Pinellas County Schools

# Bardmoor Elementary School




## 2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

# Table of Contents

**School Demographics** 3

**Purpose and Outline of the SIP** 4

**School Information** 5

**Needs Assessment** 8

**Planning for Improvement** 12

**Positive Culture & Environment** 0

**Budget to Support Goals** 0

# Bardmoor Elementary School

8333 MAGNOLIA DR, Seminole, FL 33777

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

**Demographics**

## Principal: Leigh Brown

Start Date for this Principal: 2/1/2012

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>PK-5 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2021-22 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 97% |
| **2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Asian Students<br>Black/African American Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students<br>English Language Learners<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>Students With Disabilities<br>White Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2021-22: C (51%)<br>2020-21: (39%)<br>2018-19: B (57%)<br>2017-18: C (46%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Central |
| **Regional Executive Director** | Lucinda Thompson |
| **Turnaround Option/Cycle** | N/A |
| **Year** | |
| **Support Tier** | |
| **ESSA Status** | TS&I |

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.

## School Board Approval

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

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

# Part I: School Information

## School Mission and Vision

**Provide the school's mission statement.**

Bardmoor is committed to educate and prepare each student to be productive, well-rounded citizens.

**Provide the school's vision statement.**

100% Student Success - each child will gain a year's growth or more each year.

## School Leadership Team

**Membership**
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

| Name | Position Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Brown, Leigh | Principal | | Instructional Leader and School Manager |
| Ruscetta, Mark | Assistant Principal | | Instructional leader and assists in school management. |
| Reissman, Jessica | Other | MTSS Coach | To assist teachers with understanding data and provide coaching support in the classroom. |
| Hurd, Karen | Behavior Specialist | | To assist students and teachers with behavior modification plans and work as a behavior coach in classrooms. |
| Mercier, Joanne | Attendance/ Social Work | | Monitor attendance and assist families with barriers to school attendance. Also to provide support to students who are in emotional crisis or need. |
| Ballenger, Carol | Guidance Counselor | | Assist students who are in need and provide resources for teacher. |

## Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Wednesday 2/1/2012, Leigh Brown

**Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*
0

**Number of teachers with a 2022 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective.** *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

13

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

42

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

470

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

1

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

1

**Demographic Data**

## Early Warning Systems

**Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 56 | 86 | 66 | 68 | 68 | 68 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 412 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 1 | 26 | 25 | 24 | 19 | 25 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 120 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 16 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 |
| Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 13 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 36 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 3 | 8 | 10 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 30 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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

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

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 3 | 7 | 7 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Wednesday 6/15/2022

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 53 | 63 | 72 | 76 | 65 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 383 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 22 | 27 | 23 | 23 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 111 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 12 | 12 | 21 | 19 | 15 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 89 |

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

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

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 53 | 63 | 72 | 76 | 65 | 54 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 383 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 22 | 27 | 23 | 23 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 111 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 11 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 13 |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 12 | 12 | 21 | 19 | 15 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 89 |

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

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

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

## Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

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

| School Grade Component | 2022 | | | 2021 | | | 2019 | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 42% | | | 39% | | | 48% | 54% | 57% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 51% | | | 41% | | | 57% | 59% | 58% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 50% | | | 32% | | | 63% | 54% | 53% |
| Math Achievement | 49% | | | 44% | | | 61% | 61% | 63% |
| Math Learning Gains | 67% | | | 44% | | | 64% | 61% | 62% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 59% | | | 28% | | | 45% | 48% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 40% | | | 48% | | | 61% | 53% | 53% |

**Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments**
**NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.**

| ELA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 01 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 02 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 03 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 49% | 56% | -7% | 58% | -9% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 39% | 56% | -17% | 58% | -19% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -49% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 50% | 54% | -4% | 56% | -6% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -39% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 01 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 02 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 03 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 51% | 62% | -11% | 62% | -11% |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| 04 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 61% | 64% | -3% | 64% | -3% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -51% | | | | |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 62% | 60% | 2% | 60% | 2% |
| Cohort Comparison | | -61% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2022 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 58% | 54% | 4% | 53% | 5% |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |

## Subgroup Data Review

| 2022 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2020-21 | C & C Accel 2020-21 |
| **2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2019-20 | C & C Accel 2019-20 |
| SWD | 8 | 24 | | 23 | 35 | 25 | 7 | | | | |
| ELL | 10 | | | 30 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 28 | | | 19 | | | | | | | |
| HSP | 39 | | | 33 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 41 | 31 | | 53 | 40 | | 44 | | | | |
| FRL | 38 | 38 | 29 | 40 | 41 | 17 | 47 | | | | |
| **2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
| SWD | 22 | 46 | 64 | 43 | 68 | 55 | 55 | | | | |
| ELL | 12 | 40 | | 76 | 73 | | | | | | |
| ASN | 70 | | | 80 | | | | | | | |
| BLK | 31 | 39 | | 39 | 35 | | 46 | | | | |
| HSP | 45 | 44 | | 68 | 70 | 55 | 58 | | | | |
| MUL | 64 | | | 45 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 49 | 62 | 70 | 64 | 63 | 46 | 62 | | | | |
| FRL | 44 | 55 | 66 | 57 | 64 | 50 | 57 | | | | |

## ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

| ESSA Federal Index | |
|---|---|
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | TS&I |
| OVERALL Federal Index – All Students | 54 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 1 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 71 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 429 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 98% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|---|
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 42 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |

| Students With Disabilities | |
|---|---|
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| English Language Learners | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 47 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Asian Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Asian Students | 60 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Black/African American Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 36 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Hispanic Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 52 |
| Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Multiracial Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Multiracial Students | |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Native American Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Native American Students | |
| Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Pacific Islander Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students | |
| Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | N/A |
| Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| White Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - White Students | 54 |
| White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Economically Disadvantaged Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students | 51 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Data Analysis**
Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

**What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?**

Trends are that as an over all, grade levels are stagnant or decreased in math projected proficiency as measured by MAP and stagnant or a slight increase in reading project proficiency as measured in MAP from Fall 2021 to Spring 2022. The student's average score on the Science common assessment increased by 10 points on the Beginning of the Year Diagnostic to the Mid Year diagnostic and the MOCK SSA.

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

There is need for improvement in both ELA and Math due to the low or no rate of growth in each subject area.

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

The school needs to focus on aligning tasks to the Standard/Benchmark. Understanding what is being asked by the Standard/Benchmark and aligning the task to the requirements.

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

Science showed the most improvement based off of the District created science assessments.

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

Science is consistently embedded into all areas. Students are interested, naturally, in science, so they are more engaged when it is used as a teaching engagement strategy.

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

Aligning tasks to the depth of the Standard/Benchmark will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning.

**Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.**

Professional development opportunities will be implemented that allow teachers to dig into the Standard/Benchmark so that they understand what is being asked of the student. During collaborative planning, tasks will be vetted to ensure that the requirements of the Standard/Benchmark are being met. We will continue using AVID strategies for goal setting and engagement strategies.

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

*Project 23 will impact students to catch up and close the gap in learning for both reading and math.
*Teacher sill continue to use AVID strategies to increase student engagement and promote a college or career culture.
*Digging deeper into Standards/Benchmarks and purposefully planning will promote engagement for all students and ensure that Standards/Benchmarks are being taught with fidelity and to the depth of the Standard/Benchmark.

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

**:**

| #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** | Standards-based data (FSA, common assessments, walkthrough data, etc.) collected from the 2021-2022 school year showed students performing below grade level in ELA, Math and Science with a lack of consistency in tasks aligned to grade-appropriate standards. Students are not provided with consistent opportunities to be successful with standards aligned tasks, and teachers have limited effective teaching methods to support learning. |
| **Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** | *Proficiency in English Language Arts will increase 10% from 42% to 52% as measured by the 2022 FSA to the 2023 FAST.<br>*Proficiency in Math will increase 10% from 49% to 59% as measured by the 2022 FSA to the 2023 FAST.<br>*Proficiency in Science will increase 10% from 40% to 50% as measured by the 2022 SSA to the 2023 SSA. |
| **Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** | Monitoring will occur through PLC planning with grade levels to ensure that teachers are planning for tasks that are aligned to grade level standards. Teachers will be given the opportunity to develop effective teaching methods to support learning. This will also be monitored through walk-through data to ensure that it is being implemented with fidelity. Data will be the final monitoring tool. Formative and summative data will be monitored to determine if implementation is impacting student learning. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Leigh Brown (brownlei@pcsb.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.** | Gain a deeper understanding of the B.E.S.T. Standards/NGSSS as a non-negotiable for improving student outcomes. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.** | With the new standards, it is imperative that teachers understand the B.E.S.T./NGSSS standards and are instructing the depth of the standard. Tasks need to be aligned to the standard and meet the requirements of the standards. Benchmarks need to be fully understood so that the outcomes demonstrate the full weight of the standards. |

**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.

Become familiar with the design in order to understand what students are expected to master.

**Person Responsible** Leigh Brown (brownlei@pcsb.org)

Synthesize the benchmarks, benchmark clarifications and appendices to fully understand the expected outcomes that carry the full weight of the standards.

**Person Responsible** Leigh Brown (brownlei@pcsb.org)

Purposefully combine/stack standards and benchmarks to support learning so that a benchmark is spotlighted and supporting benchmarks (such as ELA Expectations/MTRs) that enhance instruction are incorporated in the lesson to meet the demands of the spotlighted benchmark.

**Person Responsible** Leigh Brown (brownlei@pcsb.org)

Incorporate AVID strategies within all lessons to include critical reading strategies, focused note taking and collaboration between students.

**Person Responsible** Jessica Reissman (reissmanj@pcsb.org)

| #2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:**<br>**Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.** | Standards-based data (FSA, common assessments, walkthrough data, etc.) collected from the 2021-2022 school year showed Black students performing below grade level in ELA and Math. |
| **Measurable Outcome:**<br>**State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.** | *Proficiency in English Language Arts will increase 19% from 23% to 42% as measured by the 2022 FSA to the 2023 FAST.<br>*Proficiency in Math will increase 21% from 21% to 42% as measured by the 2022 FSA to the 2023 FAST. |
| **Monitoring:**<br>**Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.** | High yield strategies use will be monitored in planning and in walk-throughs for implementation. Data will be the final monitoring tool. Formative and summative data will be monitored to determine if implementation is impacting Black students' learning. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Leigh Brown (brownlei@pcsb.org) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:**<br>**Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.** | Identify student's gaps in learning and intentionally plan for whole group and small group instruction. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:**<br>**Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.**<br>**Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.** | When teachers identify gaps in learning and intentional plan for instruction, student outcomes will improve. |

**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.

| | |
|---|---|
| Teachers will identify gaps in learning for black students and intentionally plan for whole group and small group instruction. | |
| **Person Responsible** | Mark Ruscetta (ruscettam@pcsb.org) |
| Teachers will employ a variety of learning strategies (Movement, music, other engagement strategies) that engage students in active participation, address multiple learning styles and stimulate students' intellectual interest. | |
| **Person Responsible** | Mark Ruscetta (ruscettam@pcsb.org) |

**RAISE**

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

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

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

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

Strategically focus on K-2 teachers and instruction, where acceleration can occur more rapidly, by ensuring equitable use of resources including instructional supports, school-based professional development, cycles of coaching, feedback, etc.

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

Train teachers to identify individual students needs and what instructional practice will move that student forward to proficiency.

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

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.
- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and
- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

**Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)**

Proficiency in English Language Arts in grades K-2 will increase to 50% as measured by the Spring 2023 FAST.

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

Proficiency in English Language Arts in grades 3-5 will increase to 50% as measured by the Spring 2023 FAST.

**Monitoring:**
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

Monitoring will occur through PLC planning with grade levels to ensure that teachers are planning for tasks that are aligned to grade level standards. Teachers will be given the opportunity to develop effective teaching methods to support learning. This will also be monitored through walk-through data to ensure that it is being implemented with fidelity. Data will be the final monitoring tool. Formative and summative data will be monitored to determine if implementation is impacting student learning.

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

Brown, Leigh , brownlei@pcsb.org

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

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

Neumors
Jan Richardson Guided Reading
Spire
Isabelle Beck Routine

**Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:**
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?
- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

We use programs based on the need of the student. The practices/programs do have a proven record of effectiveness for the target population.

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

- Literacy Leadership
- Literacy Coaching
- Assessment
- Professional Learning

| Action Step | Person Responsible for Monitoring |
|---|---|
| Ensure teachers have a clear understanding of the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards. | Brown, Leigh , brownlei@pcsb.org |
| Increase teacher knowledge of the science of reading & evidence-based practices. Teachers will participate in a book study during PLCs entitled "Uncovering the Logic of English." | Brown, Leigh , brownlei@pcsb.org |
| Implement a plan for identifying students not meeting benchmark in the early grades, including targeted instruction, and frequently monitoring progress to eliminate gaps early. | Brown, Leigh , brownlei@pcsb.org |
| Engage in ongoing professional development on the implementation of the high-quality curricular materials, including norming walks for excellence, studying student responses, and robust & constructive feedback. | Brown, Leigh , brownlei@pcsb.org |

## Positive Culture & Environment

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

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

Bardmoor Elementary prides itself on a culture of openness and cohesiveness for all stakeholders, including staff, students and families.

Bardmoor leadership focuses on bringing the staff together as a family and caring for each other. Administration at Bardmoor encourages students and staff members to be open and supportive of each other, we call it "Being part of the Bardmoor Family." Administration is always open to listening to concerns of the staff and seeks input when making decisions in regards to the school.

Bardmoor has a strong PBIS program that recognizes and rewards not just students but also staff for their many accomplishments, academics, behavior and being good citizens. We "Paws to Celebrate" students Monday - Thursday and staff on Fridays. All are awarded with a certificate and Bardmoor Bucks for students and a choice of items for staff.

Students are encouraged to be part of the governance of the school. We have a Student Leadership Club that administration and team leaders seek input from. These students are selected by their teachers and peers. They give input for the School-wide behavior plan and often plan the PBIS reward celebrations.

Families and community members are an invaluable part of the Bardmoor Community. Administration always has an open door to parents. The School Advisory Committee share insight as to parents and community concerns about the functioning of the school. Their input is used when decisions are being made in regards to school issues.

During the school year, we will focus on keeping families engaged in parent and family activities. We are planning events like Meet the Teacher, Open House, student-led conferences and multiply Title I family nights. This year we will encourage parents to attend our monthly family nights by offering a menu of choice. Parent and Family nights will have the opportunity to learn about resources and strategies in the area of social emotional learning. We will also provide suggestions for at home academic support for families.

This year our behavior data was exceptional with the amount of office calls. There were 934 office calls for students, this is up significantly from the prior year when we had 484 calls. Of the 934 calls, 99 of the calls were proactive for the student to take a break or earned a positive break. Of the 835 remaining calls, 423 of the calls were from 5 students. Each of these students had a positive incentive plan. We will continue to focus with individual positive behavior plans with students based upon their individual needs. These could range from assigned mentor, check-in/check-out small group lessons or one-on-one counseling sessions with the school counselor or school social worker.

For the 2022-2023 school year, we will reduce the number of office calls from 835 classroom support calls by 10%. This will occur by following the School-wide PBIS plan and aligning classroom behavior plans to the Guidelines for Success (BUDDY). Individual student behavior plans will be followed by all adults.

This year we will encourage parents to attend our monthly family nights by offering a menu of choice. Parent and Family nights will provide and opportunity for parents to learn about resources and strategies in the area of social emotional learning.

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

Leigh L. Brown - Principal - overseeing that we are keeping a open and welcoming culture
Mark Ruscetta - Assistant Principal - assisting with overseeing an open and welcoming culture/PBIS Coordinator
Joanne Mercier - Student Leadership Club Sponsor/PBIS Team Member
Carol Ballenger - Student Leadership Club Sponsor/PBIS Team Member
Jessica Reissman - Data manger/PBIS Team Member
ALL STAFF - School-side Behavior plan supporters