluency.

The High-Performance Learning-Focused Lesson V9 (2018), the Learning-Focused Instructional Framework integrates and connects the following top research-based learning strategies: Higher Order Thinking (1.61) Vocabulary Instruction (.85), Writing to Raise Achievement (.82) advanced organizers (.73).

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
-------------	-----------------------------------

1. Fund Reading Coach position, Resource Teacher position, and NCH for Facilitated Collaborative Planning through Title I.
2. Reading Coach, SSSs, and Resource Teachers work with Team Leaders to identify collaborative planning and PLC dates.
3. Implement weekly facilitated collaborative planning and PLCs.
4. Identify 2 Teacher Leaders (1 primary, 1 intermediate) to co-chair the Literacy Leadership Team.
5. Schedule Literacy Leadership Team meeting.
6. Assess students to determine small-group placement.
7. Implement instruction, collect data.
8. Analyze data, reflect, and revise plans as necessary.
9. Participate in and implement the professional development provided by the State Regional Literacy Directors to improve early learning instruction.
10. Implement the Decision-Trees from the Comprehensive Evidenced-based Reading Plan for reading intervention instruction.

Brumby, Jessica,
brumbyj@manateeschools.net

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.

Building relationships between students, parents, and teachers is a collaborative effort of all Ballard staff and community. Parents and students are invited to Open House before school starts to begin building a partnership with the school. The school partners with community organizations and churches to provide parents with free backpacks, supplies, shoes and resources. Other activities that help build relationships with students are Ballard Parent events focusing on strategies parents can use with their children to improve relationships and academics, Fall/Spring Activities such as Literacy Night and Spring Fling, Ballard Family Association, and Parent-Teacher conferences. Parents are also invited to attend our School Advisory Council meetings every other month. Parents receive communication about events via Classroom DoJo, Connect Ed and flyers. Communicating to parents is vital to our success with parent involvement. Teachers and administration utilize Classroom DoJo to communicate with parents regarding school activities, news, events and follow a 3/1 mindset (three positive phone calls for very negative). ConnectEd phone calls are made to families on a regular basis to remind parents of upcoming events.

Ballard also sends home folders with graded work, flyers, and communication about important school events every week. PBIS is utilized as the foundation of the schools positive culture and positive behavioral incentives and management strategies are used throughout the school. Restorative practices are used when processing and reacting in situations with our students. Ballard will be participating in a whole school Housing System, based on the Ron Clark Houses. With this system, we will continue to build a positive, inclusive and equitable setting, that empowers all learners and cultivates an effective learning environment. The school website also offers links to our school calendar specific to Ballard. Items include: student behavior and school behavior expectations, uniforms, and teacher and district information sites. The Graduation Enhancement Technician makes positive home visits to encourage good attendance.

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

Our Dean/Student Support Specialist Victoria Adriano is the PBIS chair and MTSS Facilitator. PBIS team consists of a representative from each grade level, a fine arts representative, Guidance Counselor and Administration. Each team member is driven in creating and promoting an equitable, effective and positive learning environment for our students. This is done through school-wide incentives, positive behavior intervention system, implementing character education curriculum with fidelity, monitoring student behaviors and each staff modeling/practicing expectations. Each staff member embodies our vision of empowering all students to achieve their highest level of academic excellence, while establishing a respectful, supportive and safe learning environment.