

School District of Osceola County, FL

Bellalago Charter Academy



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| | |
|---------------------------------------|-----------|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 3 |
| School Information | 4 |
| Needs Assessment | 6 |
| Planning for Improvement | 10 |
| Title I Requirements | 17 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 19 |

Bellalago Charter Academy

3651 PLEASANT HILL RD, Kissimmee, FL 34746

www.osceolaschools.net

School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | 2017-18 Title I School | 2017-18 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|---|
| Combination School KG-8 | Yes | 72% |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | Charter School | 2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
| K-12 General Education | Yes | 84% |

School Grades History

| Year | 2017-18 | 2016-17 | 2015-16 | 2014-15 |
|-------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Grade | B | B | B | B* |

School Board Approval

N/A

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

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 (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at <https://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.

Our Mission at Bellalago Academy is to achieve lifelong learning by exploring education that is anchored in excellence.

Provide the school's vision statement.

We, the Mariners of Bellalago Academy, will accomplish our mission by creating a challenging learning environment, fostering mutual respect, honoring diversity, and establishing a safe, nurturing community.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

| Name | Title |
|---------------------|---------------------|
| Rasmussen, Jonathan | Principal |
| Torres, Millie | Dean |
| Rodgers, Kelly | Assistant Principal |
| Jones, Deborah | Assistant Principal |
| Joffe, Connie | Other |
| Troop, Marie | Instructional Coach |
| Clemons, Calena | Instructional Coach |
| Hartman, Andrew | Dean |
| Davies, Thomas | School Counselor |
| Matthews, Shirhonda | School Counselor |
| Carr, Michelle | Teacher, ESE |

Duties

Describe the roles and responsibilities of the members, including how they serve as instructional leaders and practice shared decision making.

Principal – Develops vision for school-wide improvement through shared decision-making by seeking input from key stakeholders, provides feedback and support to the leadership team, provides

feedback and support to teachers and PLCs to improve Tier 1 instruction and Tier 2 interventions

Assistant Principals – Supports the vision of the school, provides guidance and support to school staff, provide feedback and support to teachers and PLCs to improve Tier 1 instruction and Tier 2 interventions, provide input on school-based decisions

Deans - Provide assistance to teachers with classroom management, develop and deliver professional development for teachers, monitor effectiveness of Positive Behavior plan, create incentives for students to meet expectations, provide input on school-based decisions

Instructional Coaches - Provide assistance to teachers with model lessons and supplemental materials, deliver professional development, support students as academic interventionist, assess the quality of instructional plans and develop strategies for improvement on school-based decisions

Guidance Counselors - Provide assistance to teachers, students and parents, deliver classroom

guidance lesson, school-wide positive behavior support, monitor effectiveness of social-emotional plans and interventions, provide input on school-based decisions
RCS – Provide assistance to teachers in regard to best practices when working with students with disabilities, coordinate meetings to develop intervention plans and monitor effectiveness of plans, provide input on school-based decisions

Early Warning Systems

Year 2017-18

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 | | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 15 | 11 | 12 | 11 | 10 | 15 | 14 | 12 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 114 | |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 3 | 5 | 5 | 8 | 5 | 18 | 11 | 22 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 78 | |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 11 | 9 | 9 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 39 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 34 | 18 | 26 | 32 | 16 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 145 | |
| One or more in-school suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 3 | |

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|--|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|---|-------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | | |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0 | 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 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 16 | |
| Retained Students: Previous Year(s) | 2 | 3 | 5 | 11 | 10 | 12 | 15 | 7 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 74 | |

Date this data was collected

Monday 9/17/2018

Year 2016-17 - 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 | | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 4 | 5 | 12 | 15 | 12 | 9 | 13 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85 | |
| 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 | 27 | 19 | 24 | 29 | 29 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 159 | |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | |

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

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

Year 2016-17 - 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 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 4 | 8 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 4 | 5 | 12 | 15 | 12 | 9 | 13 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 85 |
| 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 | 27 | 19 | 24 | 29 | 29 | 31 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 159 |
| | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

The number of students identified by the system as exhibiting two or more early warning indicators:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

Assessment & Analysis

Consider the following reflection prompts as you examine any/all relevant school data sources, including those in CIMS in the pages that follow.

Which data component performed the lowest? Is this a trend?

Overall, the component that scored the lowest was performance in mathematics. This is not a trend with the district or the state.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

The greatest decline from the previous year was in learning gains in mathematics. Our scores dropped ten percentage points.

Which data component had the biggest gap when compared to the state average?

Again, the component(s) with the biggest gap when compared to the state average are in math achievement and learning gains in mathematics. When compared to the state, both are ten percent below the state average.

Which data component showed the most improvement? Is this a trend?

The data component which showed the most improvement is ELA achievement. The state and the district improve ELA performance by two to three percentage points, while at Bellalago, our ELA achievement improved by five percentage points.

Describe the actions or changes that led to the improvement in this area.

During the previous school year, we had a strong focus on ELA. MTSS groups strongly focused on reading and our daily schedule deliberately included time for reteaching and remediation in reading. PLCs mostly focused on ELA and much time was spent developing scales for this specific subject.

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 | 2018 | | | 2017 | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|----------|-------|--------|----------|-------|
| | School | District | State | School | District | State |
| ELA Achievement | 60% | 58% | 60% | 55% | 54% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 58% | 58% | 57% | 54% | 51% | 54% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 48% | 52% | 52% | 48% | 46% | 49% |
| Math Achievement | 51% | 52% | 61% | 52% | 49% | 56% |
| Math Learning Gains | 48% | 54% | 58% | 53% | 48% | 54% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 47% | 50% | 52% | 42% | 43% | 48% |
| Science Achievement | 57% | 54% | 57% | 48% | 49% | 52% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 74% | 71% | 77% | 85% | 74% | 72% |

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

| Indicator | Grade Level (prior year reported) | | | | | | | | | Total |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|--------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 15 (0) | 11 (1) | 12 (1) | 11 (1) | 10 (1) | 15 (1) | 14 (4) | 12 (8) | 14 (4) | 114 (21) |
| One or more suspensions | 1 (1) | 3 (4) | 5 (5) | 5 (12) | 8 (15) | 5 (12) | 18 (9) | 11 (13) | 22 (14) | 78 (85) |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 11 (0) | 9 (0) | 9 (0) | 10 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 39 (0) |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 19 (27) | 34 (19) | 18 (24) | 26 (29) | 32 (29) | 16 (31) | 145 (159) |
| One or more in-school suspensions | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 0 (0) | 1 (0) | 2 (0) | 3 (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 | 2018 | 63% | 51% | 12% | 57% | 6% |
| | 2017 | 63% | 53% | 10% | 58% | 5% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 0% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2018 | 54% | 48% | 6% | 56% | -2% |
| | 2017 | 57% | 50% | 7% | 56% | 1% |

| ELA | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -9% | | | | |
| 05 | 2018 | 53% | 50% | 3% | 55% | -2% |
| | 2017 | 48% | 48% | 0% | 53% | -5% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -4% | | | | |
| 06 | 2018 | 57% | 46% | 11% | 52% | 5% |
| | 2017 | 50% | 47% | 3% | 52% | -2% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 7% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 9% | | | | |
| 07 | 2018 | 60% | 46% | 14% | 51% | 9% |
| | 2017 | 50% | 49% | 1% | 52% | -2% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 10% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 10% | | | | |
| 08 | 2018 | 57% | 52% | 5% | 58% | -1% |
| | 2017 | 38% | 48% | -10% | 55% | -17% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 19% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 7% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|--------------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2018 | 63% | 51% | 12% | 62% | 1% |
| | 2017 | 66% | 56% | 10% | 62% | 4% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2018 | 54% | 53% | 1% | 62% | -8% |
| | 2017 | 59% | 55% | 4% | 64% | -5% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -12% | | | | |
| 05 | 2018 | 43% | 52% | -9% | 61% | -18% |
| | 2017 | 48% | 49% | -1% | 57% | -9% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -5% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -16% | | | | |
| 06 | 2018 | 33% | 43% | -10% | 52% | -19% |
| | 2017 | 30% | 41% | -11% | 51% | -21% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -15% | | | | |
| 07 | 2018 | 33% | 29% | 4% | 54% | -21% |
| | 2017 | 31% | 28% | 3% | 53% | -22% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 2% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| 08 | 2018 | 46% | 43% | 3% | 45% | 1% |
| | 2017 | 50% | 47% | 3% | 46% | 4% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -4% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| Cohort Comparison | | 15% | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|-------------------|------|--------|----------|----------------------------|-------|-------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 05 | 2018 | 52% | 49% | 3% | 55% | -3% |
| | 2017 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 08 | 2018 | 48% | 42% | 6% | 50% | -2% |
| | 2017 | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 48% | | | | |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2018 | 98% | 68% | 30% | 65% | 33% |
| 2017 | 97% | 69% | 28% | 63% | 34% |
| Compare | | 1% | | | |

| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
|------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2018 | 74% | 70% | 4% | 71% | 3% |
| 2017 | 73% | 74% | -1% | 69% | 4% |
| Compare | | 1% | | | |

| HISTORY EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2018 | | | | | |
| 2017 | | | | | |

| ALGEBRA EOC | | | | | |
|-------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2018 | 74% | 52% | 22% | 62% | 12% |
| 2017 | 89% | 46% | 43% | 60% | 29% |
| Compare | | -15% | | | |

| GEOMETRY EOC | | | | | |
|--------------|--------|----------|-----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
| 2018 | 0% | 39% | -39% | 56% | -56% |
| 2017 | | | | | |

Subgroup Data

| 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 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD | 18 | 45 | 44 | 20 | 41 | 40 | 18 | 31 | | | |
| ELL | 33 | 52 | 46 | 28 | 38 | 36 | 26 | 53 | 67 | | |
| ASN | 90 | 84 | | 87 | 68 | | 79 | | | | |
| BLK | 62 | 58 | 50 | 49 | 44 | 34 | 55 | 73 | 82 | | |
| HSP | 56 | 56 | 45 | 47 | 46 | 46 | 51 | 69 | 72 | | |
| MUL | 52 | 50 | | 62 | 43 | | 55 | | | | |
| WHT | 65 | 61 | 50 | 57 | 54 | 55 | 72 | 87 | 88 | | |
| FRL | 55 | 56 | 48 | 47 | 46 | 46 | 52 | 72 | 73 | | |
| 2017 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 | 8 | 28 | 30 | 18 | 47 | 44 | 4 | | | | |
| ELL | 32 | 48 | 49 | 38 | 51 | 48 | 29 | 30 | | | |
| ASN | 87 | 72 | | 80 | 62 | | 83 | | | | |
| BLK | 49 | 51 | 44 | 46 | 58 | 48 | 48 | 71 | 82 | | |
| HSP | 53 | 52 | 44 | 52 | 56 | 52 | 60 | 70 | 81 | | |
| MUL | 70 | 58 | | 60 | 63 | | 91 | | | | |
| WHT | 59 | 60 | 57 | 60 | 61 | 52 | 63 | 89 | 87 | | |
| FRL | 50 | 53 | 45 | 47 | 55 | 52 | 57 | 73 | 84 | | |

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Develop specific plans for addressing the school's highest-priority needs by identifying the most important areas of focus based on any/all relevant school data sources, including the data from Section II (Needs Assessment/Analysis).

Areas of Focus:

| Activity #1 | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Title | Professional Learning Communities |
| Rationale | Research states, if teachers participate in authentic collaborative teams that produce engaging lessons using high-yield strategies and best practices and are monitoring the progress to guide the instruction, then student achievement will increase. |
| Intended Outcome | All content areas will increase proficiency and learning gains by 5 percentage points in all subgroups. |
| Point Person | Connie Joffe (connie.joffe@osceolaschools.net) |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <p>1. Teams will meet weekly during early release, as well as, an additional hour weekly (paid by Title I) outside of contract hours, and at least two planning periods monthly, with the purpose of assessing, analyzing, reflecting and revising plans on course progression of individual students' needs as a collaborative team. All teachers will be active participants in the PLC process at minimum six meetings per month.</p> <p>2. Collaborative teaming professional development will be conducted throughout the year to build shared knowledge of the PLC processes.</p> <p>A. During pre-planning, the leadership team will train staff on the basics of PLCs, including the expectations for standards-based planning and instruction, development and utilization of CFAs, how to utilize data to create tier 2 groups and the use of formative assessments to drive instruction.</p> <p>B. Professional Development will be provided to each collaborative team through the year as needs are identified based on PLC data. Professional development will be provided by appropriate member of leadership team based on need of PLC, with extra support from school district personnel as necessary.</p> <p>3. GradeCam will be used by each PLC team for the purpose of assessing, analyzing, reflecting and revising plans on course progression of individual students' needs. Teachers will use the data to form groups for intervention and enrichment on essential standards. Teachers attended professional development for GradeCam provided by the district at the beginning of the year, specific to their level of usage. Instructional coaches will monitor results of assessments.</p> <p>4. Mentoring will be conducted for teams who are struggling, and additional support will be given so they become an effective collaborative team. The leadership team was provided a training by Ms. Joffe, our MTSS coach, to clarify expectations and evidence of success PLC work. Leadership team members will bring areas of concern and areas of growth to the Stocktake Process as evident from PLC data.</p> <p>5. District formative assessments will be given every four and a half weeks in all accountability areas. Data from these assessments, combined with data from PLC team formative assessments, will be utilized to determine standards-based intervention and extension opportunities for students. Instructional coaches will monitor the effectiveness and frequency of interventions monthly through Stocktake. If additional support is needed, we will reach out to district.</p> |
| Person Responsible | Connie Joffe (connie.joffe@osceolaschools.net) |
| Plan to Monitor Effectiveness | |
| Description | <p>1. A member of the leadership team will be assigned to each PLC team. The leadership team member will provide support and hold teams accountable to be sure time is being use effectively.</p> <p>2. PLC Seven Stages rubric will be used to measure Pre - Mid - End of school year</p> |

progress of the PLC teams.

3. The School Stocktake Model will take place monthly to report progress to Dr. Rasmussen on the Area of Focus. Dr. Rasmussen will update Mr. Allen during monthly check-ins.

4. Dr. Rasmussen will share and update the Chief of Staff and the Assistant Superintendents once a quarter on progress of the Area of Focus through the School Stocktake Model.

Person Responsible Kelly Rodgers (kelly.rodgers@osceolaschools.net)

| Activity #2 | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| Title | School-wide Positive Behavior |
| Rationale | If we are clear about school-wide expectations for positive behavior and offer the appropriate support for students and teachers, have a system of rewards, fair and consistent consequences, then positive behavior will increase and allow teachers and students to focus on student learning while maintaining a safe school environment. |
| Intended Outcome | Create a school culture focused on student learning through positive student-to-student and student-to-adult relationships, which will reduce referrals by 10%. |
| Point Person | Millie Torres (millie.torres@osceolaschools.net) |
| Action Step | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Establish a discipline committee. The team met during the summer to develop an initial plan for school-wide positive behavior expectations, including specific language for meeting expectations in all school settings. Create a school-wide system of expectations, including a behavior matrix for positive behaviors and consequences. Millie Torres and Andrew Hartman, deans, will oversee effectiveness of the plan. 2. Discipline Committee members were trained on the use of the HERO system in early August, with Dr. Torres being the point person for the HERO system on campus. Dr. Torres provided professional development to all staff and use of the HERO system. 3. During preplanning all staff were trained by Millie Torres and Andrew Hartman, deans, to ensure all personnel have a clear understanding of and common language for our school-wide behavior system. The training included explanation of the behavior matrix for positive behavior and consequences for failure to meet expectations. 4. Teach students behavior expectations throughout the school year. At the beginning of the year, students were shown videos created by the discipline committee. Teachers were responsible for showing videos during the first two weeks of school. The deans and counselors are responsible for creating a calendar to reteach expectations throughout the year, as well as teaching expectations to new students throughout the year. 5. The counselors and deans are responsible for creating a plan for rewards/activities throughout the school year. The team has developed initial rewards and use data from HERO to monitor the effectiveness of the rewards. |
| Person Responsible | Millie Torres (millie.torres@osceolaschools.net) |
| Plan to Monitor Effectiveness | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The School Stocktake Model will take place monthly to report progress to Dr. Rasmussen on the Area of Focus. Dr. Rasmussen will update Mr. Allen during monthly check-ins. 2. Daily and monthly usage reports from HERO will be monitored and compared to referrals. 3. The Guiding Coalition will bring ideas for improvement for behavior expectation and communicating those expectations to all stakeholders. |
| Person Responsible | Kelly Rodgers (kelly.rodgers@osceolaschools.net) |

| Activity #3 | |
|--------------------------------------|--|
| Title | Increase Proficiency in Literacy |
| Rationale | If we guarantee standards-based instruction at the appropriate depth of knowledge in all classrooms for all students and provide appropriate interventions by student by standard, then student proficiency in literacy will increase. |
| Intended Outcome | All student subgroups will increase proficiency by 5%. |
| Point Person | Marie Troop (marie.troop@osceolaschools.net) |
| Action Step | |
| Description | During pre-planning and throughout the school year, teacher PLC teams will be responsible to identify essential standards for each grade level or course and create essential standards unit plans for ELA. Marie Troop, as well as members of the leadership team, will provide support to PLC teams. Leadership team members will be responsible for monitoring the effectiveness of their individual PLC team's progress. |
| | Teacher teams will be responsible to implement the team teaching-assessing cycle, give common assessment for essential standards and using the data from the common assessments, identify students for Tier 2 support by student, standard and learning target for ELA. Marie Troop, as well as members of the leadership team, will provide support to PLC teams. Leadership team members will be responsible for monitoring the effectiveness of their individual PLC team's progress. |
| | Professional Development will be provided to each collaborative team through the year as needs are identified based on PLC data. Professional development will be provided by appropriate member of leadership team based on need of PLC, with extra support from school district personnel as necessary. |
| | Tier 2 remediation and extension will be based on teacher-team created common formative assessments. After giving the common assessment, students will be identified for either Tier 2 support or extension. These groups will change after each assessment cycle. |
| | Tier 3 will be based on prior-years's gaps in instruction and targeted by student by standard. Tier 3 remediation will be provided by interventionists and select classroom teachers. |
| Person Responsible | Marie Troop (marie.troop@osceolaschools.net) |
| Plan to Monitor Effectiveness | |
| Description | 1. The School Stocktake Model will take place monthly to report progress to Dr. Rasmussen on the Area of Focus. Dr. Rasmussen will update Mr. Allen during monthly check-ins. |
| | 2. Data from iReady. |
| | 3. The Problem-Solving Team will monitor the effectiveness of Tier 2 interventions for current grade-level content. |
| | 4. The Problem-Solving Team will make recommendations for students in need of additional support in Tier 3 for gaps in knowledge from previous grade-level content. |
| | 5. The Guiding Coalition will focus on school-wide areas of improvement and lead the ELL Task Force and ESE Task Force to provide support for their respective groups of students. |
| | 6. Follow up with teachers who have attended professional development. |

Person Responsible Deborah Jones (deborah.jones@osceolaschools.net)

| Activity #4 | |
|-------------------------------|--|
| Title | Increase Proficiency in Mathematics |
| Rationale | If we guarantee standards-based instruction at the appropriate depth of knowledge in all classrooms for all students and provide appropriate interventions by student by standard, then student proficiency in mathematics will increase. |
| Intended Outcome | All student subgroups will increase proficiency by 5%. |
| Point Person | Calena Clemons (calena.clemons@osceolaschools.net) |
| Action Step | |
| Description | During pre-planning and throughout the school year, teacher PLC teams will be responsible to identify essential standards for each grade level or course and create essential standards unit plans for math. Shawn Clemons, as well as members of the leadership team, will provide support to PLC teams. Leadership team members will be responsible for monitoring the effectiveness of their individual PLC team's progress. |
| | Teacher teams will be responsible to implement the team teaching-assessing cycle, give common assessment for essential standards and using the data from the common assessments, identify students for Tier 2 support by student, standard and learning target for math. Shawn Clemons, as well as members of the leadership team, will provide support to PLC teams. Leadership team members will be responsible for monitoring the effectiveness of their individual PLC team's progress. |
| | Professional Development will be provided to each collaborative team through the year as needs are identified based on PLC data. Professional development will be provided by appropriate member of leadership team based on need of PLC, with extra support from school district personnel as necessary. |
| | Tier 2 remediation and extension will be based on teacher-team created common formative assessments. After giving the common assessment, students will be identified for either Tier 2 support or extension. These groups will change after each assessment cycle. |
| | Tier 3 will be based on prior-years's gaps in instruction and targeted by student by standard. Tier 3 remediation will be provided by interventionists and select classroom teachers. |
| Person Responsible | Calena Clemons (calena.clemons@osceolaschools.net) |
| Plan to Monitor Effectiveness | |
| Description | <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. The School Stocktake Model will take place monthly to report progress to Dr. Rasmussen on the Area of Focus. Dr. Rasmussen will update Mr. Allen during monthly check-ins.2. Data from iReady.3. The Problem-Solving Team will monitor the effectiveness of Tier 2 interventions for current grade-level content.4. The Problem-Solving Team will make recommendations for students in need of additional support in Tier 3 for gaps in knowledge from previous grade-level content.5. The Guiding Coalition will focus on school-wide areas of improvement and lead the ELL Task Force and ESE Task Force to provide support for their respective groups of students.6. Follow up with teachers who have attended professional development. |

Person Responsible Deborah Jones (deborah.jones@osceolaschools.net)

Part IV: Title I Requirements

Additional Title I Requirements

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

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

Our school strives to involve all parents in the planning, review, and improvement of Title I programs and out Parent & Family Engagement Plan. All parents are invited to attend meetings regarding the development of the required plan through flyers, school marquee, and REMIND. Parents are asked for their input on activities and trainings provided by the school. The school uses the notes from the group discussion to guide writing the plan.

PFEP Link

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

Describe how the school ensures the social-emotional needs of all students are being met, which may include providing counseling, mentoring and other pupil services.

Positive Behavior Interventions & Supports (PBIS) and Restorative Practice trainings have been scheduled through the use of Title IV funds. The school district has also added 13 district social worker positions and 2 psychologist positions to support the socio-emotional needs of students.

Describe the strategies the school employs to support incoming and outgoing cohorts of students in transition from one school level to another.

To support the transition of Pre-K students to elementary, the school district scheduled a one-hour open house prior to the K-5 elementary students specifically for the welcome and transition of Pre-K students to their elementary school.

To support the transition of elementary to middle, middle school counselors are scheduled prior to the end of the school year to visit the elementary feeder schools. During the visit, the guidance counselor(s) share information about course offerings, school clubs/organizations, and expectations for the students as they transition from elementary to middle school.

To support the transition of middle to high school, each comprehensive high school has a College/ Career Specialist paid through a grant with Valencia College to support students in their pursuit of opportunities post-high school. Naviance software is used at the high schools to give students the opportunity to explore career options and interests.

A DJJ Commitment Specialist is employed to support students entering/leaving the juvenile justice program and a transition plan is created to help any students leaving DJJ and returning to their home-zoned school.

Describe the process through which school leadership identifies and aligns all available resources (e.g., personnel, instructional, curricular) in order to meet the needs of all students and maximize desired student outcomes. Include the methodology for coordinating and supplementing federal, state and local funds, services and programs. Provide the person(s) responsible, frequency of meetings, how an inventory of resources is maintained and any problem-solving activities used to determine how to apply resources for the highest impact.

Title I, Part A

Funds may be used to support extended learning and remediation materials and/or professional development and academic coaches.

Title I, Part C-Migrant

When Migrant children enroll, the Title I Migrant staff ensures that students receive a fair and equitable opportunity to achieve a high quality education and assistance transitioning to post-secondary education or employment.

Title I, Part D

When Neglected and/or Delinquent children enroll, we will coordinate efforts with the Alternative Programs Department to ensure that all student needs are met.

Title II

Focused professional learning opportunities are offered in: English Language Arts, Mathematics, Instructional Pipeline and Framework Design, and Professional Learning Communities (PLC).

Title III

The Multicultural Department assists in the identification of at-risk Limited English Proficiency (LEP), immigrant, and Native American students. Research-based, comprehensive educational programs help reduce barriers that result from cultural and linguistic needs.

IDEA provides support for students with an Individual Education Plan (IEP), students identified through the Preschool Education Evaluation Program (PEEP), and students identified through gifted screening of all second grade Title I students.

Title IV

The Student Support and Academic Enrichment (SSAE) program is intended to help to:

1. Provide a well-rounded education,
2. Improve safe and healthy school conditions and
3. Improve the use of technology in order to improve the academic achievement and digital literacy of all students. (ESEA section 4101).

Through RTI (Response to Intervention)/MTSS (Multi-tiered System of Support), staff at Bellalago Academy continually work to provide all students with essential core curriculum focused on student learning. Teachers agreed upon and plan for essential standards, identify students in need of additional support and intervene in a timely manner. As a school, students are provided additional support for previous content. Interventions are part of the master schedule and occur daily. The team meets weekly to discuss students.

Describe the strategies the school uses to advance college and career awareness, which may include establishing partnerships with business, industry or community organizations.

Supplemental district guidance counselors, paid through Title IV funds, to support elementary implementation of Project Lead the Way, and course acceleration and college and career achievement at the secondary levels. Naviance software is used at the high schools to give students the opportunity to

explore career options and interests. Campus tours of Valencia College and Osceola Technical College (oTech) are offered for students in seventh and eleventh grades to learn about career options and potential areas of study.

Part V: Budget

Total:

\$151,888.67