

Escambia County School District

Bellview Elementary School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	20
Budget to Support Goals	20

Bellview Elementary School

4425 BELLVIEW AVE, Pensacola, FL 32526

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Christine Jenkins L

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (41%) 2015-16: C (47%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	TS&I

* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, [click here](#).

School Board Approval

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

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a Schoolwide Improvement Plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F. This plan is also a requirement for Targeted Support and Improvement (TS&I) and Comprehensive Support and Improvement (CS&I) schools pursuant to 1008.33 F.S. and the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA).

To be designated as TS&I, a school must have one or more ESSA subgroup(s) with a Federal Index below 41%. This plan shall be approved by the district. There are three ways a school can be designated as CS&I:

1. have a school grade of D or F
2. have a graduation rate of 67% or lower
3. have an overall Federal Index below 41%.

For these schools, the SIP shall be approved by the district as well as the Bureau of School Improvement.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F, or a graduation rate 67% or less. Districts may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing for schools that do not fit the aforementioned conditions. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at www.floridacims.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

The SIP is intended to be the primary artifact used by every school with stakeholders to review data, set goals, create an action plan and monitor progress. The Florida Department of Education encourages schools to use the SIP as a "living document" by continually updating, refining and using the plan to guide their work throughout the year. This printed version represents the SIP as of the "Date Modified" listed in the footer.

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	12
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	20

Bellview Elementary School

4425 BELLVIEW AVE, Pensacola, FL 32526

www.escambiaschools.org

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	100%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	59%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

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

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.

Empowering all learners to reach their full potential.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Bellview Elementary will be a place where the entire school is valued and contributes to a flexible, caring, and personalized learning environment for all.

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
Groff, Melissa	Principal	<p>To support the teaching and learning of students, staff, and the school community by modeling the mission of Bellview Elementary School while moving all learners toward our shared vision.</p> <p>Evaluations of teachers in grades 1, 2, 4, ESE, and ESE PreK Evaluations of Instructional Coach, Tech Coordinator, Office Staff, Speech/Language Pathologist, and Assistant Principal LEA staffings and Speech/Lang only IEPs for grades 1, 2, and 4 Attend PLCs Facilitate leadership development</p>
Carroll, Laura	Assistant Principal	<p>To support the teaching and learning of students, staff, and the school community by modeling the mission of Bellview Elementary School while moving all learners toward our shared vision.</p> <p>Evaluations of teachers in grades K, 3, 5, and IMPACT Evaluations of Guidance Counselor, Custodians, TAs, Behavior Coach, and Media Specialist LEA staffings and Speech/Lang only IEPs for grades K, 3, and 5 Attend PLCs Manage and maintain textbook inventory Manage busses</p>
Eubanks, Lisa	School Counselor	<p>To provide the support necessary that attends to the social-emotional, academic, and behavioral needs of students.</p> <p>Facilitate the RTI process for academics and behavior Teach SEL lessons to within whole and small group settings Respond to teacher requests for support through student support forms Check referral inbox on the concern referral (EdClick) website and respond appropriately Assemble the threat assessment team when necessary Be available to respond to needs for joiners or crisis office calls when necessary Facilitate leadership/ mentorship opportunities with students</p>
Yannucci, Paul	Teacher, K-12	<p>To develop and maintain relationships and provide strategies that regulate behavior and prepare adults to teach and children to be ready to learn independently.</p> <p>Develop relationships with at-risk students Support the teachers of the at-risk students with strategies and tools Develop relationships with families of at-risk students Respond to office calls and complete the reintegration cycle with the child and teacher Hold circles in "The Nest" twice per week on M/Th afternoons at 1:00 Facilitate daily breakfast club with students that have difficulty being regulated for class.</p>

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		Respond to the need for joiners/tap-out when necessary Respond to crisis office calls alongside 1 administrator
		To serve as the resource for teachers to ensure curriculum standards, data, and instructional best practices are consistently utilized in the classroom to positively impact student learning
Catalani, Katie	Instructional Coach	Facilitate coaching cycles with teachers Provide professional development as needed Participate in PLCs weekly with every grade level Serve as a liaison between district subject area specialists and the school Provide resources to teachers as needed Increase capacity of teachers

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2016, Christine Jenkins L

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

37

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%

<p>2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)</p>	<p>Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*</p>
<p>School Grades History</p>	<p>2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: C (46%) 2016-17: C (41%) 2015-16: C (47%)</p>
<p>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</p>	
<p>SI Region</p>	<p>Northwest</p>
<p>Regional Executive Director</p>	<p>Rachel Heide</p>
<p>Turnaround Option/Cycle</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Year</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Support Tier</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>ESSA Status</p>	<p>TS&I</p>
<p>* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.</p>	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	42	93	81	96	107	105	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	524
Attendance below 90 percent	8	30	22	21	29	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133
One or more suspensions	1	7	3	5	9	9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	34
Course failure in ELA	0	3	3	2	4	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14
Course failure in Math	0	1	3	4	1	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	17	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	29
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	13	30	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	43
	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	6	1	3	5	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	18

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	7	14	5	9	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 8/12/2020

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	87	85	92	116	106	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	590
Attendance below 90 percent	12	31	17	25	24	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	138
One or more suspensions	3	3	6	11	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	8	3	12	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	12	34	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85

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	1	6	2	11	13	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54

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	3	12	3	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	87	85	92	116	106	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	590
Attendance below 90 percent	12	31	17	25	24	29	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	138
One or more suspensions	3	3	6	11	6	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	8	3	12	5	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	12	34	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	85

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	1	6	2	11	13	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54

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	3	12	3	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	1	2	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8

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	47%	53%	57%	43%	50%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	55%	55%	58%	43%	51%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	52%	53%	31%	43%	52%
Math Achievement	40%	57%	63%	45%	53%	61%
Math Learning Gains	39%	60%	62%	48%	53%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	19%	52%	51%	37%	45%	51%
Science Achievement	42%	54%	53%	42%	50%	51%

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	45%	56%	-11%	58%	-13%
	2018	56%	52%	4%	57%	-1%
Same Grade Comparison		-11%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	48%	52%	-4%	58%	-10%
	2018	46%	51%	-5%	56%	-10%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-8%				
05	2019	41%	51%	-10%	56%	-15%
	2018	35%	44%	-9%	55%	-20%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	42%	55%	-13%	62%	-20%
	2018	56%	54%	2%	62%	-6%
Same Grade Comparison		-14%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	43%	58%	-15%	64%	-21%
	2018	55%	58%	-3%	62%	-7%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				
05	2019	29%	55%	-26%	60%	-31%
	2018	42%	52%	-10%	61%	-19%
Same Grade Comparison		-13%				
Cohort Comparison		-26%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	41%	55%	-14%	53%	-12%
	2018	46%	55%	-9%	55%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		-5%				
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 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	16	39	45	21	30	18	13				
BLK	29	43	47	24	31	16	27				
HSP	48	58		43	42						
MUL	52	64		52	47						
WHT	56	60	60	46	41	26	52				
FRL	40	51	53	35	34	21	41				
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	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 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	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				

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	42
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	3
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	296
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	100%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	26
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
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
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	31
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	48
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	54
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial 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	39
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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.

Math learning Gains of our lowest quartile students showed the lowest performance, at 19%. Contributing factors continue to involve less instructional time dedicated for math in the master schedule as well as an overall lack of "knowing" who these students are in order to connect with them. There was a shift in the test design from CBT to PBT and our teachers did not spend the necessary time teaching how to take an assessment that was primarily decimal-gridded response.

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

The data component that showed the greatest decline from the prior year is our learning gains of our lowest quartile students in Mathematics. This number went from 41% to 19%. Along with the contributing factors listed above, our ESE instruction lacked rigor and fidelity to schedule.

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.

Math Learning Gains of our lowest quartile students shows the greatest gap when compared to the state average, with a gap of 32%. The factors are the same as those that contributed to section a and b above.

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

Our overall ELA learning gains showed the most improvement. We implement What I Need (WIN) time, providing all students with interventions within data driven flexible groups.

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

Math performance
Behavior

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

1. Proactive culture
2. Math performance
3. Increased performance of SWD
4. Increased performance of African American Students

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Other specifically relating to Instructional Practice- Small Group Instruction, ESSA Subgroup relating to Students with Disabilities, and ESSA Subgroup relating to Black/African American Student

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: The data points to a lack of learning gains in math. Our professional learning communities successfully address standards-based instruction by answering "What do we want our students to learn" and "How will we know when they have learned it?" We have a need for refining the data analysis component of the PLC with a focus on answering the question "what will we do when they do not learn it?"

Measurable Outcome: The number of students that are considered non-proficient after a summative assessment in math will decrease by 50% in each grade level after each reteach cycle.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Laura Carroll (lcarroll@escambia.k12.fl.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teachers will participate in professional learning communities, engaging in the four PLC questions on a weekly basis. The third question, "What will we do when they do not learn it," will be answered through data analysis conversations after formative and summative assessment data is gathered.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: In order to successfully reach all learners, teachers will engage in structured professional learning communities. PLCs will focus on DuFour's four questions, specifically in response to students who do not learn what has been taught.
John Hattie's Effect Size on Professional Development .62
Learning by Doing: A Handbook for PLCs at Work (DuFour, DuFour, Eaker, and Many)

Action Steps to Implement

CFA
Students complete a common formative assessment, measuring mastery of an aligned task, previously agreed upon and scheduled.

Person Responsible Katie Catalani (kcatalani@ecsdfi.us)

Analyze Data
Teachers bring students' graded work to PLCs.
Student work is analyzed: identify trends & patterns as well as opportunities to adjust and improve instruction, based on the sharing of best practice.
Teachers create an action plan for reteach.

Person Responsible Katie Catalani (kcatalani@ecsdfi.us)

Remediate & Reassess
Teachers remediate students who did not learn what we intended for them to learn (DuFour, question 3), implementing instructional strategies from PLC, reassess students after remediation period and collect additional student data.

Person Responsible Katie Catalani (kcatalani@ecsdfi.us)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Culture and environment specifically related to social and emotional learning will focus on nurturing healthy relationships and implementing proactive strategies that create a restorative culture and environment while developing the social and emotional skills of students. Our office discipline referrals during the 19-20 school year increased by over 50% per quarter as compared to the year prior, requiring proactive strategies to diminish punitive and reactive approaches.

Measurable Outcome: 90% of classroom teachers will utilize the four at the door greeting method when students enter the classroom as measured by instructional rounds.
 90% of classroom and special area teachers will implement and participate in daily classroom circles with a focus on social-emotional learning as evidenced by instructional rounds.
 Office discipline referrals will decrease for traditional students by 10% or greater per quarter.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Melissa Groff (mgroff@ecsdfi.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Implement restorative practices that focus on preventative and proactive school practices.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Restorative practices focus on proactive practices as opposed to punitive measures. Proactive practices lead to stronger teacher-student relationships, which are proven to decrease discipline referrals and close discipline disproportionalities.
 John Hattie's effect size on student achievement; .52

Action Steps to Implement

We will practice the "4 at the door" strategy in all classrooms (remote, traditional, IMPACT) every day.
 Eye contact
 Enthusiasm
 Say their name
 Greeting

Person Responsible Paul Yannucci (pyannucci@escambia.k12.fl.us)

We will hold community circles regularly:
 Daily in the PK-5 classroom
 On 60 minute days in IMPACT
 At faculty meetings

Person Responsible Lisa Eubanks (leubanks2@ecsdfi.us)

We will implement a reintegration process for use when students have been removed from the classroom. This allows for a uniform reactive approach while allowing teachers to have a voice in the disciplinary process.

Person Responsible Melissa Groff (mgroff@ecsdfi.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Although our goal related to instructional practices addresses both math and ELA, the school leadership team will track and monitor math progress specifically through PLC data analysis conversations.

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.

Bellview's culture drives our students' success and has far reaching impacts on all aspects of the school. In order to create a supportive and fulfilling environment for students, we provide opportunities for students leadership and unique ways to engage students in non-traditional roles, such as service learning projects. In order to meet the learning needs of all students, we model the learning cycle by participating in PLCs and continuously improving and sharing best practices.

We focus on teachers' individual strengths, providing opportunities for teacher leadership to promote a school culture focused on growth. An environment that values trust, respect and high expectations is a by-product we expect from our Restorative Practices focus this year.

We are intentional about distributive leadership as well as teacher, student and family involvement on decisions involving our mission, vision, values, goals and strategies. We conduct open SAC meetings, use parent surveys and invite students to take part in school level decision making.

Our broader stakeholders are typically active members of our school community, providing support through the donation of goods, services, or financial resources. We are working to keep our community partners and volunteers involved in ways that are still safe along the unique nature of this coming school year.

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

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Other: Instructional Practice- Small Group Instruction, ESSA Subgroup relating to Students with Disabilities, and ESSA Subgroup relating to Black/African American Student	\$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Social Emotional Learning	\$0.00

	Total: \$0.00
--	----------------------