Bear Creek Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Bear Creek Elementary School

350 61ST ST S, St Petersburg, FL 33707

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

Demographics

Principal: Willette Houston D

Start Date for this Principal: 6/26/2022

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2021-22: C (45%) 2020-21: (36%) 2018-19: C (41%) 2017-18: C (42%)
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.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% Student Success

School Leadership Team

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	
Houston, Willette	Principal		Facilitates and monitors the execution and implementation process of School Improvement Plan.
Dixon, Nikishia	Assistant Principal		Supports execution, monitoring and implementation process of School Improvement Plan.
McMahon, Jessica	Other	MTSS Coach	Supports the school-wide implementatio of the MTSS process. Guides the leadership team in the facilitation and implementation of a Multi-Tiered System of Supports (MTSS)at the school and/or district level.
Powers, Christina	Instructional Coach		Works directly with the school-based leadership team (SBLT) and classroom teachers in assisting with the full implementation and monitoring of the district's adopted ELA program in response to intervention needed for student achievement.
Reed, Amanda	Psychologist		Works to support the success of students academically, socially, behaviorally, and emotionally. Collaborates with educators,parents, and other professionals to create safe, healthy, and supportive learning environments that strengthen connections between home, school, and the community for all students. Identifies and assesses the learning, development, and adjustment characteristics and needs of individuals and groups, as well as, the environmental factors that affect learning and adjustment. Provides interventions to students to support the teaching process and to maximize learning and adjustment. Assists in the planning, development, and evaluation of programs to meet identified learning and adjustment needs. Delivers a planned and coordinated program of psychological services.
Johnson-Levy, Sharon	Guidance Counselor		Promotes student success while providing preventive services, and responding to identified student needs through the implementation of a comprehensive school counseling program that addresses academic, personal and social development for all students.
Youngerman, Marcia	Other	LCSW	Works to support the success of students academically, socially, behaviorally, and emotionally. Collaborates with educators, parents, and other

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		professionals to create safe, healthy, and supportive learning environments that strengthen connections between home, school, and the community for all students. Identifies and assesses the learning, development, and adjustment characteristics and needs of individuals and groups, as well as, the environmental factors that affect learning and adjustment. Provides interventions to students to support the teaching process and to maximize learning and adjustment. Assists in the planning, development, and evaluation of programs to meet identified learning and adjustment needs. Delivers a lanned and coordinated program of psychological services.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Sunday 6/26/2022, Willette Houston D

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
17

Total number of students enrolled at the school
266

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2021-22 school year.
9

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.
11

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	35	48	46	46	30	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	241
Attendance below 90 percent	1	14	18	13	19	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	68
One or more suspensions	0	2	8	7	11	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	6	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	1	2	3	13	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24

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	1	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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

Sunday 6/26/2022

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	35	48	46	46	30	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	241
Attendance below 90 percent	5	5	3	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	35	48	46	46	30	36	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	241
Attendance below 90 percent	5	5	3	4	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

The number of students 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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	43%			40%			31%	54%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	47%			47%			43%	59%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%			27%			37%	54%	53%
Math Achievement	57%			47%			50%	61%	63%
Math Learning Gains	55%			41%			50%	61%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%			9%			31%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	33%			40%			44%	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	35%	56%	-21%	58%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	29%	56%	-27%	58%	-29%
Cohort Comparison		-35%				
05	2022					
	2019	34%	54%	-20%	56%	-22%
Cohort Comparison		-29%				

				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	50%	62%	-12%	62%	-12%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	50%	64%	-14%	64%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				
05	2022					
	2019	53%	60%	-7%	60%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-50%				

				SCIENCE		
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	44%	54%	-10%	53%	-9%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

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
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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	12	25		24	25		13				
BLK	33	48		40	35		32				
HSP	55			50							
WHT	50	42		64	58		69				
FRL	34	38		42	31		32				

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
2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
SWD	8	29	33	26	33	36	29				
BLK	22	35	38	41	45	29	29				
WHT	45	59		68	56		79				
FRL	30	44	38	50	52	27	42				

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	45
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	2
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	313
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	20
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	37
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	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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	64
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	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?

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

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

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

2021-22 EOY FSA Data: Our overall grades 3-5 ELA achievement (43%), along with our Math L25 (40%) and ELA L25 (38%) demonstrate a need for improvement.

2021-22 MAP Data: Our first graders entering second grade during the 2022-23 school year demonstrate the greatest need for improvement with a decrease of proficienct students from 56% to 38%.

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 contributing factor(s) for low ELA performance include: ELA foundational gaps in grades K-5 students and inconsistent use of data to plan for differentiation and scaffold instruction to increase student achievement.

The contributing factor(s) for low Mathematics performance include: Gaps in number sense and computational skills and inconsistent use of data to plan for differentiation and scaffold instruction to increase student achievement.

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

Grade 3 FSA ELA and math students demonstrated the most improvement from the previous year with an increase of 17% in ELA and 33% in math.

Our Grade 4 ELA Cohort (2021 third graders) showed a significant increase in ELA and math as well with and increase of 10% in ELA and 21% in math.

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

Consistent utilization of data to plan for differentiation, intervention, and scaffold instruction to increase student achievement.

The only new actions taken in this area was restructuring our third grade team.

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

Continue the consistent utilization of data to plan for differentiation, intervention, and scaffold instruction to increase student achievement.

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.

Please reference our Professional Learning Plan

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

Ongoing Professional Development/Refresher of high-yield instructional best practices and research based interventions (JRGR,LLI, and Equipped for Success. Ongoing feedback provided to teachers on their use of differentiated instruction practices/interventions, and high-yield standards based instructional strategies. Ongoing K-5 literacy aligned to BEST. K-3 Project 23 Reading and Math Interventionists and 4-5 Interventionist. Embedded reading and math/science coach.

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.	Our current level of performance in ELA, Mathematics and Science is 43%, 57% and 33%, respectively, as evidenced in 2022 FSA data. Based on our winter MAP data, our projected proficiency for grades 3-5 ELA and Math was 44% and 54%, repectively. We expect an ELA, Mathematics and Science proficiency of 50%, 70%, and 50%, respectively by end of the 2022-23 school year. The problem/gap is occurring due to inconsistent use of standards-based instructional best practices and an inconsistent use of data (formative and summative) to plan for differentiation, intervention and scaffolded core instruction to increase student achievement.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	The percent of all 3-5 students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 47% to 50%, as measured by the F.A.S.T Assessment. The percent of L25 students making learning gains will increase from 38% to 70%, as measured by the F.A.S.T Assessment. The percent of all 3-5 students making learning gains will increase from 47% to 70%, as measured by the F.A.S.T Assessment. The percent of K-2 students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 67% to 70% as measured by the PK-2 F. A.S.T Assessment. The percent of all 3-5 students achieving Math proficiency will increase from 57% to 70%, as measured by the F.A.S.T Assessment. The percent of L25 students making learning gains will increase from 40% to 70%, as measured by the F.A.S.T Assessment. The percent of all 3-5 students making learning gains will increase from 55% to 70%, as measured by the F.A.S.T Assessment. The percent of PK-2 students achieving Mathematics proficiency will increase from 51% to 70%, as measured by the F.A.S.T Assessment. The percent of 5th grade students achieving science proficiency will increase from 33% to 50% as measured by the SSA.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Ongoing monitoring of desired EOY outcomes will occur during grade level data chats and monthly grade level presentations facilitated by the grade level team leader. The Instructional Leadership Team will continue conduct weekly walkthroughs and track grade level and independent progress.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Willette Houston (houstonw@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Support and strengthen staff ability to utilize data to plan for differentiation, intervention, and scaffold core instruction to increase student achievement. Ensure that teachers plan for regular assessment opportunities (both formally and informally) and utilize data to modify and adjust instruction. Support and strengthen staff ability to prioritize engaging students in immense amounts of reading, discussion, and writing across ALL content areas.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Our quantitative and qualitative data during the 2021-22 school year reveals that utilizing data to plan for differentiation, intervention, and providing necessary

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.	scaffolds within core instruction are areas to focus on to close our current acheivement gaps.

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

Ensure teachers have a clear understanding of the PK-5 B.E.S.T ELA/Math Standards

Person Responsible	Willette Houston (houstonw@pcsb.org)

Engage staff in ongoing professional development on the new curricular materials in the ELA/Math areas of need based on weekly walkthrough trend data.

Person Responsible	Willette Houston (houstonw@pcsb.org)

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

Person Responsible	Willette Houston (houstonw@pcsb.org)

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

Person Responsible	Willette Houston (houstonw@pcsb.org)

Develop, implement and monitor a data-driven 5th grade standards review plan using the 3rd and 4th grade Diagnostic Assessment.

Person Responsible	Willette Houston (houstonw@pcsb.org)

Monitor for consistent effective instruction that promotes student centered with rigor for all in ELA, Math and Science instruction in grades 1-5.

Person Responsible	Willette Houston (houstonw@pcsb.org)

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

Person Responsible	Willette Houston (houstonw@pcsb.org)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	Our percentage of black students in grades 3-5 achieving ELA proficiency is 35%, as evidenced in our 2022 EOY FSA data. Our current level of ELA performance of SWD students is 4%, as evidenced in our 2022 EOY ELA Data. We expect our performance level to be 42% for both, black and SWD by end of the 2022-23 school year. The problem/gap is occurring due to the lack of intentional planning for culturally relevant instructional best practices and utilize data to to plan for differentiation and scaffold instruction to increase the achievement of SWD due to the lack of inclusion structures where the Gen-ed and VE Resource teachers collaboratively team teach to provide differentiation. We expect our black and SWD performance level to increase to 42% by end of the 2022-23 school year.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	The percent of black students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 35% to 42%, as measured by our State Asessment data. The percent of SWD students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 14% to 42%, as measured by our State Asessment data.
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	Ongoing monitoring of desired EOY outcomes will occur during grade level data chats and monthly grade level presentations facilitated by the grade level team leader. The Climate and Culture team will continue engage staff in PD with a focus on the use of equitable teaching strategies. The Instructional Leadership Team will continue conduct weekly walkthroughs and track the progress of ESE students towards this goal.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Willette Houston (houstonw@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Ensure that an inclusion model where both, Gen-Ed and VE Resource teachers intentionally plan for the differentiated needs of EACH student with consideration of the principles of UDL to ensure content is accessible to the broadest range of learners. Cultivate a school-wide mindset that ensures teachers are engaging in equitable teaching practices (equitable grading, culturally relevant teaching,restorative practices, etc) through intentional planning and ensuring that all students are engaged in rigorous grade level course work.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria	Based on the learning gains and trend data of schools with a similar ESE populations; school leaders shared that implementing an inclusion (push-in) model with a focus on differentiation, scaffold instruction and PD on tools for modifications to instructional strategies with co-planning as a major contributing factors to increased improvement of our SWD. As educators, we are obligated to ensure that students are provided multiple opportunities to engage in rigorous, grade level standards-based teaching and learning.Our current data illustrates that black students are under performing in all content areas (ELA, math and science) in comparison to their white counterparts.

**used for selecting
this strategy.**

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

Ensure teachers have a deep understanding of the K-5 newly adopted B.E.S.T ELA and Math Standards.

Person Responsible Willette Houston (houstonw@pcsb.org)

Ensure instructional supports are in place during core instruction and independent practice, for students with exceptional needs. These supports include access to grade level text w/appropriate modifications and scaffolds.

Person Responsible Willette Houston (houstonw@pcsb.org)

Provide opportunities for ESE and general education teachers to co-plan for differentiated instruction and support delivery of services.

Person Responsible Willette Houston (houstonw@pcsb.org)

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

Person Responsible Willette Houston (houstonw@pcsb.org)

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

Our current level of performance in grades K-2 is 67%, as evidenced in our 2022 Spring MAP data.

Our Spring MAP data reflects the following performance by grade level.
Grade K - 85%

Grade 1 - 44%
Grade 2 - 71%

The problem/gap is occurring due to inconsistent use of standards-based instructional best practices and an inconsistent use of data (formative and summative) to plan for differentiation, intervention and scaffolded core instruction to increase student achievement.

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

Our current level of performance in ELA is 43%, as evidenced in our 2022 FSA data. Based on our winter MAP data, our projected proficiency for grades 3-5 ELA 44%. We expect an ELA proficiency of 50% by end of the 2022-23 school year.

Our 2022 FSA data reflects the following performance by grade level.
Grade 3 - 51%
Grade 4 - 43%
Grade 5 - 39%

Our winter MAP data reflects the following changes in winter 2020 to winter 2021 data.
Grade 3 – 50% to 55% (5% increase)
Grade 4 – 36% to 58% (22% increase)
Grade 5 – 52% to 47% (5% decrease)
The problem/gap is occurring due to inconsistent use of standards-based instructional best practices and an inconsistent use of data (formative and summative) to plan for differentiation, intervention and scaffolded core instruction to increase student achievement.

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

- Each grade K-3, using the 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)

The percent of K-2 students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 67% to 70% as measured by the PK-2 F.A.S.T Assessment.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

The percent of all 3-5 students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 47% to 50%, as measured by the F.A.S.T Assessment. The percent of L25 students making learning gains will increase from 38% to 70%, as measured by the F.A.S.T Assessment. The percent of all 3-5 students making learning gains will increase from 47% to 70%, as measured by the F.A.S.T Assessment.

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.

Ongoing monitoring of desired EOY outcomes will occur during grade level data chats and monthly grade level presentations facilitated by the grade level team leader. The Literacy Leadership Team will conduct weekly walkthroughs, as well as track grade level and independent progress.

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

Powers, Christina, powerschr@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?

Support and strengthen staff ability to utilize data to plan for differentiation, intervention, and scaffold core instruction to increase student achievement.
Ensure that teachers plan for regular assessment opportunities (both formally and informally) and utilize data to modify and adjust instruction.
Support and strengthen staff ability to prioritize engaging students in immense amounts of reading, discussion, and writing with feedback with grade-level text.

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?

Our FSA ELA achievement and learning gains data reveal that utilizing data to plan for differentiation, intervention, and providing necessary scaffold core instruction is an area of growth.

Our weekly leadership team walkthrough data reveals that prioritizing engaging students in immense amounts of reading, discussion, and writing with feedback is an area of growth.

Our first grade data reveals the importance of teachers having a deeper understanding of content and pedagogical knowledge. Ensuring that both, ELA practices and programs are rooted in the essential elements of reading.

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

- ◦ Literacy Leadership

- ◦ Literacy Coaching

- ◦ Assessment

- ◦ Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
The Literacy Leadership Team will ensure that teachers have a comprehensive understanding of the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards by consistently using them as an instructional guide by all reading teachers.	Houston, Willette, houstonw@pcsb.org
A professional development will highlight the following actions to build ELA capacity. -Sustained focus on foundational skills to support reading for understanding for all grade levels w/ an emphasis on utilizing a universal screener to address foundational gaps. Provide PD on the development of phonological awareness and explicit phonics instruction during core and small group. Grades K-2 will use the ELFAC and grades 3-5 will use the CORE phonics screener. -Increase teacher knowledge of the science of reading and evidence based practices. -Implement a plan for identifying students who are not mastering early benchmark indicators.	Houston, Willette, houstonw@pcsb.org
Foster collaborative, continuous improvement among teachers through regular shared planning and reflection time during weekly PLCs and collaborative planning sessions.	Houston, Willette, houstonw@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.

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

emotionally.

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

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

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

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

Bear Creek's School Based Leadership Team (SBLT) will take on the role of ensuring that processes/ procedures are in place, ongoing PD is provided to staff on promoting a positive culture and learning environment related to our school-wide culture and climate.

Our SBLT is made up of the the following staff members: administration, grade level team leaders, school counselor, LCSW, VE Resource, math/science coach, MTSS coach and SWIC.

Our EOY district stakeholder survey provided us with necessary feedback on creating a positive school culture and environment reflecting: a supportive and fulfilling environment, learning conditions that meet the needs of all students.