**Escambia County School District** 

# **Bellview Elementary School**



2018-19 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## **Table of Contents**

| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 3  |
|--------------------------------|----|
| School Information             | 4  |
| Needs Assessment               | 6  |
| Planning for Improvement       | 8  |
| Title I Requirements           | 13 |
| Budget to Support Goals        | 14 |

## **Bellview Elementary School**

4425 BELLVIEW AVE, Pensacola, FL 32526

www.escambiaschools.org

### **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) |
|---|------------------------|---|
| Elementary School<br>KG-5                     | Yes                    | 100%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)       | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(Reported as Non-white<br>on Survey 2)         |
| K-12 General Education                        | No                     | 53%   |
| School Grades History                         |                        |   |

2016-17

C

2015-16

C

**2014-15** C\*

## **School Board Approval**

Year

**Grade** 

This plan is pending approval by the Escambia County School Board.

2017-18

C

### **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 <a href="https://www.floridaCIMS.org">https://www.floridaCIMS.org</a>.

## **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.

Empowering all learners to reach their full potential.

#### Provide the school's vision statement.

Bellview Elementary will be a place where the entire school community is valued and encouraged to contribute to a flexible and caring learning environment.

## School Leadership Team

### Membership

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

| Name             | Title               |
|------------------|---------------------|
| Groff, Melissa   | Principal           |
| Jackson, Shannan | Teacher, K-12       |
| Trier, Katie     | Teacher, K-12       |
| Carroll, Laura   | Assistant Principal |
| Link, Alison     | Teacher, K-12       |
| Cowan, Jennifer  | Teacher, K-12       |
| Smith, Stephanie | Teacher, K-12       |
| Brown, Irish     | Teacher, K-12       |
| Brown, Sandra    | Teacher, K-12       |

#### **Duties**

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

The Bellview Elementary School Leadership Team is responsible for carrying out the mission and vision of the school by modeling, monitoring, and implementing a professional community of learners that are focused on student growth and development. The team leads weekly instructional planning meetings that align curriculum, instruction, and assessment and seeking to solve instructional challenges. The team meets once per month to review school data, plan professional development, and address any areas for growth and development.

## **Early Warning Systems**

#### Year 2017-18

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

| Indicator                       | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                       | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 12          | 30 | 19 | 19 | 23 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 123   |
| One or more suspensions         | 1           | 3  | 12 | 4  | 3  | 6  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 29    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 5  | 8  | 6  | 4  | 7  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 30    |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 14 | 22 | 36 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 72    |

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

| Indicator                                  |   | Grade Level |   |   |   |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|---|-------------|---|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                                  | K | 1           | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0 | 6           | 5 | 6 | 7 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 43    |

## The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator                           | Grade Level |   |   |    |   |   |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |
|-------------------------------------|-------------|---|---|----|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator                           | K           | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year     | 6           | 8 | 7 | 14 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 36    |
| Retained Students: Previous Year(s) | 0           | 0 | 0 | 1  | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 5     |

### Date this data was collected

Sunday 8/19/2018

## Year 2016-17 - As Reported

## The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

| Indicator                       | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    | Total |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator                       | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | TOLAT |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 4           | 10 | 24 | 26 | 19 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 106   |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 13 | 5  | 9  | 11 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 51    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 7  | 15 | 24 | 18 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 101   |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 11 | 27 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 108   |
|                                 | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
|                                 | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
|                                 | 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                                  |   |   |   |    | (  | Grad | le L | .ev | el |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|---|---|---|----|----|------|------|-----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator                                  | K | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4  | 5    | 6    | 7   | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0 | 8 | 9 | 14 | 21 | 43   | 0    | 0   | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 95    |

## **Year 2016-17 - Updated**

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

| Indicator                       | Grade Level |    |    |    |    |    |   |   |   |   |    |    |    |       |
|---------------------------------|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| mulcator                        | K           | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Attendance below 90 percent     | 4           | 10 | 24 | 26 | 19 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 106   |
| One or more suspensions         | 0           | 13 | 5  | 9  | 11 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 51    |
| Course failure in ELA or Math   | 0           | 7  | 15 | 24 | 18 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 101   |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0           | 0  | 0  | 11 | 27 | 70 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 108   |
|                                 | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
|                                 | 0           | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0  | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  |       |
|                                 | 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                                  |   |   |   |    | (  | Grad | le L | .ev | el |   |    |    |    | Total |
|--|---|---|---|----|----|------|------|-----|----|---|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator                                  | K | 1 | 2 | 3  | 4  | 5    | 6    | 7   | 8  | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Students exhibiting two or more indicators | 0 | 8 | 9 | 14 | 21 | 43   | 0    | 0   | 0  | 0 | 0  | 0  | 0  | 95    |

## 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?

ELA Learning Gains is the area that performed the lowest; this is not a trend, as this was one of the higher performing areas in previous years.

### Which data component showed the greatest decline from prior year?

ELA Learning Gains is the only area that showed a decline from the prior year.

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

ELA Learning Gains had the biggest gap as compared to the state average.

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

ELA Lowest 25 percentile showed the most improvement. This does not seem to be a trend that can be tracked.

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

Our extended day plan targeted our low quartile students very strategically; pulling them for small group instruction designed specifically for their needs.

#### **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 Grade Component      | School | District | State | School | District | State |  |  |  |  |
| ELA Achievement             | 45%    | 49%      | 56%   | 44%    | 46%      | 52%   |  |  |  |  |
| ELA Learning Gains          | 41%    | 46%      | 55%   | 46%    | 46%      | 52%   |  |  |  |  |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile  | 43%    | 40%      | 48%   | 45%    | 43%      | 46%   |  |  |  |  |
| Math Achievement            | 51%    | 55%      | 62%   | 46%    | 52%      | 58%   |  |  |  |  |
| Math Learning Gains         | 49%    | 57%      | 59%   | 48%    | 50%      | 58%   |  |  |  |  |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 45%    | 48%      | 47%   | 41%    | 43%      | 46%   |  |  |  |  |
| Science Achievement         | 46%    | 55%      | 55%   | 57%    | 51%      | 51%   |  |  |  |  |

## **EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey**

| Grade Level (prior year reported) |        |         |         |         |         |         |           |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|-----------------------------------|--------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|-----------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| Indicator                         | K      | 1       | 2       | 3       | 4       | 5       | Total     |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attendance below 90 percent       | 12 (4) | 30 (10) | 19 (24) | 19 (26) | 23 (19) | 20 (23) | 123 (106) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| One or more suspensions           | 1 (0)  | 3 (13)  | 12 (5)  | 4 (9)   | 3 (11)  | 6 (13)  | 29 (51)   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Course failure in ELA or Math     | 0 (0)  | 5 (7)   | 8 (15)  | 6 (24)  | 4 (18)  | 7 (37)  | 30 (101)  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment   | 0 (0)  | 0 (0)   | 0 (0)   | 14 (11) | 22 (27) | 36 (70) | 72 (108)  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## **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-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 03                    | 2018                  | 56%    | 52%      | 4%                                | 57%   | -1%                            |
|                       | 2017                  | 54%    | 59%      | -5%                               | 58%   | -4%                            |
| Same Grade C          | omparison             | 2%     |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Comparison     |                       |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 04                    | 2018                  | 46%    | 51%      | -5%                               | 56%   | -10%                           |
|                       | 2017                  | 37%    | 49%      | -12%                              | 56%   | -19%                           |
| Same Grade Comparison |                       | 9%     |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Comparison     |                       | -8%    |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 05 2018               |                       | 35%    | 44%      | -9%                               | 55%   | -20%                           |
|                       | 2017                  | 36%    | 47%      | -11%                              | 53%   | -17%                           |
| Same Grade C          | Same Grade Comparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Comparison     |                       | -2%    |          |                                   |       |                                |

| MATH                  |      |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|-----------------------|------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 03                    | 2018 | 56%    | 54%      | 2%                                | 62%   | -6%                            |
|                       | 2017 | 47%    | 54%      | -7%                               | 62%   | -15%                           |
| Same Grade Comparison |      | 9%     |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Comparison     |      |        |          |                                   |       |                                |

| MATH                  |                       |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
|-----------------------|-----------------------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade                 | Year                  | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |
| 04                    | 2018                  | 55%    | 58%      | -3%                               | 62%   | -7%                            |
|                       | 2017                  | 43%    | 54%      | -11%                              | 64%   | -21%                           |
| Same Grade C          | Same Grade Comparison |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Com            | Cohort Comparison     |        |          |                                   |       |                                |
| 05                    | 2018                  | 42%    | 52%      | -10%                              | 61%   | -19%                           |
|                       | 2017                  | 42%    | 50%      | -8%                               | 57%   | -15%                           |
| Same Grade Comparison |                       | 0%     |          |                                   |       |                                |
| Cohort Comparison     |                       | -1%    |          |                                   |       |                                |

|                   | SCIENCE |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |
|-------------------|---------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|--|
| Grade             | Year    | School | District | School-<br>District<br>Comparison | State | School-<br>State<br>Comparison |  |  |
| 05                | 2018    | 46%    | 55%      | -9%                               | 55%   | -9%                            |  |  |
|                   | 2017    |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |
| Cohort Comparison |         |        |          |                                   |       |                                |  |  |

## **Subgroup Data**

| 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS |             |           |                   |              |            |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
|---|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups                                 | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2016-17 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2016-17 |
| SWD                                       | 14          | 27        | 25                | 22           | 23         | 24                 | 6           |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK                                       | 33          | 32        | 30                | 41           | 40         | 25                 | 28          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP                                       | 35          | 31        |                   | 35           | 31         |                    |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| MUL                                       | 54          | 48        |                   | 52           | 50         |                    | 45          |            |              |                         |                           |
| WHT                                       | 52          | 44        | 42                | 60           | 58         | 65                 | 65          |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL                                       | 43          | 47        | 50                | 47           | 51         | 47                 | 34          |            |              |                         |                           |
|   |             | 2017      | SCHO              | OL GRAD      | E COMP     | ONENT              | S BY SU     | JBGRO      | UPS          |                         |                           |
| Subgroups                                 | ELA<br>Ach. | ELA<br>LG | ELA<br>LG<br>L25% | Math<br>Ach. | Math<br>LG | Math<br>LG<br>L25% | Sci<br>Ach. | SS<br>Ach. | MS<br>Accel. | Grad<br>Rate<br>2015-16 | C & C<br>Accel<br>2015-16 |
| SWD                                       | 8           | 21        | 29                | 8            | 21         | 13                 |             |            |              |                         |                           |
| BLK                                       | 33          | 35        | 23                | 34           | 42         | 36                 | 26          |            |              |                         |                           |
| HSP                                       | 26          | 59        |                   | 30           | 53         |                    | 17          |            |              |                         |                           |
| MUL                                       | 38          | 38        |                   | 41           | 36         |                    | 33          |            |              |                         |                           |
| WHT                                       | 54          | 50        | 29                | 54           | 54         | 39                 | 60          |            |              |                         |                           |
| FRL                                       | 37          | 39        | 28                | 41           | 44         | 37                 | 40          |            |              |                         |                           |

## 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               | Empower readers through engagement in authentic reading opportunities.  |
| Rationale           | Bellview Elementary School's proficiency in the area of ELA was the lowest out of all other subject areas. Our leadership team believes that reading is the basis for all other subject areas and that by intentionally planning for authentic reading opportunities for students, we will create a love for reading and an increase in ELA performance and learning gains. |
| Intended<br>Outcome | By empowering readers through engagement in authentic reading opportunities, our ELA proficiency will increase by 8%.   |
| Point<br>Person     | Melissa Groff (mgroff@ecsdfl.us)  |
| Action Step         |   |
|                     | BES has teamed up with the Title One Parent Involvement Coordinator to redesign open house and parent teacher conferences, which will include providing parents with learning games tied directly to one of the foundational skills needed at each grade level to be  |

games tied directly to one of the foundational skills needed at each grade level to be successful readers.

Using a WIN (What I Need) time model, students in need of support in ELA will be provided with Tier III interventions, while all other students will be given the opportunity to integrate ELA with Science and Social Studies to engage in Project Based Learning tied back to a school-wide big idea.

Every classroom teacher will participate in a school-wide read aloud; reading the same book to all students in the school.

## **Description**

We will combine our parent involvement committee with our Reading Leadership Team to create a Curriculum Events Committee that ensures that events planned for students and families tie back to authentic reading opportunities.

Students will be given the flexibility to check out books of their choice rather than within strict ranges as identified by the Accelerated Reader program.

Permanent substitute teacher will pull small groups of students as identified by achievement level to work on close reading strategies and test taking skills.

Reading intervention teacher will provide foundational skill interventions to students in the MTSS process.

## Person Responsible

Melissa Groff (mgroff@ecsdfl.us)

### Plan to Monitor Effectiveness

We will use STAR and iReady data after each assessment period.

Students will engage in goal setting with teachers after each assessment period.

## Description

Administration and coaches will be assigned to individual grade levels, where data conversations will take place between leadership team member and individual students.

Monthly data meetings will be held to monitor the reading progress for all students and equip teachers with tools to continue to increase proficiency.

Person Responsible

Melissa Groff (mgroff@ecsdfl.us)

|                       | Beliview Elementary Comoci  |
|-----------------------|---|
| Activity #2           |   |
| Title                 | Meet ALL student needs by being responsive to data.   |
| Rationale             | Bellview Elementary School increased in the area of lowest quartile learning gains, but did not make the same progress in the area of learning gains alone. We want to ensure that all students are receiving targeted small group instruction that remediates, enriches, and meets individual needs.   |
| Intended<br>Outcome   | By being responsive to ELA and Math data for all students, Bellview Elementary School will increase learning gains by 8%.   |
| Point<br>Person       | Laura Carroll (lcarroll@escambia.k12.fl.us)   |
| Action Step           |   |
|                       | Upon completion of each STAR assessment period, teachers will create instructional groups within the program.   |
|                       | Upon completion of each iReady assessment period, teachers will utilize the resources provided for groups of students.  |
|                       | BES will utilize an Instructional Coach that will assist teachers with analyzing data, planning and delivering instruction.   |
| Description           | A systematic data check circle will exist to ensure that students performing below standard or students that are not growing between assessment periods are identified and brought up to teachers.  |
|                       | All teachers will maintain data boards that are designed to motivate students within their classrooms.  |
|                       | BES will create vertical teams (Houses) that will work together to create across grade level buddies, meet to discuss vertical needs, and develop a system for data sharing and celebrations between students from different grade levels.  |
|                       | Using a WIN (What I Need) time model, students in need of support in ELA will be provided with Tier III interventions, while all other students will be given the opportunity to integrate ELA with Science and Social Studies to engage in Project Based Learning tied back to a school-wide big idea. |
| Person<br>Responsible | Laura Carroll (Icarroll@escambia.k12.fl.us)   |
| Plan to Monito        | or Effectiveness  |
|                       | We will use STAR and iReady data after each assessment period.  |
|                       | Students will engage in goal setting with teachers after each assessment period.  |
| Description           | Administration and coaches will be assigned to individual grade levels, where data conversations will take place between leadership team member and individual students.  |
|                       | Monthly data meetings will be held to monitor the reading progress for all students and equip teachers with tools to continue to increase proficiency.  |
| Person<br>Responsible | Laura Carroll (Icarroll@escambia.k12.fl.us)   |

## 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, § 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.

A written Parent and Family Engagement Plan (PFEP) in collaboration with parents, community stakeholders, and school personnel responsible for implementing the plan. The PFEP will assess the previous year's PFEP results and current needs. The plan will outline goals, strategies and activities to better communicate with families and will focus on building the capacity of parents to address the needs of all students, in particular those most at-risk of not meeting challenging State academic standards. The PFEP will be reviewed by the district Title I office and the approved plan will be disseminated to parents and stakeholders. A Family-School Compact will also be developed jointly with parents and other stakeholders. The school's Title I budget will directly support the PFEP.

#### **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.

Students social-emotional needs are met through Positive Behavior Supports, Capturing Kids Hearts, and counseling and mentoring opportunities offered at the school. The guidance counselor and behavior coach provide counseling and coaching to all students that are in need of assistance, which is initiated by teacher referral. Bellview also has an active mentor program where several students are assigned an adult mentor to meet with each week. Students are assigned mentors based on teacher and parent request.

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

Escambia County School District offers pre-k classes on 14 school campuses for students living in a Title I attendance zone. The pre-k program is a full day program established in collaboration with VPK and Head Start. Transition activities are provided to participating families to assist with school readiness for students who will attend kindergarten at our 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

Academic support is provided to ensure students requiring additional remediation are assisted through comprehensive MTSS systems which include an instructional coach and a remediation teacher paid through Title I funds. We are implementing What I Need time allowing behavior, academic, and social supports to be put into place for students in need.

### Title I, Part C Migrant

All migrant students will be provided support services by the district Title I office. Our local student information system (FOCUS) is used to track student data and is used to indicate the specific Title I services each migrant student will be provided (attendance, guidance, psychology services, dental and health services, nutrition assistance, outreach, advocacy, social services, transportation, and/or needs assessment services). The district Migrant Coordinator will monitor services and student needs.

## Title I, Part D

Services to neglected and delinquent students are provided by various district-operated programs as needed. These services are overseen by the Alternative Education Department and focus on offering programs to students who are most at-risk of leaving school prior to graduation.

#### Title II

Professional learning opportunities are offered both at the school level and the district level. Please see each individual goal area for specific professional learning opportunities (in-service education).

#### Title III-ELL

Services for English Language Learners (ELL) are provided as required by law. Several ESOL centers are provided at various key locations in the district. Students who do not attend centrally located school-based sites attend their zoned school where ESOL endorsed teachers provide services.

#### Title IX- Homeless

The school works with the district's Homeless Coordinator to provide transportation and resources (clothing, school supplies, and social services referrals) for students identified as Homeless under the McKinney-Vento Act to eliminate barriers for a free and appropriate education. This program is overseen by the Title I office.

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

NA

|        | Part V: Budget |
|--------|----------------|
| Total: | \$114,858.00   |