

Martin County School District

Bessey Creek Elementary School



2023-24

Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP)

Table of Contents

SIP Authority and Purpose	3
I. School Information	6
II. Needs Assessment/Data Review	11
III. Planning for Improvement	16
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	0
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	0
VI. Title I Requirements	0
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	28

Bessey Creek Elementary School

2201 SW MATHESON AVE, Palm City, FL 34990

martinschools.org/o/bces

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Martin County School Board on 9/19/2023.

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.

Mission: At Bessey Creek we will empower all children using a challenging curriculum focused on growth by creating a positive, connected community of learners.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Vision: Educating all students to be receptive, respectful, responsible, and resilient life-long 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
Schmit, Stacy	Principal	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Developing a world-class group of educators to serve the needs of all students and their families 2. Using data to identify gaps and opportunities to ensure student and family needs are met 3. Creating a robust and far-reaching team of empowered leaders on campus to ensure multiple perspectives are taken when making shared decisions 4. Engaging stakeholders to develop school-wide focus on student growth 5. Serving all stakeholders
Roth , Tiffany	Assistant Principal	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supporting the Vision and Mission of the school through collaborative, data-driven leadership 2. Leading PLC and CLT work, alongside the principal, to ensure supports of students leading to student growth and elimination of achievement gaps 3. Using expertise to help grow teacher practice 4. Supporting teachers to ensure teacher growth
Zech, Nicole	Curriculum Resource Teacher	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Supporting literacy instruction in the school 2. Developing our K-2 teachers to become literacy experts 3. Leading the charge in creating a literacy expert in EVERY K-2 classroom 4. Implementing coaching supports for teachers K-5 5. Working with the district instructional coaching team to implement initiatives, pilot programs, and best practices at Bessey Creek 6. Serving as our Martin Mentor; mentoring new teachers at BCE and those new to BCE
Beasley, Nicole	Teacher, K-12	Design Team member representing Grade 3
Grandy, Mary	Teacher, K-12	Design Team member representing Math Lead
Harkins, Anna	Teacher, ESE	Design Team member representing ESE unit classrooms
Hicks, Robyn	Teacher, K-12	Design Team member representing Kindergarten
Hilliard, Brittany	Teacher, K-12	Design Team member representing Grade 2
Lindsay, Charles	Teacher, K-12	Design Team member representing Related Arts
Nocito, Heather	Teacher, K-12	Design Team member representing Grade 4

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Odonnell-Iglesias, Julia	Teacher, ESE	Design Team member representing ESE for Gen Ed
Phillips, Julie	Teacher, K-12	Design Team member representing Grade 1
Stachowski, Wendy	Teacher, K-12	Design Team member representing New Teacher Mentorship
Allred, Shannon	Teacher, K-12	Design Team member representing Grade 5

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.

The School Improvement Plan(SIP) outlines the ways Bessey Creek Elementary School will stand in the gaps for all students and ensure all students are learning and growing in ways to eliminate achievement gaps. The School Advisory Council, comprised of the school leadership team, parents, teachers, and community members, works to develop and approve the SIP, and monitors data throughout the year to ensure growth and adjustments are made when growth is not optimal.

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))

The School Improvement Plan will be regularly monitored through the School Advisory Council. Data will be discussed within the School Advisory Council three times per year, after each set of progress monitoring data is available. After the winter progress monitoring data is available, revisions to the SIP will be made as necessary, to ensure continuous improvement.

Data after the third progress monitoring data set will also include annual survey data from teachers, parents, and students in grades 4 and 5. Survey data will be used to corroborate school climate and will also be used for school improvement.

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	No
2022-23 Minority Rate	22%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	28%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
ESSA Identification *updated as of 3/11/2024	N/A
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) Asian Students (ASN) Hispanic Students (HSP) White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History *2022-23 school grades will serve as an informational baseline.	2021-22: A 2019-20: A 2018-19: A 2017-18: A
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	9	5	6	8	10	11	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	1	0	9	0	0	0	12
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	2	6	12	12	9	9	0	0	0	50
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	5	3	4	3	8	5	0	0	0	28
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	6	14	28	31	23	25	0	0	0	127

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	1	2	2	8	6	0	0	0	21

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	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	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	6	15	14	13	19	18	0	0	0	85
One or more suspensions	0	3	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	5	6	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	8	8	0	0	0	25
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	13	39	45	18	17	0	0	0	132

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	0	5	4	7	0	0	0	17

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
Students retained two or more times	0	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	6	15	14	13	19	18	0	0	0	85
One or more suspensions	0	3	1	0	0	3	0	0	0	7
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	9	5	6	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	9	8	8	0	0	0	25
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	0	13	39	45	18	17	0	0	0	132

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	0	5	4	7	0	0	0	17

The number of students identified retained:

Indicator	Grade Level									Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	3
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*	68	55	53	77	53	56	79		
ELA Learning Gains				80			74		
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				71			57		
Math Achievement*	80	62	59	79	43	50	79		
Math Learning Gains				81			72		
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				70			48		

Accountability Component	2023			2022			2021		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
Science Achievement*	72	55	54	65	54	59	74		
Social Studies Achievement*					58	64			
Middle School Acceleration					38	52			
Graduation Rate					45	50			
College and Career Acceleration						80			
ELP Progress		53	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)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	73
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	292
Total Components for the Federal Index	4
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

2021-22 ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (CSI, TSI or ATSI)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	75
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	523
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	42			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	80			
BLK				
HSP	70			
MUL	43			
PAC				
WHT	77			
FRL	58			

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	51			
ELL				
AMI				
ASN	87			
BLK				
HSP	83			
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	75			
FRL	70			

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	68			80			72					
SWD	36			54			29				4	
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	80			80							2	
BLK												
HSP	69			71			71				4	
MUL	31			54							2	
PAC												
WHT	70			84			74				4	
FRL	53			66			62				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	77	80	71	79	81	70	65					
SWD	41	61	55	50	66	56	29					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN	83			91								
BLK												
HSP	82	96		79	87		70					
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	79	79	71	80	80	68	67					
FRL	70	74	77	68	77	68	54					

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	79	74	57	79	72	48	74					
SWD	43	47	50	53	53		38					
ELL												

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
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP	84	75		81	83		83					
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	79	74	61	78	68	48	73					
FRL	75	59		69	76		56					

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	75%	53%	22%	54%	21%
04	2023 - Spring	69%	66%	3%	58%	11%
03	2023 - Spring	68%	51%	17%	50%	18%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	81%	62%	19%	59%	22%
04	2023 - Spring	74%	71%	3%	61%	13%
05	2023 - Spring	87%	56%	31%	55%	32%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	73%	50%	23%	51%	22%

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.

Bessey Creek data for the 22-23 school year includes progress monitoring data for kindergarten through 5th grade. Data for grades 3 through 5 includes proficiency data for ELA and Math. 5th grade also includes science proficiency data.

The lowest performance for the year was seen within the SWD subgroups in grades 3 through 5, in the areas of ELA, Math, and Science. Factors contributing to the low performance could include teacher expertise, foundational skills gaps exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic, inadequate supports for students within the general education classrooms, and lack of high expectations for student growth and achievement within the school and on the parts of families.

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

When comparing initial percent proficient based on statewide FAST and Science assessments, Bessey Creek improved 1.5 points over last year's proficiency scores. This data is not directly comparable, however, and masks subgroup data.

Subgroups reporting for this school year are SWD, ASN, HSP, WHT, and FRL. Making preliminary comparisons, Bessey Creek showed improvement across ASN (+2 points over last year), and FRL (+1 point over last year) groups, and declined in the subgroups of SWD (-6 points from last year), HSP (-10 points from last year), and WHT (-7 points from last year). A drill down into each of the third through fifth grade subgroup data shows, specifically, that our SWD population is comprised of a much larger percentage of level 1 students across these grade levels, which makes it the subgroup with the greatest decline from the prior year.

The WHT and HSP populations are changing each year due to school choice. Bessey Creek now has 126 students on school choice. This has changed the subgroups a bit and we are seeing more students who qualify for free/reduced price lunches in our HSP category. Historically, our FRL population was mainly in the WHT population. School choice has increased the number of HSP students who qualify for free/reduced price lunches.

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.

Bessey Creek Elementary School preliminary subgroup data shows the only subgroup lagging behind the cumulative state average is the data for our Students with disabilities. For ELA this school year, as an average across grades 3 through 5, our percent proficient was 35%. This is a 6% decrease from last school year, and also a 19% gap from the overall, cumulative state average of 54%.

Factors contributing to the low performance could include teacher expertise, foundational skills gaps exacerbated by the COVID-19 pandemic, inadequate supports for students within the general education classrooms, and lack of high expectations for student growth and achievement within the school and on the parts of families.

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

The largest improvement this year was in the area of science achievement. 74% of students taking the Florida Next Generation Sunshine State Standards Assessment for Science scored at the proficient level. This was a 7% improvement over the 21-22 school year.

Science instruction was a focus for the school this past school year, and our approach included the use of hands-on science experiments and improved connections between the abstract concepts and the ways those concepts look in real life. The hands-on labs included labs from content taught in 3rd, 4th, and 5th grade, and focused on the Power Standards.

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

In terms of early warnings, student with significant absences who also are in the lowest performing levels in reading and math need the time to work with content to improve learning and close gaps. When attendance is not above 90%, time cannot be given in the amounts necessary to close gaps. Additionally, when looking at students in the lowest achievement level and putting supports in place within the school day, it is difficult to discern whether the gaps exist due to lack of exposure to the curriculum due to the absences, or whether a true learning disability is the cause. Attendance below the 90% is a disqualifying factor when trying to identify many learning disabilities. Therefore, improving attendance must become the priority when dealing with students with attendance issues coupled with any of the other early warning factors.

Some other data not on the early warning systems chart, but also an area of concern when considering student risk factors and standing in the gaps for students, are students who have both a students with disabilities label and qualify as a student eligible to receive free or reduced-price lunches. For students with these two factors, academic achievement is significantly reduced when compared to peers with all other combinations of risk factors.

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

Rank order for priorities for Bessey Creek for the 23-24 school year:

1. Ensure all teachers in grades K-2 grow their expertise in foundational literacy skills, becoming literacy experts. Goal: a literacy expert in EVERY K-2 classroom on campus
2. Ensure all students identified as a SWD grow at a rate so as to decrease the achievement gap between them and their grade level peers. Goal: 100% of SWD meet growth goals
3. Ensure all students in grades 3 to 5 are instructed in a research-aligned, daily phonics practice to provide them rules for advanced decoding to improve comprehension skills when there are content-rich vocabulary words within text. Goal: 100% of students in grades 3 to 5 will improve in vocabulary over their 22-23 sub-scores.
4. Ensure 100% of students falling below grade level proficiency in ELA and Math receive direct support within small groups and/or tiered interventions until they become proficient. Goal: 100% of students falling within the lowest 2 tiers of achievement on state progress monitoring tests will be supported by direct instruction in small groups or tiered interventions to close achievement gaps.

Area of Focus

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

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a 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.

When disaggregating data for the ESSA subgroup Students With Disabilities, it was strikingly apparent that, while there was an overall increase in proficiency (1.7 percentage points), the proficiency of our SWD decreased. 75% of SWD are taught in the general education classrooms within the school. The other 25% of students spend at least a portion of their days in self-contained classrooms.

For the 22-23 school year, assessments were new and thus, no previous years' scores were able to be used to calculate student growth. So, to look at our subgroup, we had to use proficiency data only, and no growth data.

We pulled the number of SWD scoring at each level on the state assessment and compared this data with students not identified as SWD. A normal bell-shaped curve is expected when looking at distribution of student scores over a grade level and including all students in the data pool. When eliminating SWD from the data, a shift to the right is apparent, with the majority of students scoring at the 3 to 4 levels of proficiency. When eliminating non-SWD and using only SWD as the data set, a shift to the left would be expected, but that is not the case. The majority of SWD scored at level 1, and this level represents the peak of the curve. But there is a smaller second peak showing up at the 3 to 4 levels of proficiency when looking at the grade 4 and 5 data. The grade three data does show a natural bell curve, with the majority of SWD scoring level 3.

The data shows SWD are not learning the grade level material in grades 4 and 5 and also that proficiency is attainable when provided the correct supports and skills, as was seen by the 3rd grade data.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May 2024, the percentage of students in the subcategory of SWD scoring at the proficient level will increase by 20% over the May 2023 data reported from the Spring FAST Assessments in ELA and Math, and the Science FSA.

Monitoring:

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

FAST progress monitoring assessments will be used to monitor for the desired outcome, with the Fall FAST assessment (PM1) serving as a baseline. Winter FAST (PM2) will be used to construct overall growth rates for each grade level for the school, and each student's individual growth will be compared to overall growth rates for the school. For students falling into achievement levels 1 and 2 on the Fall PMT1 assessment, when growth is smaller than the school average, meetings will be held to discuss necessary interventions for students above what is in place for the first part of the school year.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Stacy Schmit (schmits@martin.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.)

Small group instruction focusing on specific skills will be used to build student skills and fill knowledge gaps. This time will be identified in the master schedule and will be adhered to.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Small group instruction targeting specific skills deficits for students has been shown to be effective for improving student mastery of benchmarks. Once skills are mastered, students will then be moved to the next most foundational skill needed for mastery of the benchmark.

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.

Formative and summative assessments will be identified to be used to determine the foundational skills needed for student mastery of benchmarks.

Person Responsible: Nicole Zech (zechn@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: By December of 2023

Teachers will be trained in the administration of foundational skills assessments as well as in the corresponding lessons to improve student skills.

Person Responsible: Nicole Zech (zechn@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing through the year

Master schedule will be modified to designate small group instructional time within ELA and Math instructional blocks for targeted instructional time.

Person Responsible: Stacy Schmit (schmits@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: August 10, 2023

K - Include students with disabilities in quarterly progress monitoring meetings to problem solve with a focus on student growth.

1 - Consistent collaboration and backwards design planning to intentionally annotate the key components in whole group lessons. This will maximize time for small group instruction.

2 - Focus on small group teaching and set goals for all students. We will collaborate weekly and ensure: all students are instructed in content needed, all students will have their progress measured every few weeks, and all students will work on specific skills until those skills are mastered.

Person Responsible: Tiffany Roth (rotth@martinschools.org)

By When: Ongoing through the year

Staff will receive Professional Development in supporting students in classrooms where two adults are available for instruction and support of students. Bessey Creek uses a model of a highly supported gen ed classroom because we want to provide a room for students transitioning out of a self-contained classroom where they can receive the support they need to find success in general education. We use a paraprofessional to help support students in at least one classroom in each grade level for this purpose. PD will be utilized to help the duo learn to work together as co-teachers within the classroom.

Person Responsible: Stacy Schmit (schmits@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: August, 2023

Assessment schedules will be created to use paraprofessionals to administer assessments; students will receive extended time during related arts or other non-instructional time

Person Responsible: Tiffany Roth (rotth@martinschools.org)

By When: Ongoing, throughout the school year

3 - Facilitate targeted ability groups based on grade level data and observation to increase student proficiency.

4 - Assess data in the beginning of the year and continue to collaborate through the year. Small groups based on the ability of students in all classes. Promote kinesthetic activities to boost engagement and promote higher level learning. Revisit data and work collaboratively in PLCs to make any necessary changes.

5 - Being prepared to teach, taking time to make meaningful, targeted lessons based on data. Set realistic goals that gradually scaffold to more complex learning.

ESE - Tailoring instruction to fit the needs of each student based on their abilities. We will use small group instruction to target specific student strategies, and work within a co-teaching model to maximize instructional time with students. General education students with disabilities identified as non-fluent readers will receive additional instruction during weekly Benchmark assessments.

Person Responsible: Tiffany Roth (rotht@martinschools.org)

By When: Ongoing through the year.

#2. 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.

Positive school climate is associated with improvements for students, such as those for student achievement, attendance, and even graduation. It is also impactful for teachers on a school campus. Research has shown the impacts of positive school climate and the positive correlation to job satisfaction, sense of self-efficacy, retention, and even a reduction in teacher burnout and emotional exhaustion.

With a focus on student growth, and the understanding that getting to #1 in the state in terms of student outcomes will only be possible if 100% of our staff believe it takes us all to accomplish this goal and are willing to work together to that end, improving school culture and environment is always a focus.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By Spring of 2024, Bessey Creek teachers will improve in the area of Collective Responsibility by 200% over 2023 results, as reported on the 5Essentials Survey, scoring at least at the 26% when compared to like schools.

Monitoring:

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

Collective Responsibility asks teachers to report how other teachers in the school: help maintain discipline in the entire school, not just in their classrooms, take responsibility for improving the school, feel responsible to help each other do their best, feel responsible that all students learn, feel responsible for helping students develop self-control, and feel responsible when students in this school fail. This area of focus will be monitored monthly through a whole-staff survey done through Google Forms.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

CLTs will be structured in a way such that each will have a student work focus. Each member of the CLT will bring one or two student examples from their class to represent the specific construct agreed to prior to the CLT.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Collective responsibility refers to a mindset that staff members share a commitment to the success of each student. Research show a positive correlation of improved collective responsibility and improved student achievement and outcomes.

Collective responsibility is grown through work through collaborative teams, and must be facilitated by someone trained in the process, so that structures can be grown to assist in teachers being able to focus conversations on collaboration to realize the rewards and benefits of such collaboration.

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.

Designation and training of grade level leaders in creation of and work on critical friends groups and collaborative learning team processes.

Person Responsible: Stacy Schmit (schmits@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing, throughout the school year

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA**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.

ELA instruction aligned to the Science of Reading is necessary to ensure all students are reading and writing on grade level. To ensure this end, teachers in the K-2 space must become experts in literacy development to be able to identify and support students with atypical literacy development. In the 3-5 space, teachers must continue phonics in a way to support acquisition of multisyllabic words that are often content specific and rich.

Because Bessey Creek Elementary School does not have 100% of students reading and writing on grade level, teachers will continue to grow professionally in their ability to identify and support students with atypical literacy development. Student growth will remain a focus for all stakeholders, ensuring gains are made each year, until 100% of students are reading and writing on grade level.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May of 2024, 90% of students will show growth higher than the state average in ELA, as measured by STAR Early Literacy, STAR Reading, or FAST ELA, from PM1 to PM3.

Monitoring:

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

To monitor this area of focus, the leadership team and teachers will monitor student growth, using PM1 as baseline data for each grade level. Midyear data from PM2 will be used to gauge rate of growth to compare each individual student's growth.

Teachers will participate in professional learning to improve their ability to support students with atypical literacy development, as evidenced by CLT agendas and attendance logs. Leadership team will view CLT agendas and attendance logs monthly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tiffany Roth (rotht@martinschools.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.)

The use of science of reading, research-based practices will be in place in every classroom, for every student.

Teachers will participate in professional learning to improve their ability to support students with atypical literacy development, as evidenced by CLT agendas and attendance logs. Teacher professional development specifically targeting increasing our teachers' abilities to identify and support students with atypical literacy development will be tailored to individual teachers, based on their current expertise.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers are individuals, each coming with a history of experiences and understandings. With the science of reading, changes are being made to how students are taught, at what time, and in what order, to best support student success and growth in becoming proficient readers. Because of the different starting places for teachers as well as the differences in ranges of student abilities within each classroom, small group professional learning will be provided to our teachers that is appropriate and relevant to them. The

focus on teacher professional development ties teacher development to student outcomes and ensures teaching practice remains consistent with the latest research.

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.

Creation of CLTs based on teacher needs and expertise; delivery of professional development in the science of reading such that continues to grow teacher expertise and ability to support student growth.

Person Responsible: Nicole Zech (zechn@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing through the school year.

Create opportunities for teachers to attend the Florida Literacy Conference in January 2024.

Person Responsible: Tiffany Roth (rotht@martinschools.org)

By When: By November, 2023

Grade level commitments to ensuring students make measurable growth in ELA:

K - The kindergarten team commits to plan for deliberate and specific vocabulary instruction across all content areas.

1 - The first grade team commits to creating implicit and explicit instructional opportunities for academic math vocabulary and increase students' foundational fact fluency through multisensory activities.

2 - The second grade team commits to implementing small groups for needs-based instruction, progress monitoring using the foundational skills assessment. We will teach phonics with fidelity to the program and reteach students scoring below 80%. We will choose read-alouds aligned to current units of instruction.

Person Responsible: Stacy Schmit (schmits@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing, through the school year

Implementation of research-based phonics instruction in grades 3-5.

Person Responsible: Nicole Zech (zechn@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing, through the school year

Implementation of research-based vocabulary instruction K-5.

Person Responsible: Stacy Schmit (schmits@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing, through the school year

Grade level commitments to ensuring students make measurable growth in ELA:

3 - Utilize targeted ability groups to differentiate instruction and meet the needs of all students.

4 - Promoting use of new vocabulary words in real-world activities; make instruction engaging with purposely planned out activities to instill the love of reading books and boost confidence; creating phonics groups by needs to close gaps early in the school year; and focus on leveled reading.

5 - Taking time to make meaningful, targeted lessons based on data. We will set realistic goals that gradually scaffold to more complex learning. We will make this a consistent routine.

Related Arts - Providing exposure to prefixes and suffixes, Greek and Latin roots across all subject areas.

ESE - Small group instruction to target specific student strategies, and work within a co-teaching model to maximize instructional time with students. Additional instruction during non-mandatory weekly assessments.

Person Responsible: Stacy Schmit (schmits@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math**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.

Targeted, small group instruction in mathematics at all grade levels is important in order to help students with atypical numeracy development fill gaps in their understanding and then apply those new skills to master grade level content. Currently, gaps exist for portions of every subgroup of students in the school, and we are focused on ensuring gaps are eliminated.

Because Bessey Creek Elementary School does not have 100% of students on grade level in mathematics, teachers will continue to grow professionally in their ability to identify and support students with atypical numeracy development. Student growth will remain a focus for all stakeholders, ensuring gains are made each year, until 100% of students are on grade level in mathematics.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By May of 2024, 90% of students will show growth higher than the state average in Math, as measured by STAR Math or FAST Math, from PM1 to PM3.

Monitoring:

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

To monitor this area of focus, the leadership team and teachers will monitor student growth, using PM1 as baseline data for each grade level. Midyear data from PM2 will be used to gauge rate of growth to compare each individual student's growth.

Teachers will participate in professional learning to improve their ability to support students with atypical literacy development, as evidenced by CLT agendas and attendance logs. Leadership team will view CLT agendas and attendance logs monthly.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

[no one identified]

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.)

Ensuring teachers have access to, and implement, a rigorous, standards-aligned, comprehensive curriculum is the most important strategy to improve student learning. A guaranteed and viable curriculum is the variable most strongly related to student achievement at the school level. Research shows one of the most powerful things a school can do to help enhance student achievement is to guarantee specific content is taught in specific courses and grade levels.

Implementing Savvas in ways that support mastery of Florida BEST, ensures all students are provided a guaranteed, viable curriculum, and given an opportunity to work toward mastery of grade level standards in mathematics. This means that teachers must understand the standards and choose the appropriate lessons in an order aligned to research and student acquisition of skills.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Teachers are individuals, each coming with a history of experiences and understandings. Being able to choose resources from the district adopted textbook to allow students maximum benefit in learning grade-level mathematics standards is a skill that will need to be learned by teachers, as the resources are only in

their second school year of use. Because of the different starting places for teachers as well as the differences in ranges of student abilities within each classroom, small group professional learning will be provided to our teachers that is appropriate and relevant to them. The focus on teacher professional development ties teacher development to student outcomes and ensures teaching practice remains consistent with the latest research.

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.

Development of grade level CLTs centered on mathematics instruction and student learning; teacher PD to help identify resources associated with grade level state standards or parts of standards.

Person Responsible: Tiffany Roth (rotht@martinschools.org)

By When: Ongoing through the school year

Creation of student small groups within each classroom to ensure student learning needs are met and gaps in learning are supported and eliminated.

Person Responsible: Stacy Schmit (schmits@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing through the school year

Grade level commitments for this area of focus:

K - The kindergarten team commits to focus on student growth by intentionally creating groups based on student needs.

1 - The first grade team commits to utilizing data from unit, weekly, and state assessments to proactively design and create week to week small group lessons targeting students' greatest needs.

2 - The second grade team commits to implementing math talks with fidelity, focusing on the BIG M to ensure all skills are mastered through each unit, and utilizing all tools within the Savvas resource.

3 - The third grade team will utilize backwards design planning to guide instruction to achieve student growth.

Person Responsible: Stacy Schmit (schmits@martin.k12.fl.us)

By When: Ongoing through the school year

Grade level commitments for this area of focus:

4 - The fourth grade team commits to: purposeful planning of lessons and activities to include manipulatives and technology to engage students and increase meaning; provide opportunities for daily fact fluency practice; and monitor recent, relevant data to make informed decisions regarding student instruction.

5 - The fifth grade team commits to being prepared to teach, taking time to make meaningful, targeted lessons based on data. We will set realistic goals that gradually scaffold to more complex learning. We will make this a consistent routine.

ESE - The ESE Team commits to tailoring instruction to fit the needs of each student based on their abilities. We will use small group instruction to target specific student strategies, and work within a co-teaching model to maximize instructional time with students. We will use backwards design to best implement instruction based on math skills attainment.

Person Responsible: Tiffany Roth (rotht@martinschools.org)

By When: Ongoing throughout the year

Budget to Support Areas of Focus

Part VII: Budget to Support Areas of Focus

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

1	III.B.	Area of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Teacher Retention and Recruitment	\$0.00
3	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
4	III.B.	Area of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00

Budget Approval

Check if this school is eligible and opting out of UniSIG funds for the 2023-24 school year.

Yes