

Martin County School District

Bessey Creek 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 |

Bessey Creek Elementary School

2201 SW MATHESON AVE, Palm City, FL 34990

martinschools.org/o/bces

Demographics

Principal: Stacy Schmit

Start Date for this Principal: 7/11/2022

| | |
|--|--|
| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-5 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2021-22 Title I School | No |
| 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | 28% |
| 2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities Asian Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| School Grades History | 2021-22: A (75%) 2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: A (70%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information* | |
| SI Region | Southeast |
| Regional Executive Director | LaShawn Russ-Porterfield |
| Turnaround Option/Cycle | N/A |
| Year | |
| Support Tier | |
| ESSA Status | N/A |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here . | |

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Martin County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 7 |
| Needs Assessment | 10 |
| Planning for Improvement | 14 |
| Title I Requirements | 0 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 0 |

Bessey Creek Elementary School

2201 SW MATHESON AVE, Palm City, FL 34990

martinschools.org/o/bces

School Demographics

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p>Elementary School PK-5</p> | <p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p>No</p> | <p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p>28%</p> |
| <p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p>K-12 General Education</p> | <p>Charter School</p> <p>No</p> | <p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p>22%</p> |

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Martin County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE’s school improvement planning web application located at <https://www.floridacims.org>.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a “living document” by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the “Date Modified” listed in the footer.

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

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

School Leadership Team

Membership

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 |
|----------------|-----------------------------|---|
| Schmit, Stacy | Principal | 1. Developing a world-class group of educators to serve the needs of all students and their families 2. Using data to identify gaps and opportunities to ensure student and family needs are met 3. Creating a robust and far-reaching team of empowered leaders on campus to ensure multiple perspectives are taken when making shared decisions 4. Engaging stakeholders to develop school-wide focus on student growth 5. Serving all stakeholders |
| Roth , Tiffany | Assistant Principal | 1. Supporting the Vision and Mission of the school through collaborative, data-driven leadership 2. Leading PLC and CLT work, alongside Principal, to ensure supports for students lead to student growth and elimination of the achievement gap 3. Use expertise to help grow teacher practice 4. Support teachers to ensure teacher growth |
| Zech, Nicole | Curriculum Resource Teacher | Supports literacy instruction in the school Helps develop our K-2 teachers to become literacy experts Lead for charge of creating a literacy expert in EVERY K-2 classroom Supports students in Grade 1 who are below grade level Works with the district as a Literacy Coach, implementing initiatives and best practices at BCE Martin Mentor, mentoring new teachers at BCE and those new to BCE |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 7/11/2022, Stacy Schmit

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.*

4

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.*

16

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

35

Total number of students enrolled at the school

559

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

1

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

1

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 | 76 | 103 | 91 | 76 | 103 | 109 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 558 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 6 | 15 | 14 | 13 | 19 | 18 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 |
| 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 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 5 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 8 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 13 | 39 | 45 | 18 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 132 |

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 1 | 0 | 5 | 4 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |

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 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 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 8/23/2022

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--|-------------|----|----|----|----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 70 | 99 | 90 | 72 | 99 | 108 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 538 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 17 | 34 | 36 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 119 |
| Level 1 on 2021 statewide FSA ELA Assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Level 1 on 2021 statewide FSA Math Assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--|-------------|----|----|----|----|-----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 70 | 99 | 90 | 72 | 99 | 108 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 538 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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 | 17 | 34 | 36 | 32 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 119 |
| Level 1 on 2021 statewide FSA ELA Assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 14 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 |
| Level 1 on 2021 statewide FSA Math Assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 17 |

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

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

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 | 77% | 53% | 56% | | | | 77% | 58% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 80% | | | | | | 70% | 59% | 58% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 71% | | | | | | 55% | 56% | 53% |
| Math Achievement | 79% | 43% | 50% | | | | 76% | 65% | 63% |
| Math Learning Gains | 81% | | | | | | 72% | 65% | 62% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 70% | | | | | | 59% | 53% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 65% | 54% | 59% | | | | 63% | 58% | 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 | 77% | 54% | 23% | 58% | 19% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 73% | 57% | 16% | 58% | 15% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -77% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 79% | 55% | 24% | 56% | 23% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -73% | | | | |

| 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 | 75% | 58% | 17% | 62% | 13% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 74% | 67% | 7% | 64% | 10% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -75% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 80% | 64% | 16% | 60% | 20% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -74% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 64% | 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 | 41 | 61 | 55 | 50 | 66 | 56 | 29 | | | | |
| ASN | 83 | | | 91 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 82 | 96 | | 79 | 87 | | 70 | | | | |
| WHT | 79 | 79 | 71 | 80 | 80 | 68 | 67 | | | | |
| FRL | 70 | 74 | 77 | 68 | 77 | 68 | 54 | | | | |
| 2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD | 43 | 47 | 50 | 53 | 53 | | 38 | | | | |
| HSP | 84 | 75 | | 81 | 83 | | 83 | | | | |
| WHT | 79 | 74 | 61 | 78 | 68 | 48 | 73 | | | | |
| FRL | 75 | 59 | | 69 | 76 | | 56 | | | | |
| 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 59 | 60 | 50 | 67 | 68 | 45 | 47 | | | | |
| HSP | 81 | 73 | | 73 | 73 | | 75 | | | | |
| WHT | 77 | 70 | 56 | 78 | 73 | 62 | 62 | | | | |
| FRL | 63 | 63 | 67 | 63 | 56 | 37 | 43 | | | | |

ESSA Data Review

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

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 75 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 0 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 523 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 7 |

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|--|-----|
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 51 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| English Language Learners | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Native American Students | |
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | 87 |
| 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 | |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 83 |
| 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 | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Pacific Islander Students | |
|--|-----|
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| White Students | |
| Federal Index - White Students | 75 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 70 |
| 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?

Bessey Creek has had an overall upward trend for two years when looking at data contributing to overall school grade. Data from our 21-22 school year indicates we improved in all gains areas, and opportunity and academic gaps are smaller.

When looking at third grade data, our proficient percent in both reading and math decreased from the 20-21 levels. The growth from the beginning of the year to the end of the year shows high growth for the student group overall, however.

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

Overall science proficiency dropped 9% from 20-21 to 21-22. While these are not the same students, the drop gives us a great look at the supports leant to students for the acquisition of science content and confirms we need to provide more support and instruction on science concepts. Historically, science and ELA scores have been closely aligned. This was not the case for the 21-22 data, with science scores falling 10 points lower than ELA scores.

There is still a measurable gap between the gains made overall in each area and those of our Lowest 25% in each area. These students remain an important subgroup to target, as these students are generally behind their grade level peers and need to make more than a year's worth of growth each year to catch up to their peers.

Finally, third grade math proficiency remains lower than our school average, so this will remain a focus.

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

There are many possible factors contributing to these needs for improvement, including marked lower attendance during the 21-22 school year overall for students. This was due to mandatory numbers of days out of school for isolation and quarantine for COVID19 as well as no at-home learning option during the school year. Other factors include impacts on our students from missed instruction during the 19-20 school year, remote learning options that were less-effective for students during the 20-21 school year, and fewer opportunities to engage with and learn from peers.

Needs are student specific and to address student needs we need to grow teacher capacity in identifying necessary student supports and creating action plans to implement these. We also need to engage students in the work and ensure they are supported to continue progress towards mastery.

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

The largest improvements were shown to be percent of students making gains in ELA and Math as well as the percent of students in the lowest 25% of ELA and Math making gains.

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

The overall focus of the school was to identify where students were and progress monitor to ensure students were making gains in mastery of grade level content. A new curriculum was used in ELA and ensured grade level texts were used with all students. Included in this curriculum was a focus on writing embedded within the literacy block to help students formalize and express their thinking.

Mathematics was improved through targeted, small group instruction provided by a veteran, high performing teacher for 4th and 5th grades. Of the students in these small groups, a higher than school percentage of them made learning gains. The majority of these students' scores attributed to both the overall gains and the Lowest 25% of students gains.

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

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

Bessey Creek is continuing a whole-school approach through the implementation of Cambridge Global Perspectives. Students in every grade level will participate in at least two challenges this year.

Additionally, the continued building of background knowledge to form the foundation for learning is important. We will help students build background knowledge through a process of implementing grade level experiences for all students aligned to grade level content within the Benchmark units of instruction.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

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

Additionally, teachers will be given the opportunity and space to hone their expertise in micro-areas

related to student growth in areas in the classroom. This will include specific professional development for all teachers serving grades Kindergarten through Grade 2 to become literacy experts as well as teachers in other grades and subject areas to become experts in the areas most needed for their students' continued growth.

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

We will continue to improve our PLC/CLT process and have begun training teacher leaders as part of a Design Team. Design team will help ensure professional development is tied to growing teacher expertise in the areas of literacy and targeted instruction.

We will continue our focus for Thursday CLTs on the Benchmark curriculum and data corresponding to ELA and add Math Mondays CLTs to support implementation of the new Saavas math curriculum K-5. Common data will be analyzed as it becomes available, and we will lean into our 3-times-per-year progress monitoring data to ensure student growth and mastery of grade level standards.

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.**

We will implement a process for teaching, assessing, and monitoring students scoring in the lowest 35% of students per grade level. Data shows a lower percentage of students making growth gains than overall growth gains for the grade level causing students to fall further behind their peers with each grade level they enter.

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

During the 22-21 school year, at least 85% of students scoring in the lowest 35% of students in each grade level in ELA will grow at a rate higher than the average rate of growth for the grade level.

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

This area of focus will be progress monitored mid year and at the end of the year using the state progress monitoring tool which will provide us data for our students. A grade level average will be established at the beginning of the year. We will determine an average rate of growth by calculating the difference between the mid-year grade level average score and the beginning of year score. A comparison will be made for each of our students falling in the bottom 35% of the grade level between their individual growth rate and the grade level average growth rate.

**Person
responsible for
monitoring
outcome:**

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

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

Teachers will use grade level Benchmark Advance curriculum with fidelity.

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

Ensuring teacher have access to, and implement, a rigorous, standards-aligned comprehensive curriculum is the most important strategy to help student learning. A guaranteed and viable curriculum is the variable most strongly related to student achievement at the school level. Research shows one of the most powerful things a school can do to help enhance student achievement is to guarantee specific content is taught in specific courses and grade levels.

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

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.

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

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

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

Person Responsible Tiffany Roth (rotht@martinschools.org)

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

Person Responsible Tiffany Roth (rotht@martinschools.org)

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

Kindergarten - Attend and participate in professional development on the science of reading to become literacy experts. Implement strategies in small group instruction to support latest research.

Grade 1 - We are committed to using our literacy training expertise skills in spot for and divide, vocabulary workbooks, and because but so stems to achieve student mastering of standards.

Grade 2 - We will have students participate in book clubs and reader's theater to increase reading comprehension and vocabulary.

Grade 3 - Teachers will focus on targeted, small group instruction to support, remediate and enrich students in reading.

Grade 4 - Benchmark data will be used to identify standards where students are performing below grade level. Teachers will utilize small group instruction to focus on standards and support individual student needs to help close gaps in learning.

Grade 5 - We will pull small groups to ensure all students receive differentiated instruction.

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

#2. 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.

We will implement a process for teaching, assessing, and monitoring students who lack supports at home and may be identified as being in the subcategory of Economically Disadvantaged. Data shows these students are learning and growing at a slower rate than peers outside the subcategory of Economically Disadvantaged. This is causing these students to fall further behind their peers with each grade level they enter.

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

During the 22-23 school year, at least 85% of students overall in each grade level in ELA will grow at a rate higher than the average district rate of growth for the grade level.

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

This area of focus will be progress monitored mid year and at the end of the year using the state progress monitoring tool which will provide data for our students. A district grade level average will be established at the beginning of the year. We will determine an average rate of growth by calculating the difference between the mid-year district grade level average score and the beginning of year score. A comparison will be made for each of our students in the grade level between their individual growth rate and the district grade level average growth rate.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

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

A communication strategy will be used to engage all parents, focusing on strategies shown by research to be most impactful with families qualifying for free or reduced-price lunches. Parents will be texted weekly or more often with tips for engaging with and supporting their own children and boosting school readiness and overall wellness.

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

Our overall percentage of students meeting the criteria for free or reduced-price lunches (FRL) has held roughly steady for the past two years, with 25% of our students meeting this criteria. This group, while not identifiable unless the family self-identifies to the school, now includes over 140 student at the school and accounts for the lowest growth percentages of our tracked subgroups.

Additionally, the FRL group has been shown to be of the most adversely effected by the COVID19 pandemic. Students in this subgroup often have additional risk factors. The higher the number of risk factors a student has, the more likely the negative impact the pandemic has had on student achievement for that student.

selecting this strategy.

Because we cannot identify all students in this category, it is impossible to track these students individually. Therefore, this strategy encompasses providing this service to all families in the school.

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.

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

Person Responsible

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

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math

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

We will implement a process for teaching, assessing, and monitoring students to ensure all students are making gains in math. Data shows our students are not consistently reaching growth year over year. While students in some grade levels are making gains overall, not all students are making gains and there is inconsistency when looking at a subgroup or cohort over time. This is causing students to fall further behind peers in certain grade levels and then having to play catch-up in subsequent years.

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

During the 22-23 school year, at least 85% of students will grow at a rate higher than the district average growth rate for the grade level in math.

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

This area of focus will be progress monitored mid year and at the end of the year using the state progress monitoring tool which will provide data from our students. A district grade level average will be established at the beginning of the year. We will determine an average rate of growth by calculating the difference between the mid-year district grade level average score and the beginning of year score. A comparison will be made for each of our students in the grade level between their individual growth rate and the district grade level average growth rate.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

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

Teachers will implement Saavas mathematics curriculum with fidelity.

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

Ensuring teacher have access to, and implement, a rigorous, standards-aligned comprehensive curriculum is the most important strategy to help student learning. A guaranteed and viable curriculum is the variable most strongly related to student achievement at the school level. Research shows one of the most powerful things a school can do to help enhance student achievement is to guarantee specific content is taught in specific courses and grade levels.

Implementing Saavas with fidelity will ensure all students are given an opportunity to work toward mastery of grade level standards in Mathematics.

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.

Teachers will implement Saavas following the district scope and sequence.

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

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

Person Responsible Tiffany Roth (rotht@martinschools.org)

Teachers will participate in the PLC process, ensuring data from Saavas is evaluated during Mathematics Monday CLTs by grade level.

Person Responsible Tiffany Roth (rotht@martinschools.org)

Individual grade levels will focus on strategies specifically aligned to the individual needs of their students:

Kindergarten - Implement new math curriculum with small group instruction

Grade 1 - We are committed to understanding the new math curriculum (teacher and student guides), working as a team, and also using math manipulatives to increase understanding and students mastery of standards.

Grade 2 - We will implement the new math curriculum with small groups and focus on enrichment opportunities for higher math students.

Grade 3 - Teachers will focus on targeted, small group instruction to support, remediate and enrich students in mathematics.

Grade 4 - Implement new math curriculum with small group instruction to enhance student understanding. Attend professional development to increase knowledge of new benchmarks and curriculum.

Grade 5 - We will pull small groups to ensure all students receive differentiated instruction.

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

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

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Across the grade levels and ESSA subgroups, Bessey Creek has pockets where students are not making the gains they need to be considered to be growing at a rate equal to one full school year. This means, for those students, they are falling behind expected growth and an academic gap is growing. When this happens year over year, it becomes extremely difficult for students to catch up to their peers and pushes kids to consider dropping out of school.
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.
 As a Cambridge School, we will expose our students to the 5 Cambridge Learner attributes by having them participate in at least 2 Cambridge Challenges during the 22-23 school year.

Monitoring:
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.
 We will monitor this area of focus by looking at grade level work in CLTs for evidence of implementation.

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

Evidence-based Strategy:
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.
 All grade levels will provide an opportunity for students to engage in at least 2 Global Perspectives Challenges during the 22-23 school year.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.
 The learner attributes practices within each challenge in the Global Perspectives course are habits of effective learners and can be applied by students throughout their lives. Global Perspectives will give ALL students in the school exposure to challenging, cooperative learning to enrich their academic lives and allow them to see the impact they have on the environment and others.

Action Steps to Implement
 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.
 Professional learning in the area of Cambridge and particularly for teaching Global Perspectives.

Person Responsible Stacy Schmit (schmits@martin.k12.fl.us)
 Scheduling two challenges into the master calendar.

Person Responsible Tiffany Roth (rotht@martinschools.org)

Work in grade level teams to choose and prep for Challenges.

Person Responsible Tiffany Roth (rotht@martinschools.org)

#5. 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.

We will implement a process for teaching, assessing, and monitoring students to ensure all students are making gains in science. Data shows our students are not consistently proficient each year. Additionally, when looking at science proficiency, there is usually a close correlation between science proficiency and reading proficiency.

For the last two years of data, our data in ELA is 10+% higher than science proficiency, and this shows underperformance in science. Additionally, our subgroups of ELL, ESE, and FRL all have double-digit gaps when compared to the average proficiency of the school.

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

Overall science proficiency will improve to 75% by end of year 2023, based on 5th grade Florida end-of-year assessment.

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

This area of focus will be progress monitored mid year and at the end of the year using the state progress monitoring tool which will provide data from our students. A district grade level average will be established at the beginning of the year. We will determine an average rate of growth by calculating the difference between the mid-year district grade level average score and the beginning of year score. A comparison will be made for each of our students in the grade level between their individual growth rate and the district grade level average growth rate.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

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

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

Teachers will instruct students based on grade level state science standards weekly.

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

A focus on science instruction capitalizes on students' curiosity, boosts student engagement and student discourse, and creates a space for students to learn skills like teamwork, self-management, critical thinking, and problem-solving. Science instruction can encourage student learning through exploration, and builds academic vocabulary tied to helping students improve literacy skills.

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.

All classroom teachers will teach science within their schedules during scheduled recess time on the days their classes have PE during their related arts rotations.

Person Responsible Tiffany Roth (rotht@martinschools.org)

ESE teachers in self-contained classrooms will help support students to push into general education classrooms on grade-level whenever possible.

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

Science Lab on the related arts wheel will include more hands-on labs and tie learning to science standards to show students real world examples for science concepts.

Person Responsible Tiffany Roth (rotht@martinschools.org)

Grade level commitments for this area of focus:

K - We will use Geodes resources to help build background knowledge for students.

1 - We are committed to doing two hands-on activities each month in science to enhance students' understanding of the standards. This will be implemented through modeling, experiments, and student logs to achieve student mastery.

2 - We will use Geodes resources to help build science background knowledge and vocabulary for students.

3 - Teachers will focus on targeted, small group instruction to support, remediate and enrich students in science, as well as implement hands-on activities on PE days.

4 - We will implement use of a variety of hands-on experiments to improve student understanding of standards by coupling concrete examples with abstract theories and ideas.

5 - We will utilize the science curriculum and supplement with materials to help make abstract concepts concrete and connect them to real life.

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

RAISE

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

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

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

NA

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

NA

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)

NA

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

NA

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.

NA

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. 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?

NA

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?

NA

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 |
|-------------|-----------------------------------|
|-------------|-----------------------------------|

NA

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.

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

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

- School leadership team members from all grade levels; twice monthly leadership team meetings
- School literacy leaders team to help with schoolwide implementation of our literacy framework, including the new curriculum
- Increased communication with the broad school family through a new app with ties to social media, text, and the web
- "Next Week in the Creek" communication for school staff every Friday, also sent to our PTA communication liaison
- Monthly celebrations and goodies for our school staff provided by each grade level or group once per year
- PBIS celebrations for students monthly
- House system to be put into place for 22-23 school year
- PTA Community Events to focus on providing space for families to enjoy each other and their students and build connections

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

Stacy Schmit, principal - Setting the Vision and communicating that vision; messaging to the public and the school staff regarding positive programs and happenings at school; promoting school to increase enrollment
 Tiffany Roth, Assistant Principal - Next Week in the Creek; messaging to staff and stakeholders to support and promote positive school programming. Communication with PTA communication liaison to ensure a single message from school and PTA

Nicole Zech, Martin Mentor, Curriculum Resource Teacher, Literacy Coach - Embracing those new to the staff to ensure support and connection on campus

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

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