Bennett C Russell Elementary School

2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

Bennett C Russell Elementary School

3740 EXCALIBUR WAY, Milton, FL 32583

http://www.santarosa.k12.fl.us/schools/bre/

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Santa Rosa County School Board on 10/12/2023.

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.

Bennett Russell Elementary (BRE) strives to ensure all children receive an excellent education through high quality learning experiences.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Through collaboration and continuous learning, Bennett C. Russell Elementary will create a place of excellence where all students are engaged in high quality, real-world learning. A professional and highly motivated staff, in partnership with parents and families, will encourage children to work hard to achieve their full potential and to become responsible individuals who are lifelong learners.

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
Baxley, Daniel	Principal	As principal, Mr. Baxley provides strategic direction for Bennett C Russell Elementary, manages and administers the standardized curricula, assesses teaching methods, monitors student achievement, encourages parent involvement, revises policies and procedures, administers the budget, hires and evaluates staff, and oversees facilities. He also serves as an integral member of our MTSS team.
Cain, Jamie	Assistant Principal	As assistant principal, Mrs. Cain assists the principal in the following: manage and administer the standardized curricula, assess teaching methods, monitor student achievement, encourage parent involvement, revise policies and procedures, administer the budget, hire and evaluate staff, and oversee facilities. She also serves as an integral member of our MTSS team.
Carter, Kari	Instructional Coach	As instructional coach, Mrs. Carter manages, supervises and implements the early intervention reading program for our students who struggle in reading. She also provides professional development for our instructional staff and opportunities for families to support literacy learning at home. She assists in data analysis and serves on the MTSS team.
Stokes, Tyler	Other	As the behavior coach, Mr. Stokes manages and provides behavior interventions for students who struggle in behavior (Tier 2 and 3 supports). He serves on our Positive Behavior Intervention Support (PBIS) Committee, (Tier 1 support). He also provides professional development for our instructional staff. She serves as one of the MTSS team members.
Holland, Kim	School Counselor	As guidance counselor, Mrs. Holland serves as an integral part of our Multi Tiered System of Support (MTSS) team. She provides support for our students, families, and staff; acts as a liaison to the community; coordinates all assessments; provides training related to policies and procedures relating to all required assessments; and provides training on emotional/social needs of our student population.
Palermo, Diane	Instructional Coach	As literacy coach, Ms. Palermo manages, supervises and implements the early intervention reading program for our students who struggle in reading. She also provides professional development for our instructional staff and opportunities for families to support literacy learning at home. She assists in data analysis and serves on the MTSS team.

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.

Russell Elementary invites stakeholders to plan using historical schoolwide data to identify areas of focused improvement and give input for evidence-based intervention strategies to address areas of focus. This is fulfilled through our School Advisory Council.

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))

Russell will regularly monitor through classroom walkthroughs, data meetings, MTSS meetings, surveys, staff input and make adjustments as needed. At Russell Elementary we believe in data driven decisions. The continuous improvement department conducts a review each semester for SIP monitoring.

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	27%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	61%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	ATSI
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) Hispanic Students (HSP) Multiracial Students (MUL) 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: B 2018-19: B 2017-18: B
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	2	1	8	3	5	6	0	0	0	25
One or more suspensions	2	1	0	2	1	1	0	0	0	7
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	2	5	4	4	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in Math	0	3	8	3	0	4	0	0	0	18
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	
	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	2	3	9	5	9	8	0	0	0	36

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	4	8	0	11	0	0	0	0	0	23
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	12	36	21	25	17	21	0	0	0	132
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	2	1	3	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	2	7	8	3	1	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	0	3	11	3	0	4	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	16	22	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	17	27	0	0	0	47
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	18	20	16	16	11	20	0	0	0	101
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	3	8	5	7	10	0	0	0	33

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	12
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	12	36	21	25	17	21	0	0	0	132
One or more suspensions	0	2	1	2	1	3	0	0	0	9
Course failure in ELA	0	2	7	8	3	1	0	0	0	21
Course failure in Math	0	3	11	3	0	4	0	0	0	21
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	3	16	22	0	0	0	41
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	3	17	27	0	0	0	47
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	18	20	16	16	11	20	0	0	0	101
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	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	3	8	5	7	10	0	0	0	33

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	4	4	2	2	0	0	0	0	0	12
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*	56	62	53	60	65	56	58		
ELA Learning Gains				62			61		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				50			54		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement*	60	68	59	58	45	50	54		
Math Learning Gains				55			45		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				42			39		
Science Achievement*	48	57	54	39	68	59	51		
Social Studies Achievement*					64	64			
Middle School Acceleration					51	52			
Graduation Rate					55	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		77	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)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	55
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	221
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	ATSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	366

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
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	40	Yes	4	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	34	Yes	1	
HSP	53			
MUL	59			
PAC				
WHT	58			
FRL	50			

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	34	Yes	3	
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK	51			
HSP	47			
MUL	56			
PAC				
WHT	53			

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%
FRL	49			

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	56			60			48					
SWD	38			49			38				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35			30							3	
HSP	60			60			40				3	
MUL	58			65			60				4	
PAC												
WHT	58			62			49				4	
FRL	53			56			43				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	60	62	50	58	55	42	39					
SWD	33	52	42	35	40	21	15					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	35	47		56	64							
HSP	52	50		55	35		45					
MUL	61	63	60	53	63	57	38					
PAC												

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
WHT	62	65	51	59	55	42	39					
FRL	54	59	52	53	48	39	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	58	61	54	54	45	39	51					
SWD	31	38	31	36	24	17	25					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK	69			56								
HSP	65			75								
MUL	59			35								
PAC												
WHT	56	60	57	54	41	29	51					
FRL	51	62	48	43	44	38	45					

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	59%	64%	-5%	54%	5%
04	2023 - Spring	63%	68%	-5%	58%	5%
03	2023 - Spring	57%	61%	-4%	50%	7%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	66%	70%	-4%	59%	7%
04	2023 - Spring	63%	72%	-9%	61%	2%
05	2023 - Spring	57%	63%	-6%	55%	2%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	45%	55%	-10%	51%	-6%

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.

The lowest performance last year was in science achievement levels for all students(39%).

When comparing FSA science scores in science achievement, there was -12% for all students, -10% SWD, -12% White, and -9% ED. Over a three year period of time, science achievement for all students has steadily decreased.

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

The greatest decline was in ELA. Proficiency was 60% in 2022 and 59% in 2023. Factors for this include student attendance, new classroom teachers, new assessment monitoring on computers, and a drop in standards related to theme and central idea.

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.

The greatest gap in achievement was in science. Russell Elementary performed -10 the district average of 55, and -6 the state average. Our school was lowest in the content area of Earth and Space. Although we saw a 6 point increase from last year, our science scores are still significantly below pre-Covid performance.

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

Math proficiency was the area that showed the most improvement (+4) including an increase in SWD (+3). Math tutoring and having a math interventionist working with our exclusively with SWD and MTSS students.

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

Our EWS data shows a need for improvement in attendance and course failure in math for our incoming 3rd graders.

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

1. Instructional practice specifically relating to science.
2. Science (15%), Math(21%) and ELA (42%) learning gains for our students with disabilities subgroup
3. Instructional practice specifically relating to instructional coaching and professional learning
4. Positive culture and environment specifically relating to teacher retention and recruitment

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

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Teacher Retention and Recruitment

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.

Based on 22-23 school, the retention rate for Instructional personal was 90% and educational support staff was 60%. Additionally, based on student, parent, and teacher surveys, there was a decline in all surveys. A contributing factor was due to a low number of qualified applicants were available for instructional openings and retention of instructional staff. Due to the shortage of qualified instructional staff, BRE had to collapse (integrate students from other full-size classrooms) four classrooms. This created very large student-to-teacher ratios per classroom. Therefore, teacher retention is a need for our school.

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

Short Term: The goal for Russell is to increase the retention rate for instructional and educational support staff by 2% to increase consistency across the grade levels and school as a whole. Also, a goal is to see a .20 increase in each satisfaction survey (student, teacher, and parent).

Long Term Goal: The goal for Russell is to create a school environment to where the retention rate is consistently 95% or higher and student, teacher, and parent surveys are above the district average,

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

This area will be monitored through retention rates provided by district as well as surveys completed by students, parents, and teachers.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Daniel Baxley (baxleyc@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

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.)

BRE is a school-wide Positive Behavioral Interventions and Supports (PBIS) school with shared goals and behavior expectations. The use on PBIS at Russell Elementary is used to create and promote a positive learning environment for all stakeholders. These expectations are posted throughout the hallways, classrooms, and other common areas. Teachers and staff strive to use positive interactions and reinforcements to elicit desired behavior from students. Students and parents are surveyed annually to measure their level of satisfaction with school decisions.

chrome-extension://efaidnbmnnnibpcajpcglclefindmkaj/https://ies.ed.gov/ncee/pubs/2022008/pdf/2022008.pdf

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

A PBIS initiative can lay the foundation for long-term impact on a school's culture and climate. For some schools, PBIS can boost positive initiatives already in place. For others, it can be a radical shift in the way a school operates. PBIS can improve behavior schoolwide. Building a great staff takes time, and it's difficult to do when your teachers get burned out and leave year after year. Establishing a positive school climate can help with teacher retention as well as other benefits.

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 4 - Demonstrates a Rationale

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.

Development of a faculty and staff social contract.

Person Responsible: Daniel Baxley (baxleyc@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: Completed by 8/10/23

Quarterly PBIS Meetings

Person Responsible: Daniel Baxley (baxleyc@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: By the end of each quarter

Behavior Coach used to monitor behavior interventions and support teachers.

Person Responsible: Tyler Stokes (stokeswt@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: ongoing

School-wide PBIS (CHAMPS) implementation with fidelity.

Person Responsible: Jamie Cain (cainj1@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: Quarterly

Positive affirmation board for faculty and staff to celebrate and recognize employees who are following the social contract. .

Person Responsible: Jamie Cain (cainj1@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: Quarterly

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a 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.

Upon reflecting on previous 21-22 data*, our math learning gains (21%) and our science proficiency (15%) for students with disabilities subgroup are well below the minimum requirement of 41%.

*Note: Learning gains were not calculated for 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.

Short Term:
Long Term: Progress Learning and FAST Data will reflect a minimum of 41% of targeted (student with disabilities) students will be proficient in science and making gains in math.

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

Our identified area of focus will be monitoed using PM2 and PM3 data and chapter assessments.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Daniel Baxley (baxleyc@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

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.)

MTSS will be the focus of raising our science proficiency and math learning gains for our SWD. We will identify these students and placethem in intervention groups that focus on math growth and reading that relates to science concepts tested at the end of the school year.

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

The key components of MTSS include:
Universal screening of all students early in the school year
Tiers of interventions that can be amplified in response to levels of need
Ongoing data collection and continual assessment
Schoolwide approach to expectations and supports
Parent involvement
The integrated instruction model of MTSS uses collected data to assess student needs and provide them with interventions in appropriate tiers.
As part of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) updated by Congress in 2004, the Response to Intervention model of assessment originally sought to identify students who would benefit from more intensive supports. From these beginnings as a tool to help improve educational outcomes for students in special education, MTSS has grown to encompass all students at every level.

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 2 - Moderate 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.

We will utilize supplemental resources to address the academic needs of students.

Person Responsible: Daniel Baxley (baxleyc@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: This will occur monthly through reports.

The MTSS/Leadership Team will meet with the teachers (classroom and tutoring) of the SWD students to discuss their data. Necessary changes to the instruction and interventions will be made as needed.

Person Responsible: Amelia McCurdy (mccurdya@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: This will occur bi-weekly at MTSS meetings.

The leadership team will identify SWD students who qualify for extended day tutoring for science and math. The students identified will participate in tutoring sessions focused on student needs.

Person Responsible: Jamie Cain (cainj1@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: This will occur by the end of April.

The school will have quarterly Literacy Nights (family nights) to engage parents with literacy and/or math strategies to support student achievement.

Person Responsible: Daniel Baxley (baxleyc@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: This will occur by the end of April.

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

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.

Upon reflecting on previous 22-23 data, our science proficiency (45%) for 5th students is well below the the district average of 55% and the state average of 51%. Additionally, classroom walkthrough data reflected a need for an increase of teachers effectively aligned science instruction to benchmarks. Benchmark-aligned instruction is a process for planning, delivering, monitoring, and improving expectations clearly defined in academic content standards which provide the basis of content instruction and assessment. Increase exposure to explicit, benchmark-aligned instruction and setting scales and rubrics that are align with state science standards will improve learning outcomes for all students.

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

Short Term: Using PLC Data Driven Instruction, Progress Learning instructional component, specifically targeted small group instruction for science, and the use of Study Island our Practice B will be 62% proficient as well as the end of the year Science will increase to the state average.

Long Term: Based on classroom walkthroughs our science end of the year assessments will increase from year to year until BRE is at or above the district average as these strategies are put in place and monitored.

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

Classroom walkthroughs, data driven decisions based on Progress Learning reports, Study Island reports, and analysis of chapter assessments will monitor for the outcome of student achievement and instructional improvement.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Daniel Baxley (baxleyc@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

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.)

In order to increase benchmark-aligned instruction in classrooms and small group instruction, we will effectively implement the Marzano Focused Teacher Evaluation Model framework with "provides a methodology to support teacher growth as teachers make instructional shifts necessary to support students in rigorous, standards-based classrooms" (1). The model draws upon data from field research and validation studies, couples with findings from the extant literature on rigorous, standards-based instruction (2).

https://www.marzanocenter.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2018/10/MC06-14-FTEM-White-Paper-1-16-18-Digital-4.pdf

https://www.marzanocenter.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2019/04/FTEM_Updated_Michigan_08312017.pdf

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

Explicit, standards-aligned instruction ensures students have the opportunity to access the targeted grade level expectations. The Marzano Focused Teacher Evaluation Model is supported by wide research and

demonstrates significantly increased student growth scores (1). The model is comprised of four domains directly tied to student achievement, two, Standards-Based Planning and Standards-Based Instruction, explicitly align to the Area of Focus.

https://www.marzanocenter.com/wp-content/uploads/sites/4/2019/04/
FTEM_Updated_Michigan_08312017.pdf

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 2 - Moderate 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.

Increase the frequency of exposure to targeted vocabulary: word walls in main hallway. Teachers will reinforce these vocabulary words throughout their lessons.

Person Responsible: Daniel Baxley (baxleyc@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly through classroom walkthroughs.

The use of Progress Learning and Student Island to provide practice on the science standards to increase student proficiency.

Person Responsible: Daniel Baxley (baxleyc@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: Monthly using reports from Progress Learning and Study Island.

The leadership team will identify students who qualify for extended day tutoring for science. The students identified will participate in tutoring sessions focused on student needs to increase proficiency.

Person Responsible: Daniel Baxley (baxleyc@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: By the end of April.

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Instructional Coaching/Professional Learning

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.

After reflecting on previous years' student data and teacher evaluation data we identified the need for increased standard based planning and instruction to increase student achievement (ELA 59%, Math 62%, and Science 45%) and teacher effectiveness.

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

Short Term: Walkthrough and observation data and will increase to 50% at mid-year and 75% at end of the year in the area of teachers delivering explicit benchmark-aligned instruction by utilizing student led teams and scales/rubrics. Teachers delivering explicit standards based instruction will, in turn, increase student achievement from PM 1 to PM 2.

Long term: By utilizing feedback and PLCs, the goal is for all tested subjects proficiency rate will be 62% or higher.

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

Monitoring will take place by analyzing data from weekl/chapter tests, progress monitoring (STAR & F.A.S.T.) each quarter as well as analyzing teacher osbservation data.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Daniel Baxley (baxleyc@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

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.)

The Standards Assessment Inventory provided to teachers indicated a need for growth in Creating a Culture of Collaboration and Inquiry. Professional Learning Communities address this staff indicated desire for a "shared culture of excellence" and collective responsibility for all learners" (1). In order to implement student lead teams, we will effectively implement Professional Learning Communities. This evidence-based strategy is designed to support teachers with learning and implementing student led teams(2).

(1)Advancing Outcomes for All Learners: Standards for Professional Learning www.learningforward.com

(2)The Effective Implementation of Professional Learning Communities https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1194725.pdf

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

This strategy benefits all learners, and addresses teacher collaboration and inquiry. This supports our teachers and holds teachers to high expectations.

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

Through PLCs teachers will use scales/rubrics to create a road map for students to progress through standards based instruction until proficiency is achieved.

Person Responsible: Daniel Baxley (baxleyc@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: Quarterly

Book study on "The Power of Student Teams", by Toth and Sousa with 15 teachers.

Person Responsible: Daniel Baxley (baxleyc@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: First Quarter

School leaders providing explicit feedback to teachers to increase student engagement with an emphasis on student led teams and tracking student progress.

Person Responsible: Daniel Baxley (baxleyc@santarosa.k12.fl.us)

By When: Yearly

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).

Teachers will participate in professional development and professional learning communities throughout the year, aligned to their goal statements emphasizing in student led teams and Learning Scales and Performance Targets. Academic Interventionist will meet regularly with administration to review progress monitoring data in order to identify students with most needs. Those needs will be discussed in the MTSS meetings and interventions will be put in place to close the learning gap. The school leadership team will meet each month to discuss school wide data and trends. The administration will meet quarterly with the SAC team to review school improvement funding allocations and ensure resources are allocated based on the school needs. The SAC team will discuss any barriers to address school need and apply funds that will impact the school needs.

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.

Our School Improvement Plan will be reviewed by our School Advisory Council. A copy of our plan will be available on our school website, and in our Title I binder which is available progress will be shared in quarterly School advisory Council meetings in which minutes are available on our school website and submitted to the school board.

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))

Bennett Russell builds 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 by having quarterly parent engagement activities, initiate a Booster Club that includes all stakeholders, continue with updating our Facebook page (Cardinal Connection), and schedle SAC meetings at least for times this school year.

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)

BRE's top priorities are:
1. Instructional practice specifically relating to science
2. Math(21%) and ELA (42%) learning gains for our students with disabilities subgroup
3. Instructional practice specifically relating to instructional coaching and professional learning
4. Positive culture and environment specifically relating t teacher retention and recruitment

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))

N/A