# Bunnell Elementary School



# 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# Bunnell Elementary School

### 305 N PALMETTO ST, Bunnell, FL 32110

### www.flaglerschools.com

## Demographics

## Principal: Marcus Sanfilippo

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>PK-5 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2021-22 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 75% |
| **2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students*<br>Hispanic Students*<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2021-22: C (49%)<br><br>2018-19: C (52%)<br><br>2017-18: C (48%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Northeast |
| **Regional Executive Director** | [Cassandra Brusca](#) |
| **Turnaround Option/Cycle** | N/A |
| **Year** | |
| **Support Tier** | |
| **ESSA Status** | TSI |
| * 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 Flagler 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.](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

# Bunnell Elementary School

## 305 N PALMETTO ST, Bunnell, FL 32110

## www.flaglerschools.com

## School Demographics

| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | **2021-22 Title I School** | **2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5 | Yes | 75% |

| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate**<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 40% |

## 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 Flagler 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.**

Flagler County Public Schools ensures educational success through high expectations and innovative thinking in a safe learning environment to empower students to reach their full potential as responsible, ethical, and productive citizens in a diverse and changing world.

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

As a courageous, innovative leader in education, Flagler County Public Schools will be the Nation's premier learning organization where ALL students graduate as socially responsible citizens with the skills necessary to reach their maximum potential.

### 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 |
|------|---------------|--------------------------------|
| Sanfilippo, Marcus | Principal | Instructional school leader overseeing all schoolwide practices, educators, school employees, and classroom instructional routines. |
| Evensen, Donelle | Assistant Principal | |
| Hankerd, Cari | Assistant Principal | Assistant principal assigned to oversee grades 3-5, Community Engagement, Behavior, and MTSS. |
| Adams, April | Reading Coach | Literacy Coach. Meets regularly with teachers and leadership team to assess individual student and school data to make instructional decisions. |
| Jaques, Robin | Instructional Coach | Literacy Coach. Meets regularly with K-2 teachers and leadership team to assess individual student and school data to make instructional decisions. |
| Westly, Tom | Math Coach | Math/Science Coach. Meets regularly with teachers and leadership team to assess individual student and school data to make instructional decisions. |

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Friday 7/1/2016, Marcus Sanfilippo

**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.*

7

**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.*

9

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

52

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

1,155

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

10

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

11

**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 | 155 | 144 | 169 | 178 | 172 | 179 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 997 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 17 | 24 | 27 | 29 | 24 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 146 |
| One or more suspensions | 3 | 8 | 6 | 10 | 4 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 49 |
| Course failure in ELA | 3 | 3 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |
| Course failure in Math | 3 | 2 | 5 | 15 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 31 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 25 | 38 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 25 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 95 |
| 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 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |

**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 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 |
| 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**

Tuesday 8/16/2022

**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 | 134 | 148 | 156 | 176 | 154 | 154 | 174 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1096 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 15 | 26 | 23 | 23 | 19 | 30 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 156 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 8 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 15 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 |
| Course failure in ELA | 1 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 17 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 14 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 53 | 34 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 157 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 78 | 29 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 163 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 13 | 51 | 52 | 25 | 62 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 279 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |

**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 | 1 | 0 | 16 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| 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 | 134 | 148 | 156 | 176 | 154 | 154 | 174 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1096 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 15 | 26 | 23 | 23 | 19 | 30 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 156 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 8 | 4 | 6 | 5 | 15 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 |
| Course failure in ELA | 1 | 6 | 3 | 0 | 3 | 17 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 | 14 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 22 | 53 | 34 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 157 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 28 | 78 | 29 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 163 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 13 | 51 | 52 | 25 | 62 | 76 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 279 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |

**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 | 1 | 0 | 16 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 24 |
| 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 | 50% | 61% | 56% | | | | 52% | 63% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 55% | | | | | | 54% | 60% | 58% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 47% | | | | | | 49% | 53% | 53% |
| Math Achievement | 50% | 49% | 50% | | | | 59% | 66% | 63% |
| Math Learning Gains | 57% | | | | | | 58% | 62% | 62% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 51% | | | | | | 51% | 49% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 36% | 63% | 59% | | | | 44% | 55% | 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 | 58% | 68% | -10% | 58% | 0% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 45% | 60% | -15% | 58% | -13% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -58% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 45% | 58% | -13% | 56% | -11% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -45% | | | | |

| 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 | 65% | 72% | -7% | 62% | 3% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 43% | 60% | -17% | 64% | -21% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -65% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 58% | 58% | 0% | 60% | -2% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -43% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 42% | 53% | -11% | 53% | -11% |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 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 | 16 | 34 | 29 | 21 | 39 | 37 | 6 | | | | |
| ELL | 52 | 59 | | 61 | 59 | | | | | | |
| ASN | 80 | | | 80 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 28 | 44 | 38 | 29 | 44 | 31 | 13 | | | | |
| HSP | 51 | 59 | 62 | 46 | 54 | 69 | 33 | | | | |
| MUL | 48 | 63 | | 44 | 33 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 56 | 57 | 47 | 56 | 62 | 67 | 42 | | | | |
| FRL | 45 | 53 | 47 | 45 | 55 | 53 | 34 | | | | |
| 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 | 12 | 24 | 26 | 16 | 25 | 38 | 10 | | | | |
| ELL | 35 | 17 | | 50 | 48 | | | | | | |
| ASN | 55 | | | 55 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 28 | 23 | 12 | 27 | 35 | 23 | 27 | | | | |
| HSP | 49 | 32 | | 49 | 32 | | 60 | | | | |
| MUL | 39 | 30 | | 32 | 40 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 48 | 44 | 37 | 48 | 47 | 43 | 41 | | | | |
| FRL | 39 | 34 | 25 | 37 | 37 | 34 | 37 | | | | |
| 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 | 10 | 28 | 30 | 31 | 44 | 39 | 15 | | | | |
| ELL | 57 | 58 | | 69 | 58 | 60 | | | | | |
| ASN | 70 | 60 | | 80 | 70 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 32 | 46 | 47 | 36 | 49 | 50 | 23 | | | | |
| HSP | 59 | 53 | | 64 | 62 | 53 | 57 | | | | |
| MUL | 63 | 56 | | 70 | 75 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 56 | 57 | 52 | 63 | 59 | 49 | 49 | | | | |
| FRL | 45 | 51 | 47 | 51 | 53 | 50 | 39 | | | | |

## 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) | TSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 49 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 43 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 389 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| **Subgroup Data** | |
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 26 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 3 |
| **English Language Learners** | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 55 |
| 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 | 80 |
| 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 | 32 |
| 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 | 53 |

| Hispanic Students | |
|---|---|
| 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 | 47 |
| 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 | 55 |
| 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 | 46 |
| 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?**

Kindergarten through 2nd grade student mastery of phonics is increasing while the percent of student one or more grade levels behind is consistently decreasing. When compared to the state, all but 5th grade is growing at a greater rate than the state. 5th grade Science state assessment scores are consistently declining and 5th grade lowest quartile reading and math have had little to no growth from year to year. With our 2 lowest performing subgroups, Students with Disabilities and African American, student achievement is growing but has not met the Federal Percent of Points Index Rating of 41% with SWD at only 26%.

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

Science achievement
Subgroup achievement for both Students with Disabilities and African American students
5th grade ELA and Math achievement

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

The greatest contributing factor to the low achievement in Science, Students with Disabilities, and African American students is the lack of reading ability. Students struggling with reading comprehension and vocabulary exposure greatly increases the barrier for responding to content based questions. In order to address this need we will continue to remediate reading deficits starting in Kindergarten and intentionally focusing on modeling successful reading thought processes and responses. In addition we must put a strong focus on providing additional practice with foundational science vocabulary experiences with rigorous expectations for scientific responses from students following repeated modeling. The greatest contributing factor in 5th grade ELA and Math lack of achievement is the size of the gap in needed skills that must be filled in for students to perform on grade level. We have also recognized weaknesses within instructional data trends with particular staff members that have been teaching 5th grade. In order to address this need we must be very intentional about providing opportunities to gain missing skills in reading and math including the ESE/MTSS schedules so that we focus on using time frames and strategies that we have experienced success. We will also need to shift teaching teams to best utilize their strengths and in order to provide mentors to increase teacher effectiveness within the 5th grade classrooms and with identified teachers.

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

Kindergarten through 2nd grade student mastery of phonics is increasing while the percent of student one or more grade levels behind is consistently decreasing. When compared to the state, all but 5th grade is growing at a greater rate than the state. Learning gains by students in the lowest quartile experienced significant increases.

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

In Kindergarten through 2nd grade we have adopted a consistent phonics curriculum with this being the first year that 2nd graders have participated in this instruction every year since Kindergarten. We have been consistent and intentional about reviewing data around phonics achievement, providing professional learning throughout the school year, and included it in our School Improvement goal. In order to achieve greater levels of growth across the board including students in the lowest quartile we have implemented time frames across campus, PUP time, in which all students are provided instruction that meets their specific gaps and/or challenges them to learn at a deeper level for those performing on grade level. We have increased opportunities for students to generalize what they are learning through ESE/MTSS instructional services for many of our lowest quartile students through our high support classrooms which is increasing the rate of growth and confidence for those students.

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

In order to continue phonics and reading improvement into 3rd through 5th grade we will expand the phonics curriculum into Tier 1 reading instruction in 3rd grade and provide consistency with thinking maps students use for understanding text structure in grades 3rd through 5th. We will need to be very intentional about schedules for interventionists and support facilitators to expand on the opportunities for students to use what they are learning in all academic settings. We will also need to provide additional opportunities for Science and foundational Math experiences that are engaging and rigorous with targeted students based on lowest quartile and students on the cusp of grade level achievement.

**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.**

Wilson Fundations phonics training will be provided to new teachers before beginning instruction and throughout the year for all K-3rd teachers.
Modeling by instructional coaches for the use of common thinking maps as well as training on best practices will be provided through job embedded opportunities and weekly grade level meetings.
Academic coaches and grade level teachers will be mentors for both new teachers and identified teachers to increase effectiveness within the grade level they serve.
Consistent and frequent data reviews will be conducted with the math/science coach, math and science wheel teachers, and administration to ensure the the instructional practices are successful with the targeted students and if they are not we will develop plans for making adjustments to that instruction.

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

For instructional practices such as PUP time administrators are creating standard operating procedure manuals to maintain success when it is achieved. A PUP time data sheet is maintained to track students meeting criteria and ready to focus on the next skill set to accelerate growth within the school year.
The mentor program is outlined with goals, topics of focus when mentoring, as well as opportunities for job embedded instructional rounds between mentor/mentee.
Progress monitoring data is collected in the math and science wheel classes 3 times per quarter to review and analyze for needed adjustments. When success is achieved as evidenced by the progress monitoring data it will support decisions for the following years on the special area opportunities provided and validify the need for a successful special area math/science course.
Phonics grade level scores are analyzed at least monthly in order to determine success as well as needs for instructional focuses within the classroom as well as PUP time.

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

**:**

| #1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities | |
| --- | --- |
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** | Students with disabilities were identified as an ESSA subgroup based on student performance data. Overall, students with disabilities demonstrated a value of 26 on the federal percent of point index rating and.<br>According to 2021-22 iReady, the percent of students proficient across grade levels as compared to students with disabilities reveals a gap of 21 percentage points in ELA and Math. |
| **Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** | In the 2022-23 school year Bunnell Elementary will decrease the gap between grade level proficiency and proficiency of students with disabilities to 20 percentage points or less at all grade levels in ELA and Math as evidenced by grade level common assessments (Fundations, Benchmark, Savas), FAST assessments, and/or end of year iReady diagnostics. |
| **Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** | Teachers and students will track their own progress towards their goals with data chats taking place within the classroom. The leadership team will review all grade level ELA and Math assessments within a week of their completion to determine proficiency on each assessment as well as the gap between grade level proficiency and proficiency of students with disabilities. Leadership team members will hold data chats with classroom teachers on the results of these assessments including the success of students with disabilities. The leadership team will review FAST and iReady diagnostic assessments after each completion to determine proficiency on each assessment as well as the gap between grade level proficiency and proficiency of students with disabilities. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Donelle Evensen (evensend@flaglerschools.com) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being** | Classroom teachers as well as ESE teachers will hold data chats with all students in order to set goals and require students to graph those goals consistently throughout the school year. In participating in grade level meetings, ESE teachers will have a deeper understanding of vocabulary and concepts to be taught in the upcoming weeks and month in classrooms. Having this information will help them to create lesson plans and interventions that preview these vocabulary terms multiple times before it is used in the classroom and provide background knowledge on skills that will be necessary for students |

| | |
|---|---|
| **implemented for this Area of Focus.** | to better participate and understand the instruction within their homeroom classes when it is provided. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.** | According to Hattie's research with high yield strategies goal setting and follow through is effective as evidenced by self reported grades having an effect size of 1.33 followed by learning goals at .68 and goal commitment at .40. Previewing/Prior knowledge are also important with strategies to integrate prior knowledge having an effect size of .93 followed by acceleration at .68 |

### 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.

Teachers and ESE teachers will identify students falling into this ESSA category in their classroom and caseload along with their previous year data.

**Person Responsible**  April Adams (adamsa@flaglerschools.com)

Teachers will hold data chats with students to set and review individual goals for students and provide them information needed to graph their progress.

**Person Responsible**  Donelle Evensen (evensend@flaglerschools.com)

Data will be reviewed at grade level meetings at least quarterly to share progress in closing the achievement gap based on the grade level assessments given.

**Person Responsible**  April Adams (adamsa@flaglerschools.com)

| **#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American** | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** | Black/African American students were identified as an ESSA subgroup based on student performance data. Overall, Black/African American students demonstrated a value of 32 on the federal percent of point index rating. According to 2021-22 iReady, the percent of students proficient across grade levels as compared to African American students reveals a gap of 11 percentage points in ELA and 17 percentage points in Math. |
| **Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** | In the 2022-23 school year Bunnell Elementary will decrease the gap between grade level proficiency and proficiency of African American students to 15 percentage points or less at all grade levels for both ELA and Math as evidenced by grade level common assessments (Fundations, Benchmark, Savas), FAST assessments, and/or end of year iReady diagnostics. |
| **Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** | The leadership team will review all grade level ELA and Math assessments within a week of their completion to determine proficiency on each assessment as well as the gap between grade level proficiency and proficiency of African American students. Leadership team members will hold data chats with classroom teachers on the results of these assessments including the success of African American students. The leadership team will review FAST and iReady diagnostic assessments after each completion to determine proficiency on each assessment as well as the gap between grade level proficiency and proficiency of African American students. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Cari Hankerd (hankerdc@flaglerschools.com) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.** | Identified students will participate in mentoring that will include student data-driven conversations to include goal setting, steps toward improvement and growth, and follow-up. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the** | Research indicates that effective mentoring helps young people overcome barriers to academic achievement including: chronic absenteeism, inadequate academic preparation, multiple suspensions, poor academic performance, poverty, and repeating a grade.<br><br>Additionally, in an article published by edutopia.org, "surveyed students who were |

| **rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.** | tracking their data were substantially more likely to respond that they were trying their hardest, and felt in control of their learning than other students in the classroom." (Why Student Data Should be Students' Data, Li 2017) |
|---|---|

**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.

Students will be identified for mentoring with an emphasis on Black/African American students.

| **Person Responsible** | Cari Hankerd (hankerdc@flaglerschools.com) |
|---|---|

Mentoring with student data folders and goal setting frameworks to begin after the first midterm

| **Person Responsible** | Cari Hankerd (hankerdc@flaglerschools.com) |
|---|---|

| #3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** | According to our 2021-2022 Science FCAT data, only 44% of 5th grade students scored a level 3 or higher showing on grade level science achievement. While Science data has fluctuated in the past 5 years, 3 of those years have resulted in a proficiency level of 45% or less. |
| **Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** | The goal is for each class in grades 4 and 5 to score 70% or higher on the grade level Science assessments (Unit assessments and quarterlies). |
| **Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** | The leadership team will review all grade level Science assessments within a week of their completion to determine proficiency on each assessment as well as the critical areas to focus on reteaching. Leadership team members will hold data chats with classroom teachers on the results of these assessments. The leadership team will also review progress monitoring data collected 3 times per quarter from the Science on the wheel class to make any needed adjustments to science interventions provided. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Tom Westly (westlyt@flaglerschools.com) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.** | In addition to the evidence based core Science curriculum, students who are in need of additional practice and exposure to science vocabulary and content will receive these opportunities through participation in Science on the wheel. This will take place 5 days per week during special area for 9 week periods of time. This course will be taught by a qualified teacher focusing on hands on experiences rooted in vocabulary and expressed through writing. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.** | Students are selected intentionally for the described course based on the previous years ELA results and through teacher recommendations. According to Hattie's effect sizes, teacher estimates of achievement have a 1.29 effect size along with summarization at .79, rehearsal at .73, and vocabulary at .66. These evidence based strategies will be the foundation of the Science course provided. |

**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.

Identify students to participate in the first 9 weeks of the Science course based on 2021-22 ELA data and teacher recommendations prior to the beginning of the school year.

**Person Responsible**    Tom Westly (westlyt@flaglerschools.com)

Determine a progress monitoring tool to be given 3 times per 9 week rotation that requires students to summarize their understanding through written responses and utilizing science vocabulary.

**Person Responsible**    Tom Westly (westlyt@flaglerschools.com)

Meet at least monthly to make adjustments to instruction if progress monitoring does not show growth and to determine students to participate in each quarter of the Science course.

**Person Responsible**    Donelle Evensen (evensend@flaglerschools.com)

## 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

Data from iReady AP3 of the 2021-22 school year indicates Kindergarten and 1st grade are on track to be on grade level in 3rd grade, however 2nd grade students ended the year at 40% of students below grade level. Students in this grade level have missed critical instruction with many participating remotely during their previous grades. 2nd grade students made significant gains with 34% average increase of individual phonics skills according to the CORE reading assessment, however half of the skill areas were below 70% mastery at the end of the school year. In order to continue improving this phonics average to improve the upcoming 2nd grade student reading ability we will extend our Wilson Fundations phonics

instruction into 3rd grade as part of the core reading instruction. This will solidify students ability to decode and encode words so that they can begin to shift their focus from learning to read to reading to learn.

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

Data from FSA for the 2021-22 school year identifies both 3rd and 5th grade as grade levels in which less than 50% of students performed on grade level with 3rd grade at 49% and 5th grade being the lowest at 44%. iReady AP3 also identified 5th grade students as having the greatest struggle with only 36% of students scoring on grade level. In order to improve student comprehension they should fully grasp the purpose of what they are reading and how we read differently based on that purpose. Teachers will utilize scaffolding strategies along with thinking maps that are consistent across grade levels to help students identify text structures, and organize their reading and thoughts by that structure, to more fully comprehend what they are reading.

**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)**

In grades Kindergarten through 3rd grade, students will progress in phonics skills throughout the year such that 70% of students will demonstrate mastery of grade level phonics concepts by the school year's end as evidenced by the CORE reading assessment.

**Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)**

In grades 3rd-5th, 70% of students in each class will score 70% or higher on the grade level ELA 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.

Kindergarten through 3rd grade phonics mastery levels will be monitored through the use of the CORE reading assessment that will be provided to all students at least 2 times within the school year. Administration, coaches, and teachers will review this data after each assessment to determine student needs for intervention. In addition, teachers and coaches will review single skill progress monthly with grade level Fundations assessments.

Progress for grades 3rd-5th reading comprehension will be evaluated through the common assessments in the Tier 1 Reading curriculum (Benchmark Advanced). Skills mastery will be evaluated by the unit test in the Benchmark ELA curriculum. Following these assessments, taken at least monthly, administrators and academic coaches will review data and hold data chats with teachers to make instructional adjustments throughout the school year.

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

Adams, April, adamsa@flaglerschools.com

**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?

Wilson Fundations, to be utilized through 3rd grade, is recognized as having a strong level of evidence demonstrating a significant effect on improving student outcomes and is identified in our district's K-12 reading plan as curriculum used to teach and improve phonics mastery. Wilson Fundations also follows a systematic approach to teaching reading that aligns with the BEST ELA standards.

**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?

According to iReady AP3, BES ended the year with 40% of 2nd grade students below grade level. iReady, combined with data reflecting that half of the phonics skill areas were below 70% mastery in 2nd grade (according to the CORE reading assessment), signifies the need for strong phonics instructional practices moving into 3rd grade in order to close the reading gap completely. Having utilized Wilson Fundations in grades K-2 we have experienced the significant effect it has on student learning.

**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 |
|---|---|
| Professional Learning provided to 3rd grade teachers in utilizing Wilson Fundations as core instruction. | Jaques, Robin, jaquesr@flaglerschools.com |
| Provision of item analysis to track Wilson Fundations grade level phonics assessments. | Jaques, Robin, jaquesr@flaglerschools.com |
| Data chats with individual teachers at least quarterly to review progress and provide support | Evensen, Donelle, evensend@flaglerschools.com |
| Continuous professional learning around phonics instruction | Jaques, Robin, jaquesr@flaglerschools.com |

## 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.**

We have made, and continue to make, concentrated efforts to build a positive school culture and environment at Bunnell Elementary School. As a faculty and staff, we have participated in Capturing Kids Hearts, and have built social contracts to guide interactions among faculty, staff, students, families, the community, and all stakeholders. We have prioritized building positive relationships and a supportive environment through team building activities, as well as monthly and quarterly faculty and staff recognitions. We have been intentional as a leadership team, to be visible and available to faculty and staff, and to be thoughtful about the needs of the individuals on our team. This year, we have implemented a culture and climate survey which was taken at the start of the school year, and will be taken two more times. We reviewed responses and shared patterns with personnel which showed an overwhelmingly positive impression of the culture and climate at Bunnell Elementary School.

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

The school leadership team is the driving force in promoting a positive school culture and environment. Leadership sets the example for faculty and staff in how they will interact with students and one another. Additionally, school leadership is intentional about including community resources to provide support and recognition for the school as well as for faculty and staff. Everyone plays a part, and it is important that everyone "buys-in" to the efforts of creating and maintaining positivity, but it is school the school leadership team that facilitates and implements that process.