Bayshore Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Bayshore Elementary School

17050 WILLIAMS RD, North Ft Myers, FL 33917

http://bay.leeschools.net//

Demographics

Principal: Benjamin Ausman

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	No
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	91%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2021-22: B (57%) 2018-19: B (58%) 2017-18: B (58%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	ATSI
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here]().	

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Bayshore Elementary School

17050 WILLIAMS RD, North Ft Myers, FL 33917

http://bay.leeschools.net//

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	No	91%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	35%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The purpose of Bayshore Elementary School is to provide all students an educational foundation that builds skills for independent thinking, instills a love of learning for life, and develops the attitude and character to be respectful and responsible citizens.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Please refer to the mission statement section. Our school purpose is listed there.

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
Ausman, Ben	Principal	Lead and oversee all components of the school. Help drive instruction to continue to push the school forward.
Hamstra, Andrew	Assistant Principal	Help the principal oversee all components of the school and increase student achievement

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Wednesday 7/1/2015, Benjamin Ausman

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.*
1

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
27

Total number of students enrolled at the school
602

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
5

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
5

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	98	103	102	98	103	98	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	602
Attendance below 90 percent	0	24	19	18	34	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	112
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	12	13	14	21	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Course failure in Math	0	9	11	6	14	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	10	22	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	53
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	10	19	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	10	11	9	14	8	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	1	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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
Friday 9/2/2022

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	99	105	95	115	93	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	602
Attendance below 90 percent	4	15	14	14	15	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	13	8	18	11	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Course failure in Math	0	5	4	14	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	12	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	6	13	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	9	7	16	11	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58

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	1	4	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	99	105	95	115	93	95	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	602
Attendance below 90 percent	4	15	14	14	15	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	81
One or more suspensions	0	3	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	13	8	18	11	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	57
Course failure in Math	0	5	4	14	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	12	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	6	13	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	9	7	16	11	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58

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	1	4	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	13
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	53%	52%	56%				54%	57%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	56%						49%	56%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	44%						49%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	69%	45%	50%				67%	62%	63%
Math Learning Gains	71%						69%	65%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55%						63%	54%	51%
Science Achievement	51%	59%	59%				55%	52%	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	62%	58%	4%	58%	4%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	41%	55%	-14%	58%	-17%
Cohort Comparison		-62%				
05	2022					

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2019	50%	54%	-4%	56%	-6%
Cohort Comparison		-41%				

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	66%	61%	5%	62%	4%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	63%	62%	1%	64%	-1%
Cohort Comparison		-66%				
05	2022					
	2019	65%	58%	7%	60%	5%
Cohort Comparison		-63%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	53%	50%	3%	53%	0%
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	17	18	23	31	39	46	9				
ELL	26	43	41	46	62	50	20				
HSP	41	54	46	59	63	48	38				
WHT	62	60	40	78	79	64	62				
FRL	44	52	44	61	64	48	39				

| **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	15	13		39	53						
ELL	16	25		33	50						
HSP	31	42	60	46	48	53	24				
WHT	65	38		73	46		64				
FRL	41	35	44	54	43	53	32				
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	17	48	58	46	70	80	25				
ELL	22	43	62	64	64	50					
BLK	53	31		63	77						
HSP	36	42	55	56	64	55	36				
MUL	30			40							
WHT	66	56	50	75	73	67	70				
FRL	44	40	51	60	65	56	50				

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	57
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	59
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	458
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	43
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	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	64
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	50
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?

In the core content areas, ELA increased to 53% reading proficiency and this is up 2% from 2021. The students with Disabilities subgroup fell under ESSA and was the subgroup that struggled the most on state testing. Bayshore was 58% proficient in ELA and dropped to 54% in 2019 and 51% in 2021. The trend was declining scores in ELA the past two years. In 2022, scores increased by 2% in ELA as Bayshore finished at 53%. It is still short of the 58% that Bayshore was at in 2018. In 2018 Science proficiency was 60% and the trend is proficiency is decreasing. In 2021 Science proficiency was at 49% and it did increase to 51% in 2022, but is still down from the 60% in was at in 2018. Math has had a steady increase and the proficiency numbers and learning gains are in line of where we were in 2018.

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

Bayshore Elementary was 53% proficient in ELA in 2022. This is still down from 58% in 2018 although there was a 2% increase in scores. It is still going to be an area for improvement in 2022-23 school year. The students in the bottom 25% did not perform well in ELA in 2022 with 44% making learning gains. Science is also an area that needs to improve. Science proficiency was 51% and is still down from 60% in 2018.

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

A lot of students have learning gaps that teachers are trying to close due to the pandemic. Student attendance was down last year as many students were out at various times. Teacher attendance was down as well especially to start the school year. As scored dipped in 2019, a strong intervention system was put in place in order to help students reach reading proficiency.Really Great Reading, Phonics for Reading, and small group intervention are all part of the components to address the need for improvement. All level 1 and 2 readers are getting intervention in small group. Students that are close to proficiency are being pushed by being group with the proficient readers. This allows the instructor to give immediate feedback and help to students. Intervention is consistent and done across grade levels to make sure students get the differentiated instruction that is needed. Students that are close to proficiency are being pushed by being group with the proficient readers. Selection of passages have been carefully looked at for rigor to push students in small group.

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

The components that showed the most improvement based on data in 2019 were math proficiency which increased from 65% in 2018 to 67% in 2019 and increased to 69% in 2022. Math learning gains also increased from 63% in 2018 to 69% in 2019 to 71% in 2022.

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

PLCs were consistent every week to discuss student data and discussions took place based on what students didn't get it and what students to enrich. FSA packets were designed to give students practice on the standards they would be assessed on. Collaboration took place for teachers to share best practices in order to teach the standards. The teachers also used achievement level descriptors on the standards so work was differentiated from level 2 to level 5. Students were receiving intervention if needed or enrichment. Data was analyzed from the exemplars and quarterly assessments to drive the instruction inside the classroom. Achievement Level Descriptors were used in small group intervention in order to help the students that were not getting it.

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

Differentiated instruction in ELA and Math will be an expectation to accelerate learning. All ELA students have set intervention times in order to enrich students or help them in areas that are needed to be a successful reader. Students who need more support are in small group with an adult to give immediate feedback and support to students who need it most. Giving students the support in reading they need will accelerate their learning in areas they are deficient. Students will work in Really Great Reading and Phonics for Reading if needed as well. Students will be given the opportunity to work in collaboration (Kagan) to help deepen their understanding and talk about the passages they are reading. PLCs will also specifically talk about strategies to use to help students accelerate in Math and ELA.

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.

iReady PD will be given throughout the year so teachers understand the data that available to them. iReady will provide how the data can be used to drive instruction with the resources teachers have available to them.
Differentiated Instruction is a focal point and PD has been given to teachers around this and PD will continue to teachers who need more support throughout the year. The teachers that differentiate will discuss in the PLCs to help others with the activities in their room to make sure they are supporting all learners in the room.
Kagan PD was done at the beginning of the year and teachers are working to implement Kagan strategies that are observed by administration. This builds collaboration in the classroom and a deeper understanding of the standards being taught for the students.
Whole Brain instruction will also be supported through Professional Development. New staff members to Bayshore received instruction on whole brain so interactive learning can take place in the classroom. Students teach concepts to each other in order to make sure they understand the content.
All new teachers received professional development in scales. Scales set the learning targets for students and lets students know where they are at on the standards. This is great feedback to students of what they can do and what they still need to do to be on standard.

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

Ongoing Professional Development will take place with proficiency scales. Proficiency scales that are student friendly let students know exactly what they need to do to be proficient in a standard. Proficiency scales create a level of understanding for students. Students benefit as they know exactly where they

are on the scale that relates to the standard. Proficiency scales also lets teachers know the progress of the students and where they are at in relation to the standard. Scales help teachers drive instruction based on where students are at. Focus will be on feedback, content, and context. Teachers will get PD on I do, we do, and you do model and using Kagan to create engagement in the classroom.

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

:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	This subgroup was identified beginning in 2022 as being below the Federal Index of 41%, as determined by ESSA. As a result, Bayshore Elementary is a R.A.I.S.E and TS&I school that the state is monitoring for improvement. The students with disabilities fell to 26% putting Bayshore Elementary well below the 41% Federal Index.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	In 2019, this subgroup was at 26% proficiency in ELA. Our goal is to raise this percentage above 41% proficiency in ELA in 2022.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	The desired outcome will be monitored through FAST progress monitoring and student performance through district exemplars to monitor the growth of each individual student and adjust interventions as needed.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Andrew Hamstra (andrewjh@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	The evidence-based strategy approved by the ESSA is intervention RtI) with a focus on closing the gaps for all of our students, especially students with disabilities. The small group setting provides opportunities for students to receive instruction through Really Great Reading. Phonics for Reading and Wonders intervention materials. Students that are excelling based on our data would receive higher level work to extend their learning.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	The rationale for selecting this specific area of focus is due to strong ESSA evidence that the strategy is likely to improve student outcomes based on research. Based on the data available from 2019, students with disabilities would benefit from getting small group instruction in reading.

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

Identify the students with disabilities subgroup and identify the level of intervention they need.

Person Responsible   Andrew Hamstra (andrewjh@leeschools.net)

Based on levels of FSA/FAST diagnostic results, students were placed in Really Great Reading, Phonics for Reading, or placed in settings that enrich and extend the material if the data showed they were performing at a high level.

Person Responsible   Andrew Hamstra (andrewjh@leeschools.net)

Monitoring of data will take place throughout the year through FAST progress monitoring and, teacher exemplar data.

Person Responsible   Andrew Hamstra (andrewjh@leeschools.net)

PLCs will discuss the progress of the students of the students with disabilities subgroup and determine what to re-teach and what to extend/enrich.

Person Responsible   Andrew Hamstra (andrewjh@leeschools.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: **Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.**	The area of focus was identified due to the drop in our ELA proficiency from 54% in 2019 to 51% in 2021,ELA did increase to 53% proficient in 2022. Learning gains went from 49% in 2019 to 38% in 2021 and did increase to 56% in 2022. ELA L25 learning gains from 49% in 2019 to 42% in 2021 to 44% in 2022. This is a critical need area as ELA learning gains and ELA learning gains for our L25 did increase but are still low.
Measurable Outcome: **State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.**	Our school would like to achieve an outcome that increases the percentage of proficiency in ELA from 53% in 2022 to 57% in 2023. Learning gains this year will be monitored through progress monitoring as it will not be measured on FAST testing since this is the first year of testing.
Monitoring: **Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.**	The desired outcome will be monitored through FAST progress monitoring results, district exemplars, and DIBELs.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ben Ausman (benjaminia@leeschools.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: **Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.**	The evidence-based strategy approved by the ESSA is intervention (or RtI) with a focus on closing the gaps for all of our students, especially students in the lowest 25%. The small group setting provides opportunities for students to receive differentiated instruction with immediate feedback through Really Great Reading, Phonics for Reading and Wonders intervention materials.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: **Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.**	The rationale for selecting this specific strategy is due to strong evidence that the strategy is likely to improve student outcomes based on research and approved by the ESSA. Based on the data available from 2022, all student subgroups would benefit from this strategy as well.

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.

The data will be analyzed in PLC's after every administration of the FAST progress monitoring assessment.

Person Responsible	Ben Ausman (benjaminia@leeschools.net)

Students are grouped based on FSA ELA level and what each student needs to close achievement gaps or to extend their learning,according to i-Ready results and FAST progress monitoring data.

Person Responsible	Ben Ausman (benjaminia@leeschools.net)

Based on overall student level, Phonics for Reading and Really Great Reading were used for students falling in the level 1 category. Students in level 2 are reading passages in small group intervention. Extension activities for students falling in the level 3 or higher categories are provided.

Person Responsible	Ben Ausman (benjaminia@leeschools.net)

Students will be grouped (or regrouped) based on their most recent level according to the most recent ELA diagnostic assessment and areas of need. This cycle will continue throughout the school year.

Person Responsible	Ben Ausman (benjaminia@leeschools.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

The evidence based strategies that are being used in K-2 is walk to read (leveled intervention), phonological awareness through RGR and Heggerty. Students also use accelerated reader and differentiated center activities. The students participate in cooperative learning through Kagan and Whole Brain. The leveled intervention will work with students on their specific needs to make them stronger readers. 1st grade finished at 49% on the end of the year iReady diagnostic. A focus to put instructional support personnel in 2nd grade rooms has been a focus so students are consistently working with a teacher/paraprofessional in small group.

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

The evidence based strategies being used is phonics for reading in leveled intervention. Students receive differentiated instruction through iReady. Students also use accelerated reader and differentiated center activities. The students participate in cooperative learning through Kagan and Whole Brain. 4th grade was 50% proficient on the end of year FSA and leveled intervention is in place to increase reading proficiency. Teacher/instructional support is in place to give students small group with an adult.

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

In 2021-22 school year 1st grade ELA finished at 49% proficiency. 1st grade will move from 49% to 55% by the end of the 2022-23 school year based on STAR data.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

In 2021-22 school year 4th grade ELA finished at 50% proficiency. 4th grade will move from 50 to 56% by the end of the 2022-23 school year based on FAST data

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.

STAR and FAST progress monitoring data will be analyzed in December. District exemplar data will be used throughout the year to check student progress. iReady data will be analyzed quarterly and drive classroom instruction. PLCs take place weekly to analyze student data and design small group intervention.

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

Hamstra, Andrew, andrewjh@leeschools.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?

Really Great Reading will be used in K-2 and lessons are taught every day. Really Great Reading phonics helps students understand their letter sounds to make them stronger readers. Students will receive additional differentiated instruction with RGR if they need it during leveled intervention in small group. Small

group intervention is also used in the classroom. Teachers group students based on data and small group lessons are based on what the group needs. All students have an iReady learning path that they work on for 45 minutes a week. This is a learning path that is based on their abilities so it is differentiated as well. Ready scaffold lessons are also available. In grades 3-5 Phonics for Reading leveled intervention is in place to help students that are still struggling to read. DIBELS reading fluency is also done across all grade levels. This let teachers see the fluency of students.

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?

The reasons for selecting the strategies above is that they are differentiated for all students and they all align to the B.E.S.T. standards. Based on using these strategies, especially small group intervention across all grade levels our reading scores have increased. Students are getting what they need from these programs/leveled intervention. Students get the opportunity if they are struggling reader to always be working with a teacher or instructional support personnel. This in the end will make them stronger readers with practice.

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
The first step is to look at the data and identify the students that need support in reading. Once the students have been identified, instructional support/teachers will be assigned to areas of need. Mrs. Devore (Reading Specialist) and Mrs. Lefko (K-2 Literacy Coach) work with the grade levels in order to determine appropriate passages and methods of teaching the content that align to the B.E.S.T. standards. As Mrs. DeVore and Mrs. Lefko attend district trainings based on literacy, the information is passed on to make sure Bayshore Elementary is following best practices for student achievement. Grade level representatives also attend leading and learning sessions from the school district. District coaches Leading and Learning representatives before they meet with their grade level team and design instruction.	Ausman, Ben, benjaminia@leeschools.net
Scales are used as part of our assessments. B.E.S.T. standards are explained to our students and they have scales to show them what the standard is asking of them. The scales are leveled so students can explain where they are at on the standard. The goal is to get all students to level 3, which is reaching the level the standard is asking. Students have the scale on their desk and self reflect where they are at and have data chats with teachers so students understand what they still need to be able to do to reach the standard. FAST progress monitoring will be used throughout the year to determine the progress of the students. District exemplars will also be given throughout the year. The frequency of the district exemplars will give many data points to see how students are progressing.	Ausman, Ben, benjaminia@leeschools.net
PLCs are a critical component of looking at the assessments. It is determining who didn't get it and who is getting it. As the data is analyzed in PLCs, it will be used to drive instruction for the students who need additional support and lessons can be designed to enhance students who did get it. PLCs meet weekly to have consistent communication as team to move forward and talk about the data points. This process is continuous all year in order to make sure instruction is matching what the students need. Teaching and assessing are always taking place to understand the next design of instruction that needs to take place.	Ausman, Ben, benjaminia@leeschools.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.

One way Bayshore builds a positive culture and environment is through our school-wide PBIS program. Students are given an opportunity to earn "bee bucks" for following school-wide expectations of being respectful, responsible, prepared, and safe. Students can then use their bee bucks at our school "bee cart" that has snacks and prizes. Students can also choose to save up their bee bucks to attend a quarterly PBIS

party.

Another way we encourage a positive environment is through our house system. Each student is sorted into one of four houses which encourages collaboration among students and staff members. The houses are based on our four school (Whole Brain) virtues: leadership, courage, grit, and creativity. Each student is assigned a buddy within their house who they work with throughout the year. Fifth grade students are also assigned various faculty members in their house as mentors whom they collaborate with to achieve academic, attendance, and behavioral goals.

Lastly, our school counselor does classroom lessons weekly to promote kindness and respect throughout the school. Our counselor also shares a positive message on the school news every Wednesday and reads a story that goes along with that virtue. Therefore, each student in the school has access to weekly character education.

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

Bayshore Elementary has many opportunities for guardian involvement. Guardians are invited to muffins with moms, donuts with dads, Fun Run, movie night, and hoedown. Volunteers, sponsors, and other stakeholders are thanked for their time with a breakfast at the end of the year as their involvement plays a big role in the success of school. The school's mission/vision statement is on the school's website to inform parents/guardians of the goals of our school.

Information on Focus is also available to guardians through the school's website to encourage them to have a Focus account. This way, they can check their student's progress throughout the year. Parent communication is also sent through school messenger by teachers or administration to inform parents what is happening in the classroom and school-wide.

Feedback is asked by guardians through surveys to increase two-way communication. The school welcomes phone calls and emails from parents to ensure the needs of each student are met. Parents, teachers, students, community members, and business partners will participate in the comprehensive needs' assessment by attending meetings that discuss the data of the school with how the school is doing overall, as well as L25s, and ESE students. Stakeholders will participate as the result of invitations through school messenger and school newsletters. Input from stakeholders will be collected through open discussions. Information will be given to parents through different languages to make parents aware.

Stakeholders will be involved in the design, implementation, and evaluation of the school wide plan such as creating and reviewing during SAC meetings. All data are shared with the School Advisory Committee (SAC), where parents and community business members are able to share and discuss ideas about how Bayshore Elementary may best move forward.