Bear Creek Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Bear Creek Elementary School

350 61ST ST S, St Petersburg, FL 33707

http://www.bearcreek-es.pinellas.k12.fl.us

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes (F.S.), requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a new, amended, or continuation SIP for each school in the district which has a school grade of D or F; has a significant gap in achievement on statewide, standardized assessments administered pursuant to s. 1008.22 by one or more student subgroups, as defined in the federal Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA), 20 U.S.C. s. 6311(b)(2)(C)(v)(II); has not significantly increased the percentage of students passing statewide, standardized assessments; has not significantly increased the percentage of students demonstrating Learning Gains, as defined in s. 1008.34, and as calculated under s. 1008.34(3)(b), who passed statewide, standardized assessments; has been identified as requiring instructional supports under the Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE) program established in s. 1008.365; or has significantly lower graduation rates for a subgroup when compared to the state's graduation rate. Rule 6A-1.098813, Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), requires district school boards to approve a SIP for each Department of Juvenile Justice (DJJ) school in the district rated as Unsatisfactory.

Below are the criteria for identification of traditional public and public charter schools pursuant to the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) State plan:

Additional Target Support and Improvement (ATSI)
A school not identified for CSI or TSI, but has one or more subgroups with a Federal Index below 41%.

Targeted Support and Improvement (TSI)
A school not identified as CSI that has at least one consistently underperforming subgroup with a Federal Index below 32% for three consecutive years.

Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CSI)
A school can be identified as CSI in any of the following four ways: 1. Have an overall Federal Index below 41%; 2. Have a graduation rate at or below 67%; 3. Have a school grade of D or F; or 4. Have a Federal Index below 41% in the same subgroup(s) for 6 consecutive years.

ESEA sections 1111(d) requires that each school identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI develop a support and improvement plan created in partnership with stakeholders (including principals and other school leaders, teachers and parent), is informed by all indicators in the State's accountability system, includes evidence-based interventions, is based on a school-level needs assessment, and identifies resource inequities to be addressed through implementation of the plan. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as TSI, ATSI and non-Title I CSI must be approved and monitored by the school district. The support and improvement plans for schools identified as Title I, CSI must be approved by the school district and

Department. The Department must monitor and periodically review implementation of each CSI plan after approval.

The Department's SIP template in the Florida Continuous Improvement Management System (CIMS), https://www.floridacims.org, meets all state and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all ESSA components for a support and improvement plan required for traditional public and public charter schools identified as CSI, TSI and ATSI, and eligible schools applying for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG) funds.

Districts may allow schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions to develop a SIP using the template in CIMS.

The responses to the corresponding sections in the Department's SIP template may address the requirements for: 1) Title I schools operating a schoolwide program (SWD), pursuant to ESSA, as amended, Section 1114(b); and 2) charter schools that receive a school grade of D or F or three consecutive grades below C, pursuant to Rule 6A-1.099827, F.A.C. The chart below lists the applicable requirements.

SIP Sections	Title I Schoolwide Program	Charter Schools
I-A: School Mission/Vision		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(1)
I-B-C: School Leadership, Stakeholder Involvement & SIP Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(2-3)	
I-E: Early Warning System	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(iii)(III)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-A-C: Data Review		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(2)
II-F: Progress Monitoring	ESSA 1114(b)(3)	
III-A: Data Analysis/Reflection	ESSA 1114(b)(6)	6A-1.099827(4)(a)(4)
III-B: Area(s) of Focus	ESSA 1114(b)(7)(A)(i-iii)	
III-C: Other SI Priorities		6A-1.099827(4)(a)(5-9)
VI: Title I Requirements	ESSA 1114(b)(2, 4-5), (7)(A)(iii)(I-V)-(B) ESSA 1116(b-g)	

Note: Charter schools that are also Title I must comply with the requirements in both columns.

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 Department 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.

I. School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

Providing all children with a challenging, high-quality education for their academic and vocational success.

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% Student Success

School Leadership Team, Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Monitoring

School Leadership Team
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 as it relates to SIP implementation for each member of the school leadership team.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Houston, Willette	Principal	Facilitates and monitors the execution and implementation process of School Improvement Plan.
Powers, Christina	Assistant Principal	Supports the execution, monitoring and implementation process of our School Improvement Plan.
Reed, Amanda	Psychologist	Works to support the success of students academically, socially, behaviorally, and emotionally. Collaborates with educators, parents, and other professionals to create safe, healthy, and supportive learning environments that strengthen connections between home, school, and the community for all students. Identifies and assesses the learning, development, and adjustment characteristics and needs of individuals, and groups, as well as the environmental factors that affect learning and adjustment. Provides interventions to students to support the teaching process and to maximize learning and adjustment. Assists in the planning, development, and evaluation of programs to meet identified learning and adjustment needs. Delivers a planned and coordinated program of psychological services.
Johnson-Levy, Sharon	School Counselor	Promotes student success while providing preventive services, and responding to identified student needs through the implementation of a comprehensive school counseling program that addresses academic, personal and social development for all students.
Youngerman, Marcia	Other	Works to support the success of students academically, socially, behaviorally, and emotionally. Collaborates with educators, parents, and other professionals to create safe, healthy, and supportive learning environments that strengthen connections between home, school, and the community for all students. Identifies and assesses the learning, development, and adjustment characteristics and needs of individuals. and groups, as well as the environmental factors that affect learning and adjustment. Provides interventions to students to support the teaching process and to maximize learning and adjustment. Assists in the planning, development, and evaluation of programs to meet the unique needs of our students and families.

Stakeholder Involvement and SIP Development
Describe the process for involving stakeholders (including the school leadership team, teachers and school staff, parents, students (mandatory for secondary schools) and families, and business or community leaders) and how their input was used in the SIP development process. (ESSA 1114(b)(2))

Note: If a School Advisory Council is used to fulfill these requirements, it must include all required stakeholders.

Bear Creek's School Based Leadership Team (SBLT) will continue to operate and function as Bear Creek's governing team as it relates to "all things" involving the overall safety and well-being of our

students, while meeting their individual academic, behavior and social-emotional needs. Bear Creek's SBLT consists of members representing our leadership team, student services, ESE and grade level team leaders. As a team, we use multiple sources of quantitative and qualitative data and the ECPS (equity centered problem-solving) protocol to address issues as they arise.

Towards the end of each fiscal school year (typically around April) our SIP committees meet to reflect and provide feedforward using the following guiding questions. Which instructional strategies and actions step were implemented with fidelity during the school year? What modifications/adjustments need addressing? Is the process used to determine the effectiveness of the strategy occurring? Are there any additional action steps that our ILT needs to address? Committees are then provided with an opportunity to include strategies that are occurring, yet not included in our plan. Committees are also allowed to make additional recommendations.

SIP Monitoring
Describe how the SIP will be regularly monitored for effective implementation and impact on increasing the achievement of students in meeting the State's academic standards, particularly for those students with the greatest achievement gap. Describe how the school will revise the plan, as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement. (ESSA 1114(b)(3))

Every Monday the Instructional Leadership Team (Admin and content coach) convene to review both, quantitative and qualitative data to ensure that we are on track to meeting our EOY targeted goals. Each member of the team highlights their walkthrough observations for week prior and make next steps recommendations for grade level teams, individual teachers and in some cases the instructional staff as a whole. Every curriculum meeting, collaborative planning session, and PLC begins with a review of our SIP goals.

After each progress monitoring cycle (PM1-3), grade level teams meet with administration to analyze/ reflect on the data, while making the necessary modifications to ensure that we collectively meet our end-of-year targeted goals.

Every first Monday of the month @ 7:45am is set aside for committee meetings. During this time our SIP committees work to put together a family engagement event tied to one our SIP content areas. This is just one of the ways that we engage our families, while providing them with resources and training that they can implement at home.

Demographic Data	
Only ESSA identification and school grade history updated 3/11/2024	
2023-24 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
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	74%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	100%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	Yes
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	TSI

Eligible for Unified School Improvement Grant (UniSIG)	No
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities (SWD)* Black/African American Students (BLK)* White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: C 2019-20: C 2018-19: C 2017-18: C
School Improvement Rating History	
DJJ Accountability Rating History	

Early Warning Systems

Using 2022-23 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**	
Absent 10% or more days	1	14	18	13	19	9	0	0	0	74
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	5	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	19	10	4	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	15	7	5	0	0	0	27
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	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 that have two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	3	3	13	5	0	0	0	25

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) As Initially Reported (pre-populated)

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	1	14	18	13	19	3	0	0	0	68
One or more suspensions	0	2	8	7	11	8	0	0	0	36
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	2	3	13	5	0	0	0	24

The number of students identified retained:

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

Prior Year (2022-23) Updated (pre-populated)
Section 3 includes data tables that are pre-populated based off information submitted in prior year's SIP.

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

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Absent 10% or more days	1	14	18	13	19	3	0	0	0	68
One or more suspensions	0	2	8	7	11	8	0	0	0	36
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students by current grade level that had two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	**1**	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	2	3	13	5	0	0	0	24

The number of students identified retained:

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

II. Needs Assessment/Data Review

ESSA School, District and State Comparison (pre-populated)
Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school or combination schools). Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school.

On April 9, 2021, FDOE Emergency Order No. 2021-EO-02 made 2020-21 school grades optional. They have been removed from this publication.

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	41	54	53	43	55	56	40		
ELA Learning Gains				47			47		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				38			27		
Math Achievement*	51	61	59	57	51	50	47		
Math Learning Gains				55			41		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				40			9		
Science Achievement*	61	62	54	33	62	59	40		
Social Studies Achievement*					65	64			
Middle School Acceleration					52	52			
Graduation Rate					57	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		64	59						

In cases where a school does not test 95% of students in a subject, the achievement component will be different in the Federal Percent of Points Index (FPPI) than in school grades calculation.

See Florida School Grades, School Improvement Ratings and DJJ Accountability Ratings.

ESSA School-Level Data Review (pre-populated)

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	49
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	196
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	TSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	313
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	25	Yes	4	4
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	34	Yes	4	
HSP	61			
MUL				
PAC				

2022-23 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
WHT	61			
FRL	49			

2021-22 ESSA SUBGROUP DATA SUMMARY				
ESSA Subgroup	Federal Percent of Points Index	Subgroup Below 41%	Number of Consecutive years the Subgroup is Below 41%	Number of Consecutive Years the Subgroup is Below 32%
SWD	20	Yes	3	3
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	37	Yes	3	
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	64			
FRL	51			

Accountability Components by Subgroup

Each "blank" cell indicates the school had less than 10 eligible students with data for a particular component and was not calculated for the school. (pre-populated)

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
All Students	41			51			61					
SWD	22			28							2	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	25			41			50				4	
HSP	57			64							2	

2022-23 ACCOUNTABILITY 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 2021-22	C & C Accel 2021-22	ELP Progress
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	57			63							3	
FRL	39			54			61				4	

2021-22 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	43	47	38	57	55	40	33					
SWD	14	21		14	29							
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	33	42	42	48	50	27	20					
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	69	64		69	54							
FRL	45	53	50	57	55	60	36					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
All Students	40	47	27	47	41	9	40					
SWD	12	25		24	25		13					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	33	48		40	35		32					
HSP	55			50								
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	50	42		64	58		69					

2020-21 ACCOUNTABILITY 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	ELP Progress
FRL	34	38		42	31	0	32					

Grade Level Data Review– State Assessments (pre-populated)
The data are raw data and include ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data. The percentages shown here represent ALL students who received a score of 3 or higher on the statewide assessments.

An asterisk (*) in any cell indicates the data has been suppressed due to fewer than 10 students tested, or all tested students scoring the same.

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	66%	57%	9%	54%	12%
04	2023 - Spring	41%	58%	-17%	58%	-17%
03	2023 - Spring	44%	53%	-9%	50%	-6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	46%	62%	-16%	59%	-13%
04	2023 - Spring	62%	66%	-4%	61%	1%
05	2023 - Spring	66%	61%	5%	55%	11%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	60%	60%	0%	51%	9%

III. Planning for Improvement

Data Analysis/Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources.

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

Although there was 5% percent increase in proficiency on the 2023 F.A.S.T. ELA, ELA continues to be our lowest performance area.

As a school, we have noticed that students in grades PreK-2 have gaps in the foundational literacy areas (phonics, fluency comprehension and writing), which only impedes their ability to access complex grade level text and engage in complex tasks in grades 3-5.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Across the K-2 STAR Literacy/Reading, K-2 STAR Math, 3-5 ELA F.A.S.T, 3-5 ELA Math there was no significant decline from the prior year.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

When compared with to the state average our 4th grade ELA (with a gap of 16%) and 3rd grade math (with a gap of 18%) presented the greatest gaps. As we continue to reflect upon our data from year to year, much of the gaps that we are seeing in grades 3-5 align to the following:

In ELA, students in grades PK-2 have significant gaps in the foundational literacy areas (phonics, fluency comprehension and writing), which impedes their ability to access complex texts and engage in complex tasks in grades 3-5.

In Mathematics, we have identified students in grades K-3 are experiencing difficulties understanding. place value (number sense) and basic computational skills (addition, subtraction, multiplication and division), which impedes their ability to independently engage in multi-step math problems in grades 3-5. In some cases, challenges related to reading also play a significant role.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

5th grade science showed the most improvement from the previous year with an overall increase of 28% (from 33% to 61%) in the number of students who were proficient. Consistent use of data to plan for differentiation,
intervention, and scaffold core instruction to increase science proficiency. Our 5th grade teachers collaborated with our district science coach to plan for regular assessment opportunities (both formally and informally)
and utilize data to modify and adjust instruction.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I, identify one or two potential areas of concern.

The percentage of level 1 students in both third grade ELA and math is a potential of concern going into fourth grade. As well as the percentage of students missing 10% or more days overall.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for school improvement in the upcoming school year.

Increasing ELA proficiency in grades K-5 as measured by our state assessment.
Increasing Math performance in grades K-5 as measured by our state assessment.

Area of Focus
(Identified key Area of Focus that addresses the school's highest priority based on any/all relevant data sources)

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Benchmark-aligned Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our current level of performance on the grade 3 ELA is 46%, as evidence by our 2023 F.A.S.T data. Our current level of performance in ELA, Mathematics and Science in grades 3-5 is 48%, 56% and 61%, respectively, as evidenced by 2023 F.A.S.T. data. Although this year we demonstrated improvement across all content areas, we must continue to place a strong emphasis on overall reading proficiency in grades K-2, by closing significant gaps in the foundational literacy areas (phonics, fluency comprehension and writing) early on.

In mathematics we must ensure that our students in K-3 have a solid understanding of place value (number sense) and basic computational skills (addition, subtraction, multiplication and division), in order to engage in high-cognitive demand tasks with multiple pathways.

In science we must ensure that our 5th grade students have a solid understanding of the grade level standards by accessing their prior knowledge of content to make appropriate connections to build upon new knowledge.

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

The percent of 3rd grade students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 46% to 60%, as measured by the F.A.S.T. Assessment.

The percent of all 3-5 students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 48% to 60%, as measured by the F.A.S.T Assessment. 70% of all 3-5 students will make a yearly learning gain, while 60% percent of all L25 students will make a yearly learning gain, as measured by the F.A.S.T Assessment. The percent of K-2 students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 65% to 70%, as measured by the PK-2 STAR Assessment. Please note the individual grade level contribution to our spring 2023 K-2 data: K-84%, 1st - 53% and 2nd - 58%.

The percent of all 3-5 students achieving Math proficiency will increase from 56% to 70%, as measured by the F.A.S.T Assessment. 70% of all 3-5 students will make a yearly learning gain, while 60% percent of all L25 students will make a yearly learning gain, as measured by the F.A.S.T Assessment. The percent of K-2 students achieving math proficiency will increase from 66% to 70% as measured by the PK-2 STAR Assessment. Please note the individual grade level contribution to our spring 2023 K-2 data: K - 72%, 1st - 57% and 2nd - 68%

The percent of 5th grade students achieving science proficiency will increase from 61% to 65% as measured by the SSA.

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

Ongoing monitoring of desired EOY outcomes will occur after each formative check, F.A.S.T Progress Monitoring and Unit Assessment. Other opportunities include during grade level data chats and monthly grade level data presentation to SBLT, facilitated by the grade level team leader. The Instructional Leadership Team will continue conduct weekly walkthroughs and track grade level and independent progress.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Willette Houston (houstonw@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Support and strengthen staff ability to utilize data to plan for core instruction, differentiation, intervention, and scaffold core supports to increase student achievement. Ensure that teachers plan for regular assessment opportunities (both formally and informally) and utilize data to modify and adjust instruction. Support and strengthen staff ability to prioritize engaging students in immense amounts of reading, discussion, and
writing across ALL content areas.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Our quantitative and qualitative data during the 2022-23 school year reveals that utilizing data to plan for core instruction, differentiation, intervention, and providing necessary scaffolds within core instruction are areas to focus on to close our current achievement gaps.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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 that teachers have the tools and resources to develop a clear understanding of the PK-5 B.E.S.T ELA/Math Benchmarks, while deepening their knowledge.

Person Responsible: Willette Houston (houstonw@pcsb.org)

By When: Within the first 30 days of school and ongoing.

Engage staff in ongoing professional development on curriculum updates/resources/materials in the ELA/ Math/Science areas based on walkthrough trend data.

Person Responsible: Willette Houston (houstonw@pcsb.org)

By When: Within the first 60 days and ongoing.

Using the ECPS process, our SBLT will continue to develop data-driven interventions that eliminate educational inequities and improve student outcomes.

Person Responsible: Willette Houston (houstonw@pcsb.org)

By When: Within the first 60 days and ongoing.

Administration will continue to cultivate a school-wide culture of collaboration for both teachers and students, using protocols developed in collaboration with Learning Sciences International.

Person Responsible: Willette Houston (houstonw@pcsb.org)

By When: Within the first 60 days and ongoing.

Provide embedded coaching support and PD centered around utilizing multiple forms of data (ISIP, F.A.S.T., Success Criteria, Formative assessments, Unit assessments, student work analysis) to drive instruction. (school-wide).

Person Responsible: Willette Houston (houstonw@pcsb.org)

By When: Within the first 60 days and ongoing.

Provide embedded coaching support and PD centered around utilizing multiple forms of data (ISIP, F.A.S.T., Success Criteria, Formative assessments, Unit assessments, student work analysis) to drive instruction. (school-wide).

Person Responsible: Willette Houston (houstonw@pcsb.org)

By When: Within the first 60 days and ongoing.

Develop, implement and monitor a data-driven science plan using unit assessments and formative checks.

Person Responsible: Willette Houston (houstonw@pcsb.org)

By When: Within the first 60 days and ongoing.

Monitor for consistent effective instruction that promotes student centered learning with rigor for all in ELA, Math and Science instruction in grades K-5.

Person Responsible: Willette Houston (houstonw@pcsb.org)

By When: Within the first 60 days and ongoing.

Develop a comprehensive writing plan across ELA, Math and Science for grades 2-5

Person Responsible: Willette Houston (houstonw@pcsb.org)

By When: Within the first 60 days and ongoing.

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Our current level of performance of our black subgroup is 33%, as evidenced by our 2023 ELA F.A.S.T. data.

Our current level of performance of our SWD subgroup is 22%, as evidenced by our 2023 ELA F.A.S.T. data.

We expect a proficiency level of 42% for both, subgroups to be by end of the 2023-24 school year.

The problem is occurring due to the lack of intentional planning for culturally relevant instructional best practices and utilize data to plan for differentiation and scaffold instruction to increase the achievement of SWD due to the lack of inclusion structures where the Gen-ed and VE Resource teachers collaboratively team teach to provide differentiation. We expect our black and SWD performance level to increase to 42% by end of the 2022-23 school year.

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

The percent of black students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 33% to 42%, as measured by our 2024 ELA F.A.S.T. data.

The percent of SWD students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 22% to 42% as measured by our
2024 ELA F.A.S.T data.

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

Ongoing monitoring of desired EOY outcomes will occur during grade level data chats and monthly grade level presentations facilitated by the grade level team leader. The Climate and Culture team will continue engage staff in PD with a focus on the use of equitable teaching strategies. The Instructional Leadership Team will
continue to conduct weekly walkthroughs and track the progress of both subgroups.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Willette Houston (houstonw@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Ensure that an inclusion model where both, Gen-Ed and VE Resource teachers intentionally plan for the differentiated needs of EACH student with consideration of the principles of UDL to ensure content is accessible to the broadest range of learners.

Cultivate a school-wide mindset that ensures teachers are engaging in equitable teaching practices (equitable grading, culturally relevant teaching, restorative practices, etc) through intentional planning while ensuring that all students are engaged in rigorous grade level course work.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Based on the learning gains and trend data of schools with a similar ESE population; school leaders shared that implementing an inclusion (push-in) model with a focus on differentiation, scaffold instruction and PD on tools for modifications to instructional strategies with co-planning as a major contributing factors to increased improvement of our SWD. Last year, we received numerous resources from our ESE ISD, resources that were relevant not only for our VE teachers, but our Gen-ed teachers as well.

As educators, we are obligated to ensure that students are provided multiple opportunities to engage in rigorous, grade level benchmark-based teaching and learning. Our current data illustrates that black students are under performing in all content areas (ELA, math and science) in comparison to their white counterparts.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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 teachers have a deep understanding of the K-5 B.E.S.T ELA and Math Benchmarks.

Person Responsible: Willette Houston (houstonw@pcsb.org)

By When: Within the first 60 days.

Ensure instructional supports are in place during core instruction and independent practice for our SWD. These supports include access to grade level text w/appropriate modifications and scaffolds, while providing small group differentiated instruction to close foundational gaps.

Person Responsible: Willette Houston (houstonw@pcsb.org)

By When: Within the first 60 days.

Provide opportunities for ESE and general education teachers to co-plan for differentiated instruction and support delivery of services within the Gen-ed setting.

Person Responsible: Willette Houston (houstonw@pcsb.org)

By When: Within the first 60 days.

Using the ECPS process, our SBLT will continue to develop data-driven interventions that eliminate educational inequities and improve student outcomes.

Person Responsible: Willette Houston (houstonw@pcsb.org)

By When: Witin the first 60 days.

#3. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a crucial need from the data reviewed.
One Area of Focus must be positive culture and environment. If identified for ATSI or TSI, each identified low-performing subgroup must be addressed.

Bear Creek staff is committed to building a bridge between what students know and what they need to learn. We are committed to knowing our students on a personal level -academically, socially, and emotionally by ensuring that their needs are known and met.

Using multiple sources of data (PIC, BOQ, PBIS Walkthrough and TFI RP 1 & 2), there is a need to increase our overall Tier 1 PBIS Implementation Program as measured by our PBIS Implementation Checklist.

We received an overall score of 46/52 (88%) on our EOY PCS Tier 1 Walkthrough with Restorative Practices Elements protocol. Ensuring that all students and staff are able to identify our Tier 1 Expectations (GFS) will be our area of focus.

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

The results of our EOY PBIS rating will increase from 88% to 100%, as measured by our EOY PBIS Walkthrough tool.

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

This area of focus will be monitored for the desired outcome year-round using the PBIS Implementation Checklist data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Marcia Youngerman (youngermanm@pcsb.org)

Evidence-based Intervention:
Describe the evidence-based intervention being implemented for this Area of Focus (Schools identified for ATSI, TSI or CSI must include one or more evidence-based interventions.)

Ongoing professional development, for staff and lessons for students, will be embedded during staff trainings, and classroom morning meetings.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

It is important that we not assume that ALL staff have the same understanding of our PBIS implementation program just because of the preschool rollout. As with any curriculum program, we will need to monitor and be intentional about revisiting the implementation of our school-wide plan throughout the school year.

Tier of Evidence-based Intervention
(Schools that use UniSIG funds for an evidence-based intervention must meet the top three levels of evidence as defined by ESSA section 8101(21)(A).)

Tier 1 - Strong Evidence

Will this evidence-based intervention be funded with UniSIG?

No

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

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review
Describe the process to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on needs. This section must be completed if the school is identified as ATSI, TSI or CSI in addition to completing an Area(s) of Focus identifying interventions and activities within the SIP (ESSA 1111(d)(1)(B)(4) and (d)(2)(C).

The district allocates SIP funds to each school as prescribed by the legislature. Principals present to the School Advisory Council the amount of their SIP Funds, their SIP, and how the SIP funds will support the plan. The SAC reviews and votes on approval of the SIP and use of SIP funds. The SIP funds are spent in alignment with the SIP, and reviewed by the SAC throughout the year. Expenditures that deviate from the approved SIP are presented to the SAC, which votes to approve or deny the expense.

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

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

Our current level of performance in grades K-2 is 65%, as evidenced in our 2023 PM3 F.A.S.T. data. Our PM3 F.A.S.T. data reflects the following performance by grade level.
Grade K - 85%
Grade 1 - 51%
Grade 2 - 55%

While 80% or more of students leaving Kindergarten are on above grade level year after year, our teachers in first and second grade are not as consistent in maintaining or accelerating that level of student progress/growth in ELA. Addressing the reading gap from grade K to first will require an intentional focus from the Literacy Leadership Team that strategically focuses on science of teaching reading (what and how).

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

Our current level of performance in ELA is 48% (5% increase from the year prior), as evidenced in our 2023 PM3 F.A.S.T. data. We expect an ELA proficiency 60% by end of the 2023-24 school year.

The percent of all 3rd grade students achieving proficiency in ELA will be 60%, as measured by the 2024 PM3 F.A.S.T. Assessment

Our 2023 FSA data reflects the following performance by grade level.
Grade 3 - 42%
Grade 4 - 42%
Grade 5 - 67%

The grade level performing below 50% is occurring due to the increased gaps in the early literacy/ foundational skills, inconsistent use of instructional best practices to accelerate learning, inconsistent use of data (formative and summative) to plan for differentiation, intervention and scaffolded core instruction to increase student achievement.

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 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 Measurable Outcomes

The percent of K-2 students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 65% to 70%as measured by the 2024 PM3 F.A.S.T. Assessment.

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

The percent of all 3-5 students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 48% to 60%, as measured by the F.A.S.T Assessment.
The percent of all 3rd grade students achieving proficiency in ELA will be 60%, as measured by the 2024 PM3 F.A.S.T. Assessment.
The percent of all 3-5 students making a yearly learning gain in ELA will be 70%, as measured by the 2024 PM3 F.A.S.T. Assessment.
The percent of all L25 students making a yearly learning gain in ELA will be 60%, as measured by the 2024 PM3 F.A.S.T. Assessment.

Monitoring

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 impact student achievement outcomes.

Ongoing monitoring of desired EOY outcomes will occur during grade level data chats and monthly grade
level presentations, facilitated by the grade level team leader, during our state of the grade. The Literacy

Leadership Team will conduct weekly walkthroughs, as well as track grade level and independent progress.

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Houston, Willette, houstonw@pcsb.org

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

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

- Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

Support and strengthen staff ability to prioritize engaging students in immense amounts of reading, discussion, and writing with feedback with grade-level text.
-Provides print rich, explicit, systematic, and scaffolded instruction
-Teach students to decode words, analyze word parts, and recognize words
-Reinforce the effectiveness of instruction in alphabetics, fluency, and vocabulary.
-Provide instruction in broad oral language skills
-Teach students how to use reading comprehension strategies
-Ensure that each student reads connected text every day to support reading accuracy, fluency, and comprehension.

Rationale:
Explain the rationale for selecting 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 evidence-based practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

To develop literacy, students need instruction in two related sets of skills: foundational reading skills and reading comprehension skills. Employing the evidence-based strategies and action steps will enable students to read words (alphabetics), relate those words to their oral language, and read connected text with sufficient accuracy and fluency to understand what they read.

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
Ensure that K-2 teachers are implementing evidence-based practices/programs which focus on the on the following: six components of reading (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, oral language, comprehension, and vocabulary) into an explicit, systematic, and sequential approach to reading instruction, including multisensory intervention strategies.	Houston, Willette, houstonw@pcsb.org
Literacy Leadership Team will provide training to teachers that integrate the six components of reading (phonemic awareness, phonics, fluency, oral language, comprehension, and vocabulary) into an explicit, systematic, and sequential approach to reading instruction, including multisensory intervention strategies.	Houston, Willette, houstonw@pcsb.org
Support and strengthen staff ability to utilize data to plan for differentiation, intervention, and scaffold core instruction to increase student achievement.	Geer, Natalie, geern@pcsb.org
Ensure that teachers plan for regular assessment opportunities (both formally and informally) and utilize data to modify and adjust instruction.	Geer, Natalie, geern@pcsb.org
N/A	Houston, Willette, houstonw@pcsb.org

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

This section must be completed if the school is implementing a Title I, Part A SWP and opts to use the SIP to satisfy the requirements of the SWP plan, as outlined in the ESSA, Public Law No. 114-95, § 1114(b). This section is not required for non-Title I schools.

Provide the methods for dissemination of this SIP, UniSIG budget and SWP to stakeholders (e.g., students, families, school staff and leadership and local businesses and organizations). Please articulate a plan or protocol for how this SIP and progress will be shared and disseminated and to the extent practicable, provided in a language a parent can understand. (ESSA 1114(b)(4))
List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

A SIP one-page document will be created and physically distributed to all families. It will be posted on our school-wide Dojo site, weekly family communication and website. The SIP will also be shared/reviewed in person at the Annual Title I meeting, as well as at our SIP and PTA meetings.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.
List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Bear Creek staff is committed to building a bridge between what students know and what they need to learn. We are committed to knowing our students on a personal level -academically, socially, and emotionally.

Our goal is to learn about our students' families, cultures, and interests. Creating a school-wide learning community which encourages students to care for one another and be responsible for each other will foster
a positive learning environment in spite of our current circumstance. As gatekeepers of our school's vision
and mission, we will provide consistent routines that help students feel valued and safe, and accountable to
one another.

This school year, a face-to-face Meet the Teacher and Open House will provide an informal opportunity for
students and parents to meet the teacher and visit the school. Teachers will elicit ideas from parents and students in regard to their likes, dislikes, strengths and areas for support. Throughout the school year, parents will have opportunities to engage in parent workshops and parental involvement activities.

Instructional Staff will work to promote rigorous, relevant, and differentiated opportunities for all students based on their future goals. Short and long-term goal setting will be expected. A welcoming attitude and inviting environment will be expected.

Families received a FOCUS printed progress report every month highlighting their student's progress.

Describe how the school plans to strengthen the academic program in the school, increase the amount and quality of learning time and help provide an enriched and accelerated curriculum. Include the Area of Focus if addressed in Part III of the SIP. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)ii))

As noted in our PFEP,
• Bear Creek's Community and Family Engagement Liaison will provide training on the Implementation and Coordination of Parental Involvement and Volunteer and Mentor Program. Improving the ability of staff to work effectively with parents and school volunteers. Family participation in their student's education positively affects student achievement.
• Bear Creek's SBLT will train staff on the importance of effectively interpreting student data in order to share that with families so that they are better able to assist their students at home.
• Bear Creek's SBLT will develop training for teachers during PLC meetings regarding parent communication, the use of the compact, cultural sensitivity, and working successfully with parents. Communication with parents/families has a positive effect on student performance.
• Bear Creek's SIP committees will plan high interest activities for parents in the content areas of ELA, math, and science. Activities will include information on how parents can use the skills taught to help their students at home, which positively impacts student performance at school.
• Bear Creek PTA/SAC will attend workshops on recruitment of parents. Parental engagement in has a

positive impact on student academic achievement.
• Bear Creek Reading Recovery teachers will provide PD for our K-2 teachers with an emphasis on increasing student achievement using RR strategies. Teachers will communicate best reading practices for families to implement at home, to increase family engagement with early literacy development.

The development of our teachers is an excellent why to support our parents.

If appropriate and applicable, describe how this plan is developed in coordination and integration with other Federal, State, and local services, resources and programs, such as programs supported under ESSA, violence prevention programs, nutrition programs, housing programs, Head Start programs, adult education programs, career and technical education programs, and schools implementing CSI or TSI activities under section 1111(d). (ESSA 1114(b)(5))

Bear Creek Elementary and the VPK Office work together to coordinate transition programs for students entering the regular public-school program. Activities include: coordinated meetings with parents, VPK teachers and the kindergarten teachers to discuss the specific learning needs of students, joint parent meetings to discuss transitioning, etc.

Bear Creek Elementary and the District Title I Office work together to provide information and education on ways parents can help their children at home.

Supplemental instructional supports and after-school learning opportunities is provided by the school is shared with parents during the development of the students' IEP.