

Orange County Public Schools

# Bonneville Elementary



## 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>0</b>  |

## Bonneville Elementary

14700 SUSSEX DR, Orlando, FL 32826

<https://bonnevillees.ocps.net/>

### Demographics

**Principal: Natalie Stevens**

Start Date for this Principal: 6/2/2021

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>PK-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2021-22 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%  |
| <b>2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Hispanic Students*<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2021-22: B (57%)<br>2018-19: C (50%)<br>2017-18: C (46%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Southeast   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">LaShawn Russ-Porterfield</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   | ATSI  |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |   |

### School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 1/24/2023.

## 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](http://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

|                                       |           |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b> | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>             | <b>6</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>               | <b>11</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>       | <b>15</b> |
| <b>Title I Requirements</b>           | <b>0</b>  |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>        | <b>0</b>  |

## Bonneville Elementary

14700 SUSSEX DR, Orlando, FL 32826

<https://bonnevillees.ocps.net/>

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2021-22 Title I School | 2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>PK-5                        | Yes                    | 100%   |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)               |
| K-12 General Education                           | No                     | 76%  |

### School Grades History

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

### School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Orange County School Board on 1/24/2023.

### 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**

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   |
|-------------------------|---------------------|---|
| 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.   |
| Weinstein Rojas, Lauren | 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   |
| Judah, Kira             | 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. |
|                         | Reading 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. |
| 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 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.   |

| Name           | Position Title   | Job Duties and Responsibilities   |
|----------------|------------------|---|
| 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. |

## Demographic Information

### Principal start date

Wednesday 6/2/2021, Natalie Stevens

**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.*

0

**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.*

7

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

44

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

408

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

6

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

6

### 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                              | 59          | 60 | 72 | 77 | 58 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 405   |
| Attendance below 90 percent                              | 4           | 6  | 3  | 16 | 3  | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 46    |
| One or more suspensions                                  | 0           | 0  | 0  | 2  | 0  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 3     |
| Course failure in ELA                                    | 3           | 4  | 1  | 8  | 0  | 2  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 18    |
| Course failure in Math                                   | 1           | 4  | 3  | 7  | 1  | 1  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 17    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment             | 0           | 0  | 0  | 25 | 18 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 64    |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment            | 0           | 0  | 0  | 23 | 12 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 58    |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 10          | 3  | 14 | 25 | 18 | 79 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 149   |

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 | 4           | 6 | 3 | 20 | 4 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 52    |

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 7/6/2022

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                              | 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  |       |

**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                              | 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 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 12    |
| Students retained two or more times | 0           | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |

**Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis****School Data Review**

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

| School Grade Component      | 2022   |          |       | 2021   |          |       | 2019   |          |       |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
|                             | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement             | 49%    | 56%      | 56%   |        |          |       | 55%    | 57%      | 57%   |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 61%    |          |       |        |          |       | 53%    | 58%      | 58%   |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 41%    |          |       |        |          |       | 43%    | 52%      | 53%   |
| Math Achievement            | 56%    | 46%      | 50%   |        |          |       | 62%    | 63%      | 63%   |
| Math Learning Gains         | 72%    |          |       |        |          |       | 49%    | 61%      | 62%   |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 64%    |          |       |        |          |       | 36%    | 48%      | 51%   |
| Science Achievement         | 59%    | 61%      | 59%   |        |          |       | 55%    | 56%      | 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 | 54%    | 55%      | -1%                        | 58%   | -4%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 49%    | 57%      | -8%                        | 58%   | -9%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -54%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |

| ELA               |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
|                   | 2019 | 57%    | 54%      | 3%                         | 56%   | 1%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -49%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| 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 | 64%    | 62%      | 2%                         | 62%   | 2%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | 0%     |          |                            |       |                         |
| 04                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 55%    | 63%      | -8%                        | 64%   | -9%                     |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -64%   |          |                            |       |                         |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 61%    | 57%      | 4%                         | 60%   | 1%                      |
| Cohort Comparison |      | -55%   |          |                            |       |                         |

| SCIENCE           |      |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade             | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05                | 2022 |        |          |                            |       |                         |
|                   | 2019 | 54%    | 54%      | 0%                         | 53%   | 1%                      |
| 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                                       | 11       | 40     | 46          | 21        | 40      | 45           | 21       |         |           |                   |                     |
| ELL                                       | 38       | 64     |             | 51        | 64      |              | 31       |         |           |                   |                     |
| BLK                                       | 60       |        |             | 50        |         |              |          |         |           |                   |                     |
| HSP                                       | 45       | 61     | 38          | 48        | 64      | 57           | 51       |         |           |                   |                     |
| WHT                                       | 58       | 58     |             | 77        | 88      |              | 69       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 46       | 60     | 43          | 48        | 70      | 67           | 50       |         |           |                   |                     |

| 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       |         |           |                   |                     |
| FRL                                       | 48       | 46     | 47          | 56        | 44      | 39           | 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)  | ATSI |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students  | 56   |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students                                    | NO   |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target                                    | 1    |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 48   |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index                                       | 450  |
| Total Components for the Federal Index  | 8    |
| Percent Tested  | 99%  |
| Subgroup Data   |      |
| Students With Disabilities  |      |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities                                      | 32   |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?              | YES  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%       | 0    |
| English Language Learners   |      |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners                                       | 49   |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | NO   |

| English Language Learners  |     |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%       | 0   |
| Native American Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Native American Students                                       |     |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?               | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%        | 0   |
| Asian Students   |     |
| Federal Index - Asian Students   |     |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?                         | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%                  | 0   |
| Black/African American Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students                                | 55  |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?        | NO  |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0   |
| Hispanic Students  |     |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students  | 51  |
| 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   | 70  |
| 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                                | 53 |
| 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?

When looking at school wide student data, trends showed growth was made across all grade levels decreased 2% points from 2021 and 15% points from 2019. The economically disadvantaged student population all made growth in ELA 2021 41% to 43% and Math 2021 38% to 47% in 2022. The ELL student data also showed growth in both ELA and Math. Our SWD data shows a decrease in proficiency in both ELA and Math. Our lowest 25% proficiency data in ELA shows an increase from 2021 37% to 2022 57% and math proficiency increased from 2021 15% to 2022 64%.

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

Our Students with Disabilities 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. Third grade ELA overall proficiency is also a focus as it has declined from 2019 54% to 43% in 2022.

#### 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 experienced more hardships transitioning back into the physical classroom setting from the previous year where the majority were virtual. These students continue to need intensive interventions focused on recouping. Reading endorsed teachers have been hired for self contained 3-5 classrooms.

An increased focus on the bottom 25% has lead to closing the gaps for our lowest quartile but not pushing other students in proficiency. Strategic focus on grade level standards and teaching to the full depth of complexity,

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

Our lowest 25% proficiency data in ELA shows an increase from 2021 37% to 2022 57% and math proficiency increased from 2021 15% to 2022 64%. Math learning gains increased from 2021 42% to 2022 69%.

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

Having the students back face to face was a positive factor in our success. Hiring Tier 1 Interventionists and implementing small group instruction strategies were new actions that contributed to the success in both ELA and Math.

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

As a result of these scores, we will focus on front loading ELA lessons with strategic vocabulary and small group instruction focused on writing. With additional Tier 1 intervention teachers pushing into both ELA and Math blocks for grades 2nd through 5th, students have small group learning opportunities.

**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.**

Professional Development Opportunities will be centered around teaching the new BEST standards. Math PD will be focused on building fluency and automaticity using manipulatives. ELA will focus on building vocabulary utilizing a new program called Wordly Wise.

**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 2022-2023 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 through small group instruction during tier 1 ELA and Math.

**Areas of Focus**

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

:

**#1. -- Select below -- specifically relating to**

**Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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.

**Monitoring:**

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

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

**Action Steps to Implement**

List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

*No action steps were entered for this area of focus*



**#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities****Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**

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

While our students with Disabilities was the subgroup that performed the worst on their 2022 FSA when looking at the grade level comparison data. This group is also made up of our Bottom 25% of students. When looking at this group as a whole, the Bottom 25% did show growth in ELA.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

By the end of the school year students are expected to increase proficiency in Math and ELA by 5%.

**Monitoring:**

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

After each common assessment and FAST assessments student data will be discussed through scheduled one on one or small group MTSS/PLC meetings to determine individual student needs and performance.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Kira Judah (kira.judah@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based Strategy:**

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

We will have focused PLCs with teachers regarding meeting the needs of all of their students, especially the bottom 25%. We will also have data driven PLC meetings with grade level teachers to ensure that their instruction is meeting the needs of their students.

**Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this 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 making learning gains to be proficient.

**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.

BEST Professional Development to ensure a systematic approach to teaching the depth of the new standards.

**Person Responsible**

Kira Judah (kira.judah@ocps.net)

After each common assessment and FAST assessments student data will be discussed through scheduled one on one or small group MTSS/PLC meetings to determine individual student needs and performance.

**Person Responsible**

Lauren Weinstein Rojas (lauren.weinsteinrojas@ocps.net)

**#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to B.E.S.T. Standards****Area of Focus  
Description and  
Rationale:**

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

BEST standards will be new for the 2022-23 school year and will include new state assessments.

**Measurable Outcome:**

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

By focusing on the BEST standards student data will continue to show an increase in proficiency in ELA and Math by 5%.

**Monitoring:**

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

Professional Development will be provided monthly on BEST standards in both ELA and Mathematics. Implementation of taught strategies will be monitored during common planning days and through classroom observations.

**Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Natalie Stevens (natalie.stevens@ocps.net)

**Evidence-based  
Strategy:**

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

We will be vertically aligning the new BEST standards to dig deeply into the depth of the standards using state guiding documents. We will strategically plan as grade level/departments to align small group and whole group instruction utilizing math manipulatives and vocabulary strategies. The Instructional Coach will provide coaching on student discourse and using manipulatives specific to math instruction.

**Rationale for  
Evidence-based  
Strategy:**

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

Teachers will gain mastery of their grade level/content area standards because they will invest the time to analyze all the components involved to obtain the desired effects from their students in all subgroups.

**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.

Ensure lead teachers attend district and state professional development on both ELA and Math standards to serve as resident experts in school wide implementation.

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

Provide coaching for the planning and implementation of the BEST ELA and Math standards.

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

## RAISE

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

### Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

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

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

Students who score highest in reading comprehension also achieve the highest in vocabulary, and vocabulary ability has a reciprocal relationship with reading comprehension. In order to support the growth of reading comprehension among Bonneville's primary grades, we will provide systematic research-based instruction in Tier 2 academic vocabulary and support students' use of those words across content areas. In Kindergarten and first grade, classes will focus on explicit oral vocabulary instruction, close-reading (through read-alouds in K-1) with embedded and contextualized academic vocabulary, and practice with academic vocabulary that follows Marzano's six best practices of vocabulary instruction. Teachers will plan specific academic vocabulary across content areas, and students will use self-assessment (a high-yield strategy) as part of their vocabulary practice.

This area was identified as a critical need based on the End of Year (EOY) iReady reading assessment. Last year 46% of students at Bonneville and 41% of students in kindergarten, first, and second grades were working below grade level according to EOY iReady Reading data. For each of those grades, vocabulary was the lowest area of proficiency with only 41% of students in K-2 ending the year at mid-grade level or above. At the end of the year, 25% of kindergarten students, 44% of first-grade students, and 57% of second-grade students were working below grade level in vocabulary. In addition, teachers identified this area of need through data discussions in PLCs. Lack of vocabulary was often cited as a contributing factor when students missed questions on reading common assessments.

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

As discussed in the previous response, vocabulary knowledge strongly correlates to reading comprehension. From a statistics standpoint, it is likely that a more significant percentage of students at a Title I school will begin their schooling with a gap in vocabulary knowledge than students from non-Title I schools. Because of the reciprocal relationship between vocabulary and reading comprehension, this gap will progressively increase reading deficiencies if not closed. The Bonneville data for grades 3-5

support the need to close vocabulary gaps. Apart from third grade (46% below grade level), each grade level year, the percentage of students who are not proficient in vocabulary according to iReady reading data increases from kindergarten to fifth grade. Sixty-two percent of fourth-grade students and 66% of fifth-grade students finished the 2021-2022 school year below grade level in vocabulary. Vocabulary is the greatest area of need according to overall school data for iReady Reading EOY. Lack of vocabulary was often cited as a contributing factor when students missed questions on reading common assessments. Greater than 50% of students in each grade level were not proficient in ELA according to the Spring 2022 administration of the FSA.

In order to support the growth of reading comprehension among Bonneville's third, fourth, and fifth grades, we will provide routine opportunities to practice with research-based instruction in Tier 2 academic vocabulary. Teachers will plan to incorporate these words across subject areas and support students' use of those words. Students will use close reading exercises with embedded and contextualized academic vocabulary and practice with multiple-meaning words. Vocabulary instruction will follow Marzano's six best practices of vocabulary instruction, and students will use self-assessment (a high-yield strategy) as part of their vocabulary practice.

### **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)**

By June 2023:

The percentage of kindergarten students testing at or above proficiency in vocabulary will be 80% as measured by the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system. (No prior year data)

The percentage of first-grade students testing at or above proficiency in vocabulary will increase from 75% as measured on the EOY iReady diagnostic administered to kindergarten students to 80% on the equivalent component of the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system.

The percentage of second-grade students testing at or above proficiency in vocabulary will increase from 56% as measured on the EOY iReady diagnostic administered to first-grade students to 61% on the equivalent component of the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system.

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

By June 2023:

The percentage of third-grade students testing at or above proficiency in vocabulary will increase from 43% as measured on the EOY iReady diagnostic administered to second graders to 48% on the equivalent component of the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, and the percent of students showing proficiency on the ELA will increase from 40% as measured on the EOY iReady diagnostic administered to second graders to 45% on the equivalent component of the new

coordinated screening and progress monitoring system.

The percentage of fourth-grade students testing at or above proficiency in vocabulary will increase from 54% as measured on the EOY iReady diagnostic administered to third graders to 59% on the equivalent component of the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, and the percent of students showing proficiency on the ELA will increase from 43% as measured by the 2022 3rd grade FSA ELA to 48% on the equivalent component of the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system.

The percentage of fifth-grade students testing at or above proficiency in vocabulary will increase from 38% as measured on the EOY iReady diagnostic administered to fourth graders to 43% on the equivalent component of the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, and the percent of students showing proficiency on the ELA will increase from 49% as measured by the 2022 4th grade FSA ELA to 54% on the equivalent component of the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system.

### **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.

Student vocabulary data will be monitored according to the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system. Additionally, vocabulary achievement will be monitored using common assessment tracking. Vocabulary instruction will be tiered and differentiated as part of the MTSS process (when appropriate to the needs of that specific small group or individual).

Vocabulary data will be analyzed during bi-weekly PLC meetings.

School-wide progress monitoring of vocabulary growth will be conducted each quarter using a leveled Wordly Wise common assessment unless that data can be monitored more effectively under the coordinated screening and progress monitoring system.

### **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:**

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Weinstein Rojas, Lauren, [lauren.weinsteinrojas@ocps.net](mailto:lauren.weinsteinrojas@ocps.net)

### **Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**

Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. Â§7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?
- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Bonneville students will be using Wordly Wise, a research-based vocabulary program with built-in support for differentiation for language acquisition students and students with disabilities. The program aligns with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan as an example of implementing evidence-

based explicit, systematic, and multisensory reading instruction in vocabulary. In kindergarten and first grade, instruction and assessment will take place in two-week cycles. Instruction occurs in seven 20-minute segments throughout two weeks with assessment on the last day of the cycle. Teachers will use the five-day plan in grades 2-5. Students receive ten minutes of instruction four times a week, and progress monitoring takes place once a week. Assessment data will be part of the second PLC meeting each week. Two computer-based progress monitoring assessments will be administered as mid-point and end-of-year assessments. The program aligns with B.E.S.T. V.1.1 Academic Vocabulary, B.E.S.T V.1.2 Morphology, and B.E.S.T V.1.3 Context and Connotation.

#### **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?

This program aligns with our students' identified need for vocabulary development by addressing conceptual understanding, word choice, multiple meanings, morphology, context, word relationships, and etymology.

Comprehensive vocabulary instruction has been proven to significantly narrow achievement gaps between Title I and non-Title I students (Burns Burns 2016 and Lubliner & Smetana, 2005).

#### **Action Steps to Implement:**

List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

| Action Step  | Person Responsible for Monitoring                       |
|--|---|
| Professional Learning in Vocabulary Program                | Judah, Kira, kira.judah@ocps.net                        |
| Literacy Coaching on application of vocabulary instruction | Judah, Kira, kira.judah@ocps.net                        |
| Data analysis for vocabulary assessment                    | Weinstein Rojas, Lauren, lauren.weinsteinrojas@ocps.net |



## **Positive Culture & Environment**

A positive school culture and environment reflects: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students, people who are sure of their roles and relationships in student learning and a culture that values trust, respect and high expectations. Consulting with various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. Stakeholder groups more proximal to the school include teachers, students and families of students, volunteers and school board members. Broad stakeholder groups include early childhood providers, community colleges and universities, social services and business partners.

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

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 expand a PBIS program for our students to receive tangible incentives for demonstrating prosocial behavior. Additionally, students in grades 2-5 will continue to have the opportunity to be a part of a positivity-focused 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 our next steps by using the data collected by the Panorama Survey. The 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 school culture and environment.**

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