

Leon County Schools

Buck Lake Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	5
Needs Assessment	9
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	22
Budget to Support Goals	23

Buck Lake Elementary School

1600 PEDRICK RD, Tallahassee, FL 32317

<https://www.leonschools.net/bucklake>

Demographics

Principal: Billy Millard

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2015

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
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	19%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	
School Grades History	2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (74%) 2015-16: A (78%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Jeff Sewell
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	
* 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 Leon 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

The mission of the Buck Lake School community is to nurture each child regardless of gender, race, creed or ability by providing all students with a safe environment where they can take risks, practice problem solving, and learn to be responsible citizens. Our school community thrives on respect among all of our members. We will work diligently to provide for each student's academic, physical, social, and emotional needs.

Provide the school's vision statement

Programs in our school community will be designed to meet the needs of all students. Both brick/mortar and digital classrooms will be infused with traditional resources and technology that will help students access curricula and learn about areas of interest. Teachers will use research-based practices, coupled with innovative techniques to prepare students to be productive, respectful members of a larger community. Our students will experience a campus filled with adults who care, are knowledgeable, and will support them to grow into life-long learners and leaders.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Millard, William	Principal	William Millard, Principal: Ensures that the vision, mission of the school is communicated to all stakeholders. Provides support to teachers by way of materials, professional development, classroom observations/feedback. Works with grade levels to analyze student data as it relates to proficiency with curricular standards.
Quiggins, Angela	Assistant Principal	Angela Quiggins, Assistant Principal: identifies needs of grade levels, individual teachers. Provides support to teachers by way of materials, professional development, classroom observations/feedback. Ensures that the standards are being taught with fidelity.

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Wednesday 7/1/2015, Billy Millard

Number of teachers with a 2019 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 2019 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

53

Demographic Data

2020-21 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
2018-19 Title I School	No
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	19%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (68%) 2017-18: A (70%) 2016-17: A (74%) 2015-16: A (78%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Jeff Sewell
Turnaround Option/Cycle	
Year	
Support Tier	NOT IN DA
ESSA Status	
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

The number of students by 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	91	127	129	129	134	107	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	717
Attendance below 90 percent	4	11	10	9	4	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
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 ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	1	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10

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	1	8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	9

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		1	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 9/8/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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	126	136	132	131	107	122	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	754
Attendance below 90 percent	11	9	15	7	12	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	2	2	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		1	8	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times		0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

Prior Year - Updated

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	126	136	132	131	107	122	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	754
Attendance below 90 percent	11	9	15	7	12	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	58
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	1	7	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	2	2	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	1	8	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	79%	57%	57%	79%	57%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	64%	54%	58%	69%	53%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	47%	53%	60%	46%	48%
Math Achievement	80%	64%	63%	80%	61%	62%
Math Learning Gains	75%	63%	62%	70%	55%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	55%	45%	51%	52%	40%	47%
Science Achievement	77%	52%	53%	83%	52%	55%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey							
Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data

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
03	2019	81%	61%	20%	58%	23%
	2018	76%	61%	15%	57%	19%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	78%	57%	21%	58%	20%
	2018	82%	58%	24%	56%	26%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		2%				
05	2019	79%	56%	23%	56%	23%
	2018	82%	57%	25%	55%	27%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-3%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	79%	63%	16%	62%	17%
	2018	73%	64%	9%	62%	11%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	82%	66%	16%	64%	18%
	2018	86%	62%	24%	62%	24%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		9%				
05	2019	81%	61%	20%	60%	21%
	2018	83%	58%	25%	61%	22%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	79%	54%	25%	53%	26%
	2018	83%	56%	27%	55%	28%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	50	52	58	42	48	44	27				
ASN	93	74		95	97		93				
BLK	67	63	58	65	50	38	60				
HSP	72	74		62	53						
MUL	92			92							
WHT	79	62	44	82	78	67	78				
FRL	73	61	63	73	71	50	67				

2018 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	30	44	31	30	42	8	33				
ASN	94	85		94	94		89				
BLK	65	59	53	52	50	30	57				
HSP	79	71		88	64						
MUL	94	67		94	75						
WHT	78	66	59	81	70	63	85				
FRL	58	58	53	56	45	33	75				

ESSA Data

This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index - All Students	68
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	479
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	46
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0

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	90
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	57
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	65
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	92
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	70
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	65
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends

ELA proficiency for our Lowest 25th Percentile showed the lowest performance (49%) Factors contributing: While Language and Editing and Craft/Structure were strands students scored higher in, Main Idea and Details and Integration of Knowledge and Ideas were weaker areas of performance. Integration of Knowledge and Ideas proves to be challenging for some students because of the higher order thinking posed in questions. Many of the students in this subgroup are receiving ESE services, and several of those students have transitioned to our school from other schools.

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

ELA proficiency for our Lowest 25th Percentile showed the greatest decline from the prior year. Factors contributing: While Language and Editing and Craft/Structure were strands students scored higher in, Main Idea and Details and Integration of Knowledge and Ideas were weaker areas of performance. Integration of Knowledge and Ideas proves to be challenging for some students because of the higher order thinking posed in questions. Many of the students in this subgroup are receiving ESE services, and several of those students have transitioned to our school from other schools.

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

5th grade science had the greatest gap when compared to the state average. Our school had 79% proficiency while the state had 53% proficiency. Our school focuses on incorporating STEM into the classroom, and all classroom teachers have many STEM resources in their classrooms. By integrating STEM, our scores remain well above the state average.

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

Math learning gains showed the most improvement. Actions to improve in this area included increased knowledge of iReady to guide instruction, more small group instruction, and less emphasis on using instructional time to teach students how to use tools to take the FSA online. We will continue these actions, particularly with our SWD and Black/African American subgroups.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

One area of concern is our number of Level 1 students who are mostly Students with Disabilities. Because most of these students are a year or more behind, we are continuing to find ways to help them make learning gains. Because there are large numbers of SWD at certain grade levels, we will have to plan and schedule services accordingly.

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

1. Increase ELA proficiency for the lowest 25th Percentile.
2. Increase ELA Learning Gains.
3. Increase Science proficiency.
4. Emphasis on Social Emotional Health.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our lowest 25th percentile in reading was the lowest performing area for our school based on data from the 2019 FSA. By focusing on instructional practice specifically relating to ELA, teachers can continue to use the Universal Design for Learning model to meet the needs of all learners. Our fall 2019 iReady diagnostic showed 9% of our 1st-5th students being "At Risk" for Tier 3 interventions, and 38% of our 1st-5th graders needing Tier 2 interventions. In the spring of 2020, the iReady diagnostic showed us going in the right direction with only 2% of K-5 students being "At Risk" for Tier 3 interventions, and 18% of K-5 students needing Tier 2 interventions.

Measureable Outcome: At least 55% of matched students in the lowest 25th percentile will be proficient in ELA on the 2020-2021 FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: William Millard (millardw@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will provide the Universal Design for Learning model in their classrooms.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: By using the UDL model, teachers can plan lessons using multiple means of representation, giving learners various ways of acquiring information and knowledge; Students will be allowed opportunities for multiple means of expressions, given opportunities for alternatives to show what they know, and be provided with lessons with multiple means of engagement by tapping into learners' interests, offering appropriate challenges, and increasing motivation.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Both digital and brick/mortar teachers will have common time to plan lessons to reach all learners. The reading coach will work with teachers to plan appropriate Tier 2 interventions for small groups.

Person Responsible William Millard (millardw@leonschools.net)

2. Tier 3 brick/mortar students will work with the reading coach to receive research-based interventions. Tier 3 digital students will receive research-based interventions from their Reading Endorsed digital teacher.

Person Responsible William Millard (millardw@leonschools.net)

3. iReady will be used to monitor the progress of students and target specific reading skills.

Person Responsible Angela Quiggins (quigginsa@leonschools.net)

4. Accelerated Reading will be used to challenge and motivate students

Person Responsible Angela Quiggins (quigginsa@leonschools.net)

5. IXL will be used in grades 3-5 to target specific skills, depending on individual needs of students.

Person Responsible Angela Quiggins (quigginsa@leonschools.net)

6. Lexia will be used in K-1 and for targeted 2nd graders to build foundational skills in reading.

Person Responsible Angela Quiggins (quigginsa@leonschools.net)

7. Student progress will be monitored in progress monitoring meetings and the MTSS process.

Person Responsible Angela Quiggins (quigginsa@leonschools.net)

8. Starfall site license for grades Pre K-3. This program Starfall is especially effective for special education and English language development.

Person Responsible William Millard (millardw@leonschools.net)

9. Epic Digital Library for Kids encouraged at all grade levels to fuel curiosity and reading confidence.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Differentiation

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our school dropped from 69% making Learning Gains in ELA in 2017-2018 to 64% making learning gains in 2018-2019. Our fall 2019 iReady diagnostic showed 9% of our 1st-5th students being "At Risk" for Tier 3 interventions, and 38% of our 1st-5th graders needing Tier 2 interventions. In the spring of 2020, the iReady diagnostic showed us going in the right direction with only 2% of K-5 students being "At Risk" for Tier 3 interventions, and 18% of K-5 students needing Tier 2 interventions. Most of our students in the bottom quartile showed an increase in the STAR percentile from fall 2019 to winter 2020. By focusing on instructional practice specifically relating to ELA, teachers can continue to use the Universal Design for Learning model to differentiate instruction based on the needs of all learners.

Measureable Outcome: 65% of matched students will make Learning Gains on the 2020-2021 ELA FSA.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: William Millard (millardw@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: The Universal Design for Learning model will be used in classrooms.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: By using the UDL model, teachers can differentiate instruction by planning lessons using multiple means of representation, giving learners various ways of acquiring information and knowledge; Students will be allowed opportunities for multiple means of expressions, given opportunities for alternatives to show what they know, and be provided with lessons with multiple means of engagement by tapping into learners' interests, offering appropriate challenges, and increasing motivation.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Both digital and brick/mortar teachers will have common time to plan lessons to reach all learners. The reading coach will work with teachers to plan appropriate Tier 2 interventions for small groups.

Person Responsible William Millard (millardw@leonschools.net)

2. Tier 3 brick/mortar students will work with the reading coach in addition to the core reading block using research-based interventions. Tier 3 digital students will work with their Reading Endorsed digital ELA teacher using research-based interventions.

Person Responsible William Millard (millardw@leonschools.net)

3. iReady diagnostic data will be used to differentiate learning paths for each student.

Person Responsible Angela Quiggins (quigginsa@leonschools.net)

4. Accelerated Reading will be used to challenge and motivate students.

Person Responsible Angela Quiggins (quigginsa@leonschools.net)

5. IXL will be used in grades 3-5 to differentiate practice of targeted skills, depending on individual needs of students.

Person Responsible Angela Quiggins (quigginsa@leonschools.net)

6. Lexia will be used in K-1 and for targeted 2nd graders to build foundational skills in reading, based on individual needs.

Person Responsible Angela Quiggins (quigginsa@leonschools.net)

7. Starfall site license for grades Pre K-3. This program Starfall is especially effective for special education and English language development.

Person Responsible William Millard (millardw@leonschools.net)

8. Epic Digital Library for Kids encouraged at all grade levels to fuel curiosity and reading confidence.

Person Responsible William Millard (millardw@leonschools.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our science proficiency dropped 6 percentage points from the previous school year based on our 2018-2019 Next Generation Sunshine State Standards Science Assessment. Our Students with Disabilities subgroup shows that 27% were proficient on the assessment.

Measureable Outcome: 80% of our matched students will be proficient on the 2020-2021 Next Generation Sunshine State Standards Science Assessment.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: William Millard (millardw@leonschools.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will incorporate STEM teaching strategies into daily science instruction.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: STEM education creates critical thinkers, increases science literacy, and enable the next generation of innovators.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Common time given for both digital and brick/mortar teachers to plan STEM lessons for their classrooms.

Person Responsible William Millard (millardw@leonschools.net)

2. K-5 Media/Makerspace activities provided in the special area wheel through Media Center.

Person Responsible Karen Young (youngk@leonschools.net)

3. STEM carts available for use in every grade level.

Person Responsible William Millard (millardw@leonschools.net)

4. iXL science used for all 5th graders to focus on specific science standards.

Person Responsible Angela Quiggins (quigginsa@leonschools.net)

1. Common time given for both digital and brick/mortar teachers to plan STEM lessons for their classrooms.

Person Responsible William Millard (millardw@leonschools.net)

2. K-5 Media/Makerspace activities provided in the special area wheel through Media Center.

Person Responsible Karen Young (youngk@leonschools.net)

3. STEM carts available for use in every grade level.

Person Responsible William Millard (millardw@leonschools.net)

4. iXL science used for all 5th graders to focus on specific science standards.

Person Responsible Angela Quiggins (quigginsa@leonschools.net)

#4. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Social Emotional Learning

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Because our students have been off campus since March 2020, we are faced with the challenge of ensuring all students feel safe, secure, and comfortable on campus. Teaching students how to deal with stress, challenges, and uncertainty is a priority. Before students can focus on academics, they must be sound socially and emotionally.

Measureable Outcome: Given scenarios, K-5 students will be able to show evidence of knowing how to:
 Resolve conflicts or disagreements
 Form and strengthen relationships
 Recognize and manage emotions
 Empathize with others and support them
 Collaborate with others
 Interact with people with different experiences, backgrounds, and opinions

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy: Students in grades K-5 will participate in Social Emotional Learning (SEL). SEL is the process through which boys and girls and adults acquire and effectively apply the knowledge, attitudes, and skills necessary for being a healthy adult. This includes problem-solving skills and intergender communication and understanding, as well as teaching kids to embrace diversity and build healthy relationships that will last well into adulthood.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Our students need to be able to:
 Resolve conflicts or disagreements
 Form and strengthen relationships
 Recognize and manage emotions
 Empathize with others and support them
 Collaborate with others
 Interact with people with different experiences, backgrounds, and opinions

Action Steps to Implement

1. All students in grades K-5 will attend guidance class as part of the special area wheel.

Person Responsible William Millard (millardw@leonschools.net)

2. Students will receive Sanford Harmony lessons in both guidance and homeroom classes.

Person Responsible William Millard (millardw@leonschools.net)

3. Our guidance counselors will "check-in" with students as needed to address individual issues.

Person Responsible Sarah Mullinax (mullinaxs@leonschools.net)

4. Guidance department will conduct school-wide "Cat Chats" to teach the expectations of our school-wide Positive Behavior System.

Person Responsible Sarah Mullinax (mullinaxs@leonschools.net)

No description entered

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#5. -- Select below -- specifically relating to

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

Measureable Outcome:

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: [no one identified]

Evidence-based Strategy:

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

Action Steps to Implement

No action steps were entered for this area of focus

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

One area of concern is our number of Level 1 students who are mostly Students with Disabilities. Because most of these students are a year or more behind, we are continuing to find ways to help them make learning gains. Because there are large numbers of SWD at certain grade levels, we will have to plan and schedule services accordingly.

Part IV: 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 to employ school improvement strategies that impact the positive school culture and environment are critical. 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.

Stakeholders play a key role in school performance and addressing equity. Consulting various stakeholder groups is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

Buck Lake Elementary is truly a community school. Programs in our school are designed to meet the needs of all students. Classrooms are infused with traditional resources and technology that help students access curricula and learn about areas of interest. Our teachers use research-based practices, coupled with innovative techniques to prepare students to be productive, respectful members of a larger community. Our families are extremely supportive,

as evidenced by the thousands of volunteer hours logged, constant presence, and participation on committees such as SAC and PTO. Our students are part of a school family with adults who care, are knowledgeable, and will support them to grow into life-long learners and leaders.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget			
1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Differentiation	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: -- Select below --:	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00