

Nassau County School District

Bryceville 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	9
III. Planning for Improvement	13
IV. ATSI, TSI and CSI Resource Review	18
V. Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence	18
VI. Title I Requirements	20
VII. Budget to Support Areas of Focus	22

Bryceville Elementary School

6504 CHURCH AVE, Bryceville, FL 32009

[no web address on file]

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.

Our mission at Bryceville Elementary School is to provide an environment where each student will aspire to be a life-long learner and responsible citizen.

Provide the school's vision statement.

At Bryceville Elementary School, we are committed to creating an environment that successfully prepares students to achieve academic excellence.

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
Smith, Tammy	Principal	Coordinates administrative oversight and plans for all phases of instructional leadership for the school including educational programming, administration, budgetary planning, discipline, and counseling services.
Sawicki, Elizabeth	Reading Coach	
Butler, Sue	Teacher, K-12	
Davis, Latashia	Teacher, K-12	
Davis, Julie	Teacher, K-12	
White, Jessica	School Counselor	

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.

Bryceville Elementary School Advisory Council meets every other month (five times per year) to assist in developing and evaluating the school improvement plan. SAC members discuss relevant data including academics, discipline, attendance and barriers.

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 SAC reviews relevant data, identifies problem areas, develops improvement strategies, monitors their implementation and makes changes as necessary when new data becomes available.

Demographic Data	
2023-24 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2022-23 Title I School Status	Yes
2022-23 Minority Rate	8%
2022-23 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate	50%
Charter School	No
RAISE School	No
2021-22 ESSA Identification	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)	White Students (WHT) Economically Disadvantaged Students (FRL)
School Grades History	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	5	5	7	12	3	10	0	0	0	42
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	3
Course failure in English Language Arts (ELA)	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	3	3	0	0	0	7
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	2	2	4	6	3	1	0	0	0	18

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	1	1	0	1	2	2	0	0	0	7

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

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

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	7	11	12	9	6	4	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	2	2	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	2	0	0	0	0	9
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	5	7	6	0	2	1	0	0	0	21

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	1	4	2	3	1	3	0	0	0	14

The number of students identified retained:

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

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	7	11	12	9	6	4	0	0	0	49
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	3
Level 1 on statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	7	2	2	0	0	0	11
Level 1 on statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	7	2	0	0	0	0	9
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency as defined by Rule 6A-6.0531, F.A.C.	5	7	6	0	2	1	0	0	0	21

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	1	4	2	3	1	3	0	0	0	14

The number of students identified retained:

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

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	2022			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement*	71	69	56	84	76	57
ELA Learning Gains	69	66	61	73	65	58
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	62	54	52	59	54	53
Math Achievement*	80	81	60	87	85	63
Math Learning Gains	82	70	64	80	77	62
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	83	64	55	67	67	51
Science Achievement*	84	70	51	74	75	53
Social Studies Achievement*		0	50		0	
Middle School Acceleration						
Graduation Rate						
College and Career Acceleration						
ELP Progress						

* 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	76
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% - All Students	No
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	531
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100
Graduation Rate	

ESSA Subgroup Data Review (pre-populated)

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				
ELL				
AMI				
ASN				
BLK				
HSP				
MUL				
PAC				
WHT	78			
FRL	74			

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)

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	71	69	62	80	82	83	84					
SWD												
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	70	70	67	80	83	91	83					
FRL	67	67		81	79							

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	78	71		83	100		90					
SWD	53			80								
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	80	74		84	100		95					
FRL	66			76								

2018-19 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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18	ELP Progress
All Students	84	73	59	87	80	67	74					
SWD	71	75		79	80		58					
ELL												
AMI												
ASN												
BLK												
HSP												
MUL												
PAC												
WHT	84	74	56	89	81	71	73					
FRL	80	66	55	80	74	64	65					

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	100%	73%	27%	54%	46%
04	2023 - Spring	86%	71%	15%	58%	28%
03	2023 - Spring	62%	69%	-7%	50%	12%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2023 - Spring	84%	76%	8%	59%	25%
04	2023 - Spring	91%	78%	13%	61%	30%
05	2023 - Spring	93%	81%	12%	55%	38%

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2023 - Spring	93%	69%	24%	51%	42%

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.

3rd Grade ELA at 62%. The ELA percentage was up 6% from 21-22. This group of students were in kindergarten during the covid quarantine. A contributing factor that may be related to these outcomes is the new BEST standards, the adoption of new core curriculum, and new teachers within the grade level.

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

The only decline we had was in 5th grade math. It was 100% in 21-22 and 93% in 22-23. The seven percent equates to one student.

Grade Level 21-22 22-23

K ELA 58.5% 94%

K Math 80.5% 94%

1st ELA 72% 86%

1st Math 76% 100%

2nd ELA 70.5% 83%

2nd Math 63% 90%

3rd ELA 56% 62%

3rd Math 63% 85%
4th ELA 77% 86%
4th Math 87% 92%
5th ELA 86% 100%
5th Math 100% 93%
5th Science 85% 93%

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.

Bryceville Elementary and Nassau County are above the state average in every area.

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

3rd Grade math 63% in 21-22 increased to 85% in 22-23. We did not departmentalize during the 22-23 school year.

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

ESW indicated that 12% (18 students) had a substantial reading deficiency.
Attendance continues to be an area of concern. 42 students or 20% of our students population had attendance below 90%.

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

Increase ELA proficiency, decrease percentage of students with substantial reading deficiency.
Attendance

Area of Focus

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

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to 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.

22-23 FAST data indicated 3rd grade students were 62% proficient in ELA. A contributing factor that may be related to these outcomes is the new BEST standards, the adoption of new core curriculum, and new teachers within the grade level.

Measurable Outcome:

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

We want to increase our third grade proficiency from 62% (22-23) to 70% (23-24).

Monitoring:

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

We will monitor our progress by dissecting our results from the beginning of year STAR ELA assessment. The STAR assessment is taken quarterly and is a good indicator on how students will perform on the end of year assessment. According to our most recent STAR assessment we have 34% of our students performing below the proficiency benchmark in 3rd grade.

Our principal and literacy coach have data chats in order to guide teachers through instructional grouping practices. Many students are also served through our MTSS process to help ensure they are successful in the general education classroom.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tammy Smith (smithta@nassau.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.)

We must first identify students who are performing below the proficiency level. From there, we examine current and additional instructional supports we can implement and put in place for our students. Most students receive multiple doses of instruction throughout the day. Differentiated small group instruction is a primary instructional strategy in which we find great success. The instruction must be standards based, differentiated and based on the Science of Reading research. Additional professional development is also needed to ensure teachers are equipped with the tools and knowledge they need as professionals. Most recently teachers received PD on the practice profiles with emphasis on explicit and scaffolded instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

We must meet our students where they are academically. This will ensure learning gaps are filled so we can move forward toward on-level instruction. We must also continue to provide professional development for teachers in how to provide quality research based instruction. Teachers must continue to develop skills in the areas of explicit and scaffolded instruction, and engagement strategies.

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.

1. Targeted in-school support with small group instruction
2. Tiered support as indicated in MTSS
3. After school tutoring of our lower quartile with specific instruction based on area of need
4. Intervention Time - to support students with specific skills and standards
5. Incorporating a more direct use of the gradual release model in small group instruction, explicit and scaffolded instruction. Additionally provide teachers with opportunities to observe model teachers using these instructional strategies effectively

Person Responsible: Tammy Smith (smithta@nassau.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 2024

#2. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Other

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

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

Our current data reveals that we have 20% of students K-5 not attending school at least 90% of the time.

Measurable Outcome:

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

By the end of the 2024 school year, the goal at BES is to decrease the number of students that do not have a 90% attendance rate to 18%.

Monitoring:

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

Student average daily attendance from FOCUS will be reviewed monthly at our Bobcat Lead Team meeting.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Tammy Smith (smithta@nassau.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.)

Parent communication will be used to bring awareness of attendance policies and to implement student, classroom and school-wide positive incentives regarding attendance.

Rationale for Evidence-based Intervention:

Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

It is evident that parent/student communication and incentives are needed to express the importance of attendance and the correlation to student achievement.

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.

1. 2-day absenteeism follow-up calls
2. Positive celebrations for students who maintain perfect attendance
3. Increase parent awareness of attendance policy
4. Home visits and parent-teacher conferences regarding poor attendance
5. Tiered system of support including: letters, phone calls and building positive relationships

Person Responsible: Tammy Smith (smithta@nassau.k12.fl.us)

By When: May 2024

CSI, TSI and ATSI Resource Review

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

N/A

Reading Achievement Initiative for Scholastic Excellence (RAISE)

Area of Focus Description and Rationale

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

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

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

N/A

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

N/A

Measurable Outcomes

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

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

Grades K-2 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

Grades 3-5 Measurable Outcomes

N/A

Monitoring

Monitoring

Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will impact student achievement outcomes.

N/A

Person Responsible for Monitoring Outcome

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Evidence-based Practices/Programs

Description:

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

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

N/A

Rationale:

Explain the rationale for selecting practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

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

N/A

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
-------------	-----------------------------------

N/A

Title I Requirements

Schoolwide Program Plan (SWP) Requirements

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

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

List the school's webpage* where the SIP is made publicly available.

Bryceville Elementary analyzes subgroup achievement data to develop our Title I Comprehensive Needs Assessment (CNA) and School Improvement Plan (SIP). Both plans are discussed, evaluated, and voted on at our School Advisory Council (SAC) meetings. Our Title I CNA outlines how we plan to fund 1.) student needs (e.g., supplies, paraprofessionals, technology programs), 2.) parent and family engagement needs (e.g., parent nights, parent communication), 3.) curriculum development needs (e.g., data chats, planning days), and 4.) professional development needs (e.g., teacher walkthroughs, B.E.S.T. standards and Benchmark training). The CNA must be developed with participation from individuals that carry out school-wide program plans including teachers, administrators, parents, and as appropriate, pupil services personnel, technical assistance providers, school staff, and district staff. Our CNA is available upon request. A paper copy of our SIP is available in our front office and a digital copy can be viewed on our school's website. <https://www.nassau.k12.fl.us/domain/336> Both the paper copy and digital copy are referenced on our monthly school calendars, so that all school stakeholders are aware of the various methods of dissemination. Translation services are available upon request for all documentation related to our School-Wide Program Plan.

Describe how the school plans to build positive relationships with parents, families and other community stakeholders to fulfill the school's mission, support the needs of students and keep parents informed of their child's progress.

List the school's webpage* where the school's Family Engagement Plan is made publicly available. (ESSA 1116(b-g))

Bryceville Elementary School continually strives to build positive relationships with parents, families, and community stakeholders. To achieve our goal in fulfilling our school's mission for parent and family engagement, we follow a process that starts at our spring School Advisory Council (SAC) meeting. At this meeting, we evaluate the results of our current year's Title I Parent Survey and school-level Parent and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP). Topics of discussion include flexible parent nights and meetings, progress monitoring of students, parent communication, barriers to parent involvement, and professional development to effectively train our staff on bridging the gap between school and home. Additionally, we reflect on parents' survey results indicating if they feel valued, respected, and welcomed at our school. The information gleaned at this meeting, along with insight gathered from weekly collaboration meetings, leadership team meetings, faculty meetings, and parent teacher meetings gives us a comprehensive look into our school's ability to build positive relationships with our school stakeholders. If an area of focus does not meet our level of expectations, we set goals and establish priorities for the upcoming school year and reassess them in the spring. Bryceville Elementary School's PFEP is available on our school website <https://www.nassau.k12.fl.us/Page/2920> and in our front office. Our monthly calendars and newsletters state where this plan can be accessed. Our district PFEP is available on our Nassau County School District website. The Title I Handbook-Desk Reference is disseminated to all families at the start of each school year, and it outlines how to access the district PFEP. Translation services are available upon request for all documentation related to our School-Wide Program Plan.

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

Title 1 funds are used to hire additional personnel to assist in the classroom with small group ELA and Math instruction and provide academic remediation. Technology programs such as Lexia Core 5 and IXL are utilized to strengthen students' phonics, phonemic awareness and comprehension skills as well as math skills. School-wide tutoring and intervention programs are also in place to provide additional intervention and remediation.

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

Bryceville Elementary School-Wide Program Plan is developed with participation from teachers, administrators, parents, and as appropriate, pupil services personnel, technical assistance providers, school staff, and district staff. We work with our Title I department and Food Service department to determine our school's free and reduced lunch count, which dictates our Title I allocation. Bryceville Elementary School and the Title I department work closely with other federal programs, including Title II and Title III to pinpoint staff development opportunities and to improve the achievement of our ELL student population. We collaborate with Head Start programs to effectively transition our preschool children to kindergarten. We work with our Director of Intervention Prevention, and Safety Services to ensure interventions are in place for our homeless students, foster care students, and neglected and delinquent students. We collaborate with our ESE department to provide specially designed instruction to meet the unique needs of our students.

Optional Component(s) of the Schoolwide Program Plan

Include descriptions for any additional strategies that will be incorporated into the plan.

Describe how the school ensures counseling, school-based mental health services, specialized support services, mentoring services, and other strategies to improve students' skills outside the academic subject areas. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(I))

N/A

Describe the preparation for and awareness of postsecondary opportunities and the workforce, which may include career and technical education programs and broadening secondary school students' access to coursework to earn postsecondary credit while still in high school. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(II))

N/A

Describe the implementation of a schoolwide tiered model to prevent and address problem behavior, and early intervening services, coordinated with similar activities and services carried out under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act. 20 U.S.C. 1400 et seq. and ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(III).

N/A

Describe the professional learning and other activities for teachers, paraprofessionals, and other school personnel to improve instruction and use of data from academic assessments, and to recruit and retain effective teachers, particularly in high need subjects. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(IV))

N/A

Describe the strategies the school employs to assist preschool children in the transition from early childhood education programs to local elementary school programs. (ESSA 1114(b)(7)(iii)(V))

N/A

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: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.B.	Area of Focus: Positive Culture and Environment: Other	\$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.

No