Bronson Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Bronson Elementary School

400 ISHIE AVE, Bronson, FL 32621

http://www.levyk12.org/schools

Demographics

Principal: Cheryl Beauchamp

Start Date for this Principal: 4/1/2004

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	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Levy County School Board on 10/27/2020.

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

In a cooperative effort by school, community and home, we strive to provide a safe environment in which students are expected to master skills that help them reach their maximum potential in life.

Provide the school's vision statement

N/A

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
Beauchamp, Cheryl	Principal	Evaluates and supports the school's instructional programs and practices. Communicates school's mission to all stakeholders and provides training and support for every area of the school and local community.
Fries, Rebecca	Teacher, K-12	First Grade Team leader Facilitates weekly grade level meetings to discuss instructional strategies and ways to improve learning. Leads team in long range and short range planning and student achievement goals.
Bowman, Tina	Guidance Counselor	Supports the schools instructional practices and monitors the well being of all students. Coordinates efforts with outside entities to provide appropriate services to meet the needs of our students. Coordinates and monitors the state testing process.
Chemin, Melinda	Instructional Coach	Teacher intervention for Tier 3 students. Facilitates data meetings with teachers to monitor student progress of Tier 2 and Tier 3 students. Coordinates the progress monitoring process schoolwide.
Romagnolo, Robin	Teacher, K-12	Second Grade Team leader Facilitates weekly grade level meetings to discuss instructional strategies and ways to improve learning. Leads team in long range and short range planning and student achievement goals.
Trimm, Julie	Teacher, K-12	Fourth Grade Team Leader Facilitates weekly grade level meetings to discuss instructional strategies and ways to improve learning. Leads team in long range and short range planning and student achievement goals.
Wiggins, Marlene	Assistant Principal	Evaluates and supports the school's instructional programs and practices. Communicates school's mission to all stakeholders and provides training and support for every area of the school and local community. Supports the principal, faculty and staff.
Pitts, Ashley	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten Team leader Facilitates weekly grade level meetings to discuss instructional strategies and ways to improve learning. Leads team in long range and short range planning and student achievement goals.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Pelt, Crystal	Teacher, K-12	Fifth Grade Team leader Facilitates weekly grade level meetings to discuss instructional strategies and ways to improve learning. Leads team in long range and short range planning and student achievement goals.
Carson, Melody	Teacher, K-12	Third Grade Team leader Facilitates weekly grade level meetings to discuss instructional strategies and ways to improve learning. Leads team in long range and short range planning and student achievement goals.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Thursday 4/1/2004, Cheryl Beauchamp

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.*
0

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.*
5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
31

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	Yes
2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students)	Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students

(subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold)	English Language Learners Hispanic Students Students With Disabilities White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (49%) 2017-18: C (43%) 2016-17: B (59%) 2015-16: B (56%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Dustin Sims
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	Total
Number of students enrolled	94	74	81	76	86	93	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	505
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	8	19	22	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	49
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	4	13	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	36
	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	

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/9/2020

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	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	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	

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	98	80	82	91	92	99	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	542
Attendance below 90 percent	38	18	20	23	20	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	135
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
Course failure in ELA or Math	24	16	15	9	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
Level 1 on statewide assessment	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	6	1	8	5	5	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37

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
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	44%	49%	57%	42%	43%	56%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	59%	58%	42%	44%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	50%	55%	53%	44%	44%	48%
Math Achievement	51%	58%	63%	57%	52%	62%
Math Learning Gains	53%	64%	62%	36%	47%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	40%	42%	51%	27%	40%	47%
Science Achievement	46%	50%	53%	54%	46%	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	39%	52%	-13%	58%	-19%
	2018	39%	48%	-9%	57%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	49%	48%	1%	58%	-9%
	2018	40%	41%	-1%	56%	-16%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				
05	2019	45%	44%	1%	56%	-11%
	2018	46%	44%	2%	55%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-1%				
Cohort Comparison		5%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
03	2019	44%	55%	-11%	62%	-18%
	2018	63%	55%	8%	62%	1%
Same Grade Comparison		-19%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	60%	59%	1%	64%	-4%
	2018	57%	59%	-2%	62%	-5%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	51%	53%	-2%	60%	-9%
	2018	55%	53%	2%	61%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
05	2019	45%	49%	-4%	53%	-8%
	2018	54%	48%	6%	55%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-9%				
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	33	42		47	58						
ELL	29	40		39	60	57	36				
BLK	37	50		47	54						
HSP	30	49	45	41	57	50	28				
WHT	48	58	48	54	51	35	51				
FRL	39	51	45	47	50	43	40				

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	27	31	42	35	23		20				
ELL	20	43	43	38	35						
BLK	33	30		43							
HSP	32	40	47	46	34	9	45				
MUL	44	30		75	40						
WHT	45	44	48	59	37	39	56				
FRL	38	40	40	54	33	28	51				

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	52
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	77
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	417
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities

Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	45
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	48
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
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	47
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	49
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	49
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	49
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

Our bottom quartile for math showed the lowest performance, with only 40% reaching proficiency, however, this is a 13 point gain from 2018. While we did improve our math learning gains from 36% in 2018 to 53% in 2019, we have had a three year decline in math achievement overall. We are also experiencing a three year decline in Science achievement scores. Additionally, the ELL subgroup and Hispanic subgroups had low performance in ELA achievement, with 29% and 30% respectively. Teacher turnover and inexperience may be a contributing factor. Our students' lack of exposure to vocabulary upon entering kindergarten and varied experiences with academic vocabulary are contributing factors. Students with reading deficits have a difficult time accessing the science content from text driven instruction. Some of our ELLs come to us speaking very little English and are fully immersed in the regular classroom for instruction supported by specific ESOL strategies and the ESOL aide. In these situations, the students are learning to speak, read and comprehend, and write English and will be assessed with the same instrument as a native speaker.

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

Math achievement for third grade decreased 19 percentage points, while Science achievement decreased by 9 percentage points. Teacher turn over and inexperience may also be a contributing factor to this decline. Teachers may have difficulty clarifying student misconceptions and helping students make connections in science and math due to their own misconceptions. In grades K-3, the requirement for Science and Social Studies instruction combined is only 90 minutes per week, so if teachers need extra time for reading or math, they may take time from Science instruction. Students need hands-on experiments and other modes of instruction to supplement Science instruction only delivered from a text. Students with reading deficits are at an even greater disadvantage since they are not able to access the text without a lot of support. Such hands-on experiments and demonstrations can be difficult for teachers to implement due to time constraints and lack of supplies. Effective math instruction requires teachers to have a solid conceptual grasp of mathematics in order for them to present problems that challenge students to think deeply, to ask and answer student questions that build conceptual knowledge, and to facilitate discussions that develop mathematical thinking. Math fluency also continues to be a factor in improving math scores.

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

Our third grade ELA scores were 19 percentage points below the state average. Both ELA and Math overall achievement scores were 13 and 12 percentage points below the state average, respectively. A significant amount of our students are entering third grade as non-readers or are not proficient with grade level decoding, vocabulary, and fluency. Without these solid foundational skills, students struggle with the demands of the third grade ELA standards.

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

Our black subgroup improved in ELA learning gains from 30% to 50%. Overall, ELA learning gains also improved 42%-56%. ELA achievement was one the main areas of focus last year. Teachers took part in KAGAN structures training.

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

ELA and Math Achievement are both still our main concerns.

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

1. Math Proficiency with a focus on 3rd grade
2. Math Bottom Quartile
3. ELA Proficiency with a focus on 3rd grade
4. Science Achievement
5. ELA Bottom Quartile

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Math Proficiency There has been a three year decline in overall math achievement: 2017-70%; 2018-57%; & 2019-51%. Math achievement for third grade decreased 19 percentage points from the prior year. Although, we have increased our overall learning gains in math, still only 51% of our students are proficient in math and we remain behind the State average by 12 percentage points. This remains an area of work.
Measureable Outcome:	Overall proficiency on the 2021 Florida Standards Assessment in Math will increase from 51% to 60%. Math proficiency for 3rd grade on the 2021 Florida Standards Assessment in Math will increase from 39% to 50%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Marlene Wiggins (salinda.wiggins@levyk12.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will focus on strategic planning for the core math block to support teachers in delivering standards-driven instruction. An additional focus will be to include small group instruction and remediation during math lessons (to the extent possible due to COVID-19 pandemic).
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Instructional leaders and teachers working together to plan standards-based math instruction ensures all math standards are taught with rigor and fidelity which is critical to student success. Small group remediation during the math block provides immediate corrective feedback, allows teachers to differentiate based on student need, and provides the opportunity for positive interactions between teacher and students with a wide variety of manipulatives.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Core lead team will meet one time per week to analyze current math data (all grades) to determine areas to discuss with grade levels. Special attention will be placed on this discussion in third grade.
2. Grade level teams will meet regularly with the Core lead team to plan for math and make data based decisions to adjust instruction as necessary.
3. Instructional leaders will meet with teams and individual teachers to support small group planning.
4. Walkthroughs by administration will be focused on ensuring math standards are being taught with rigor and fidelity.
5. Teachers will participate in professional development geared toward building their core knowledge of mathematics and small group instruction in math.

Person Responsible Marlene Wiggins (salinda.wiggins@levyk12.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	ELA Proficiency continues to be an area of work for BES. Overall, at 44% proficient, we were 13 points below the State average. In 2019, only 49% of fourth graders, 45% of fifth graders and 39% of third graders were proficient readers. The ELL subgroup was 29% proficient.
Measureable Outcome:	Overall proficiency on the 2021 Florida Standards Assessment in ELA will increase from 44% to 54%. ELA proficiency for third grade on the 2021 Florida Standards Assessment in ELA will increase from 39% to 50%. ELL students proficiency on the 2021 Florida Standard Assessment in ELA will increase from 29% to 35%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cheryl Beauchamp (cheryl.beauchamp@levyk12.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will focus on strategic planning for the core ELA block and interventions to support teachers in providing daily standards-driven instruction. Another focus is the consistent and pervasive implementation of small group instruction including foundational skills, vocabulary, and comprehension.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Instructional leaders supporting teachers as they plan standards-based ELA instruction ensures that all aspects of the ELA block are taught with fidelity which is critical to student success. Some small group instruction is happening in pockets throughout the school, but in order for it to make a substantial impact on student achievement, this must be a consistent and pervasive practice. Teaching in small groups helps teachers to better assess students' needs and progress and provide differentiated support in foundational skills, vocabulary and comprehension.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Core lead team will meet one time per week to analyze current ELA data for all grades to determine areas to discuss with grade levels. Special focus will be placed on data pertaining to the ELL subgroup and third grade data.
2. Teams will meet regularly with the Core lead team to make data based decisions to adjust instruction as necessary.
3. Instructional leaders will meet with grade level teams and individual teachers to support small group and intervention planning
4. Walkthrough observations by administration will focus on ensuring that small group instruction is happening consistently and pervasively.
5. Administration will monitor supplemental ELL programs for usage and hold one on one conferences with students who not making progress on these programs.
6. The Reading Interventionist will provide support for 1st-3rd grade in ELA by providing targeted data-driven interventions in small group settings.

Person Responsible	Cheryl Beauchamp (cheryl.beauchamp@levyk12.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Science Achievement will be addressed through standards-based instruction developed at grade level meeting and reviewed at Core lead team meetings.

Math and ELA Bottom Quartile are also areas that will benefit from intervention planning and constant monitoring during grade level and core team meetings.

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.

Bronson Elementary School addresses building a positive school culture and environment with the implementation of the Sanford Harmony Social Emotional Learning curriculum. Teachers received training on the program and are expected to hold daily morning meetings in which the class participates in open discussions about personal and social issues in and outside the classroom. Students are taught how to share their feelings and thoughts, how to listen and empathize, and how to be a mentor to classmates. Teachers also use KAGAN cooperative learning structures in their classrooms which help students develop problem solving strategies through teamwork. The Child Development Services program provides our school with an additional special area teacher. She uses the Too Good for Drugs curriculum and does other character development activities with all grade levels. Additionally, we implement the Positive Behavior Interventions and Support program schoolwide.

We partner with the local AMVETs chapter and the Bread of the Mighty Foodbank. Both of these agencies help us provide for the needs of the whole child. The AMVETs provide school supplies for teachers and students, and the food bank supplies food backpacks (Backpacks 4 Kids program) so that our neediest of students have food over the weekend and over extended breaks from school. The Rotary Club of Williston donates new shoes for the Rack program and Bronson First Baptist Church gives clothes from their clothes closet program. The Bronson Elementary School Book Buddy Program provides free books to eager readers whose families might not necessarily have the means to purchase new books for them. Each month, for an entire school year, these students receive a free, age-appropriate book of their own. The funds for the program are raised and donated by Delphine Meliti, a private citizen, in honor of her son.

We have positive relationships with the VPK program at Nana's Place Daycare in Bronson. The

owner/operator of the daycare meets at least bi-annually with Mrs. Beauchamp to review materials, correlate their curriculum with ours, and review incoming kindergarten data and student needs. Our school board member speaks with administrators regularly to discuss school needs and to address concerns.

Members of the lead team attended a District-wide parent and family engagement workshop during the 2019-2020 school year facilitated by Dr. Steven Constantino. Each member of the team received a copy of the Dr. Constantino's book Engage Every Family: Five Simple Principles. During this workshop, the team analyzed our current state of family engagement by ranking our communication, home-school connections, opportunities for parent input, and the variety of ways we encourage families to contribute. Due to COVID-19 pandemic, further work in this area stymied, however we have plans to continue the book study with the lead team and provide virtual PD with Dr. Constantino three times during this school year.

Any written communication that we send home is also translated into Spanish by our ESOL aides for our ELL families. Our aides make phone calls home and interpret during conferences so that all families are included.

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: Math**	$0.00
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**