Bonneville Elementary

2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Bonneville Elementary

14700 SUSSEX DR, Orlando, FL 32826

https://bonnevillees.ocps.net/

Demographics

Principal: Natalie Stevens

Start Date for this Principal: 6/2/2020

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
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Hispanic Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (50%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: A (62%)
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	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 2/8/2022.

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

Bonneville Elementary

14700 SUSSEX DR, Orlando, FL 32826

https://bonnevillees.ocps.net/

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2020-21 Title I School**	**2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	73%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 2/8/2022.

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.

With the support of families and the community, we create enriching and diverse pathways that lead our students to success

Provide the school's vision statement.

To ensure every student has a promising and successful future

School Leadership Team

Membership
Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Stevens, Natalie	Principal	The Principal provides a common vision for instruction and learning and uses data as a basis for decision-making, ensures the school-based team is implementing research-based instructional strategies, monitors student learning, and assigns school resources to meet the needs of students.
Foranoce, Melissa	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal supports the common vision for instruction and learning and monitors and tracks student data, ensures the school-based team is implementing research-based instructional strategies, monitors student learning, and recommends school resources to meet students' needs.
Amick, Danielle	Staffing Specialist	The Staffing Specialist is responsible for compliance for all exceptional education students and those with 504 plans,conducts bi-weekly Multi-Tiered System of Supports meetings to monitor student progress, and collaborates with both general education and exceptional education teachers to ensure the least restrictive learning environment for all students.
LaRusso, Emily	Instructional Coach	The Resource Teacher develops, models, and evaluates schoolwide reading instruction and practices,identifies and implements research-based curriculum and interventions, and provides support for all grade levels.The Resource Teacher develops, supports, and assists new teachers with curricula and resources, conducts the bi-weekly Multi-Tiered System of Supports meetings to monitor student progress, provides biweekly professional development, implements and supervises the after-school tutoring program, and conducts all district and state testing.
Judah, Kira	Math Coach	The Resource Teacher develops, models, and evaluates schoolwide reading instruction and practices,identifies and implements research-based curriculum and interventions, and provides support for all grade levels.The Resource Teacher develops, supports, and assists new teachers with curricula and resources, conducts the bi-weekly Multi-Tiered System of Supports meetings to monitor student progress, provides biweekly professional development, implements and supervises the after-school tutoring program, and conducts all district and state testing.
Savitz, Alyssa	School Counselor	The Guidance Counselor supports the social and emotional needs of students and provides individual, small group, and whole class instruction based on student data and teacher recommendations.
Crowe, Holly	Instructional Media	The Media Specialist not only has an open media center, but also is the staff member in charge of technology on campus. She assesses computers and

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		discusses with administration if a fine needs to be issued. She works through computer issues and works closely with our IT support to resolve an issues that may arise. The Media Specialist also organizes and distributes the textbooks and curriculum to teachers.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 6/2/2020, Natalie Stevens

Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*
2

Number of teachers with a 2019 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.*
7

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
40

Total number of students enrolled at the school
408

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.
6

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.
6

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

The number of students by 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	28	60	63	84	59	76	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	370
Attendance below 90 percent	15	17	25	44	10	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	131
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	2	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	23	22	43	21	26	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	163

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	4	2	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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	1	1	1	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

Wednesday 7/28/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

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	41	59	77	66	82	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	411
Attendance below 90 percent	7	17	27	22	18	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	12	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	1	6	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

2020-21 - Updated

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	41	59	77	66	82	86	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	411
Attendance below 90 percent	7	17	27	22	18	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109
One or more suspensions	0	1	2	1	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	5	12	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	4	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	5	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	3	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	1	6	10	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				55%	57%	57%	54%	56%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				53%	58%	58%	42%	55%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				43%	52%	53%	33%	48%	48%
Math Achievement				62%	63%	63%	62%	63%	62%
Math Learning Gains				49%	61%	62%	51%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				36%	48%	51%	27%	46%	47%
Science Achievement				55%	56%	53%	55%	55%	55%

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
03	2021					
	2019	54%	55%	-1%	58%	-4%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	49%	57%	-8%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-54%				
05	2021					
	2019	57%	54%	3%	56%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	64%	62%	2%	62%	2%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	55%	63%	-8%	64%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-64%				
05	2021					
	2019	61%	57%	4%	60%	1%
Cohort Comparison		-55%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	54%	54%	0%	53%	1%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

We used iReady to track student data.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	18	28	41
	Economically Disadvantaged	14	15	28
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	10	8	8
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	12	22	38
	Economically Disadvantaged	6	15	26
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	7
	English Language Learners	10	8	8

Grade 2				
English Language Arts	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	7	19	28
	Economically Disadvantaged	4	13	22
	Students With Disabilities	5	10	9
	English Language Learners	0	0	6
Mathematics	**Number/% Proficiency**	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
	All Students	1	15	24
	Economically Disadvantaged	2	8	18
	Students With Disabilities	0	5	9
	English Language Learners	0	0	6

Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	16	26	30
	Economically Disadvantaged	7	23	23
	Students With Disabilities	0	20	10
	English Language Learners	0	7	8
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	5	12	28
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	5	23
	Students With Disabilities	10	20	10
	English Language Learners	0	0	8

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
English Language Arts	All Students	12	27	27
	Economically Disadvantaged	9	21	19
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	0
	English Language Learners	0	8	15
	Number/% Proficiency	**Fall**	**Winter**	**Spring**
Mathematics	All Students	1	16	26
	Economically Disadvantaged	0	10	20
	Students With Disabilities	0	0	7
	English Language Learners	0	15	17

Grade 5				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	6	11	12
	Economically Disadvantaged	2	8	10
	Students With Disabilities	0	6	7
	English Language Learners	0	0	0
Mathematics	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	3	10	28
	Economically Disadvantaged	2	6	24
	Students With Disabilities	7	6	29
	English Language Learners	0	9	25
Science	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	36	38	44
	Economically Disadvantaged	24	27	32
	Students With Disabilities	8	27	20
	English Language Learners	17	23	29

Subgroup Data Review

2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	14	25		29	60		8				
ELL	30	35		39	35		31				
HSP	37	28	27	36	35	17	36				
WHT	56	56		63	60		54				
FRL	41	37	38	38	34	15	34				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	19	28	19	23	34	24	31				
ELL	38	44	41	54	47	47	38				
BLK	67	50		60	55						
HSP	49	51	45	58	43	41	48				
WHT	60	55		70	59		62				

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
FRL	48	46	47	56	44	39	43				

2018 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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	21	32	30	23	29	14	36				
ELL	37	35	24	47	53	33	30				
BLK	50			69							
HSP	49	41	29	58	50	31	50				
WHT	65	42		68	47		59				
FRL	49	41	34	58	51	29	53				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	39
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	4
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	46
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	314
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	93%

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%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	36
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	

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%	
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	33
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	58
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	35
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

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?

When looking at school wide student data, trends showed were making growth across all grade levels in both ELA and Math. The economically disadvantaged student population all made growth in ELA and Math from BOY to EOY. The ELL student data also showed growth from BOY to EOY. Our students with disabilities data showed some inconsistencies between BOY, MOY and EOY.

When further looking at data, and looking at FSA data, the bottom 25% of students.Our ELA bottom 25% learning gains were 20%, and our Math bottom 25% learning gains were at 18%. This data correlates with our iReady EOY data.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

Our Students with Disabilities subgroup is the subgroup that has the greatest area of need. Their data is indicating that this group of students is not making adequate progress over time.

Our greatest need for improvement is our bottom 25% students and our learning gains. Our bottom 25% subgroup was by far our lowest performing subgroup on ELA and Math FSA.

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

Many of our students with disabilities either started or finished their year in a virtual setting and experienced more hardships transitioning back into the physical classroom setting. These students returning back to campus will need explicit routines and intensive interventions focused on recouping and differentiating grade level content.

When addressing our bottom 25% students, we need to take a more individualized approach to each and every student that fall into this category. We will begin addressing the students needs right away and ensuring that the teachers are aware of the students and their needs. We will ensure that the instruction within the classroom is meeting the needs of the students.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

According to our Math iReady data, students identified as economically disadvantaged showed the most improvement. Amongst each grade level, this data showed an increase throughout the process monitoring assessments.

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

The majority of these students were learning on campus for the majority of the school year. This provided minimal interruptions to their typical learning environment and allowed for better monitoring and reteaching during instruction.

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

As a result of these scores, we will focus on front loading lessons with strategic vocabulary and small group instruction. With additional Tier 1 intervention teachers pushing into both ELA and Math blocks for grades 2nd through 5th, students who require additional learning opportunities can receive this during their typical reading and math blocks.

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.

Teachers in grades K-5 have been training on the Scholastic Guided Reading program as an additional resource that is leveled for students across multiple levels. Our teachers in Kindergarten through 2nd grade are also being trained in the new curriculum Wonders. Teachers in grades 4th and 5th grade are being trained in Write Score. During PLCs, teachers will participate in ghost walks to better view and reflect upon instruction happening on campus.

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

For the upcoming 2021-2022 school year, we have Intervention Tier 1 teachers pushing into ELA and Math for 2nd grade through 5th grade. These teachers will be supporting the students in their tier 1 instruction for ELA and Math. These teachers will be able to pull small groups within the tier 1 classroom to offer support to the gen ed teacher.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	When reviewing our staff panorama data, a few categories stood out as needing improvement for the 21-22 school year. For the 21-22 school year we are going to focus our SEL efforts into the areas of Feedback and Coaching, School Climate, and Professional Learning about SEL.
Measurable Outcome:	After implementing changes, our plan is to increase our satisfaction percentage in our 3 focused areas by 10% on the 2022 Panorama survey. We would like to see: Feedback and Coaching move from 35% to 45%, School Climate from 56% to 66%, and Professional Learning about SEL from 35% to 45%.
Monitoring:	The SEL focus will be monitored by brief staff surveys throughout the year to maintain a pulse on the SEL of our staff.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Alyssa Savitz (alyssa.savitz@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will use social and emotional strategies to foster a sense of collaboration and togetherness, Collaboratively we will work together on teacher's social and emotional well being, as well as the SEL of the entire staff as a whole.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The rationale behind this strategy is to increase staff morale which will inturn increase student achievement. We would like to create a culture of learning and collaboration throughout our campus.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Professional Development for teachers on SEL
2. Staff activities to boost morale
3. Collaborative PLCs
4. Classroom walkthroughs with actionable feedback

Person Responsible Natalie Stevens (natalie.stevens@ocps.net)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	When looking at iReady date from 2020-2021, our Students with Disabilities were the subgroup that performed the worst on their iready diagnostics, when looking at the grade level comparison data. This group is also made up of our Bottom 30% of students. When looking at this group as a whole, the Bottom 30% did show growth in ELA. These students went from a 26% at MOY and finished at a 51% at EOY, showing a 25 point gain. The growth was not the same in math however. The data stayed the same from BOY to EOY, and showed 20% of our Bottom 30% made growth.
Measurable Outcome:	By the end of the school year students are expected to make the required learning gains to demonstrate an increase of knowledge in all subject areas. Students performing in the lowest 25% are expected to experience a full years growth of learning and to meet their stretch goal as measured in the following ways: bi-weekly teacher assessments of student progress and iReady data.
Monitoring:	The subgroup of Students with Disabilities will be monitored throughout the year. The data will be tracked using iReady, as well as teacher data. The data on this subgroup will be discussed during regular PLCs and data meetings.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Natalie Stevens (natalie.stevens@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will have focused PLCs with teachers regarding meeting the needs of their students, especially the bottom 30%. We will also have monthly data meetings with teachers to ensure that their instruction is meeting the needs of their students.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Holding data driven meetings/conversations is critical when making instructional changes in the classroom. It is important for teachers and administrators to see the data in order to ensure that students are learning and making gains.

Action Steps to Implement

1. PLCs with teachers
2. Analyze Data
3. Walkthroughs
4. Interventions/MTSS

Person Responsible	Melissa Foranoce (melissa.foranoce@ocps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	On the most recent Florida Standards Assessment (FSA), data indicated that 55% of students scored below a level 3 in English Language Arts (ELA). Our proficiency rate was at 45% for the 20-21 school year.
Measurable Outcome:	The 2022 ELA FSA will show an increase in our ELA proficiency (scores 3 and above) from 45% to 51%.
Monitoring:	We will monitor growth by using the following: i-Ready Diagnostics i-Ready Growth Monitoring SIPPS Mastery Assessments Classroom Walkthroughs District Standards Based Unit Assessments District K-2 Foundational Unit Assessments (K-2) Heggerty Assessments (K-2)
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kira Judah (kira.judah@ocps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	By using all of the data pieces above, the students will be better prepared to: Develop awareness of the segments of sounds in speech and how they link to the letters. Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and write and recognize words. Ensure that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension. Ensure that students can find evidence in text to respond to grade level questions.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	By using all of the above strategies we will be able to increase reading proficiency amongst our students in grades 3-5.

Action Steps to Implement

Strengthen our common planning process.
-Use the district created K-2 and 3-5 Common Planning Resources to guide the agenda and discussions
-Include foundational planning in K-2

Person Responsible	Kira Judah (kira.judah@ocps.net)

Classroom walkthroughs are conducted regularly and ELA feedback is provided; when needed adjustments are made in common planning/PLCs.

Person Responsible	Natalie Stevens (natalie.stevens@ocps.net)

Standards Based Unit Assessment (SBUA) Data and Foundational Assessment Data is used to plan small group instruction and differentiation opportunities.

Person Responsible	Kira Judah (kira.judah@ocps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the SafeSchoolsforAlex.org, compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

When analyzing 2019-2020 discipline data, our areas of growth were: Threats/Intimidations, Fighting, Bullying, Harassments, and Physical Attacks. With an increase in schoolwide SEL initiatives and instruction, these numbers will decrease. During our monthly threat assessment meetings, we will monitor school wide data.

Part IV: 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 to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. 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.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

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

In order to establish a positive school culture and climate at Bonneville Elementary School, our faculty and staff engage in ongoing, school based professional learning on leveraging social and emotional learning as well as leadership for student success. Through a collaborative leadership model, Bonneville uses social and emotional learning to strengthen team dynamics and collaboration in order to build academic expertise in all students. This year we will implement a PAWsitivity store for our students to receive tangible incentives for demonstrating prosocial behavior. Additionally, students in grades 2-5 will have the opportunity to be a part of a SEL focus club before school hours. We will also continue working on SEL with our teachers. The teachers will have the opportunity to further their SEL learning by attending professional development on campus. Our leadership team collaborates with stakeholders, through processes such as the School Advisory Council, to reflect on implementation and determine next steps by using the data collected by the Panorama Survey. Development of positive culture and environment is further enhanced through district programs such as the Parent Academy. Bonneville utilizes our Parent Engagement Liaison to bridge the community and school culture.

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

As the school counselor, Alyssa Savitz, will facilitate stakeholder trainings to provide critical SEL content and information. The school based SEL team, which includes, school principal-Natalie Stevens, School Counselor-Alyssa Savitz, Media Specialist- Holly Crowe, fifth grade teacher-Ali Boggs, first grade teacher-Denise Ortiz, and ESE teacher- Barbara Martinez, will provide Wellness Wednesdays where staff can interact with each other and also learn different self care techniques.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning				$5,330.30
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	0000	510-Supplies	0871 - Bonneville Elementary	General Fund		$1,500.00
		Notes: The school will be focusing on a book study. The book will be used to build a positive school culture amongst the staff. Additional funds will be utilized to build in quarterly team building activities.				
	0000	500-Materials and Supplies	0871 - Bonneville Elementary	Title, I Part A		$3,830.30
		Notes: The school will be using supplemental materials to support SEL instruction. (Teach Town K-5, Early Learning SEL kits Committee for children)				
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities				$43,249.82
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2021-22
	0000	500-Materials and Supplies	0871 - Bonneville Elementary	Title, I Part A		$43,249.82
		Notes: The school will be using supplemental materials for small group and tiered instruction for ELA, Math and Writing.				
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA				$0.00
					Total:	$48,580.12