

Charlotte County Public Schools

Babcock Neighborhood School



2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Positive Culture & Environment	18
Budget to Support Goals	0

Babcock Neighborhood School

43301 CYPRESS PKWY, Babcock Ranch, FL 33982

www.babcockneighborhoodschool.org

Demographics

Principal: Shannon Treece

Start Date for this Principal: 5/1/2017

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	3%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Charlotte County School Board on 10/13/2020.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	6
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	15
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Babcock Neighborhood School

43301 CYPRESS PKWY, Babcock Ranch, FL 33982

www.babcockneighborhoodschool.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)
Combination School KG-12	No	3%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	Yes	15%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade	C	C	A

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Charlotte County School Board on 10/13/2020.

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.

Growing World Changers

Provide the school's vision statement.

BNS will design meaningful learning experiences that: develop effective communicators, resilient learners, and global citizens to become tremendous Trailblazers.

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
Treece, Shannon	Principal	The principal is to use her leadership, supervisory, and administrative skills to promote the educational development and well-being of each student. The principal engages in PLCs to support and guide instructional decisions among grade level teams based on data. The principal provides stakeholders with the dates and times of Governing Board Meetings and SAC meetings to ensure opportunities for collaboration among stakeholders in the school's decision making process.
Fennell, Chris	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal is to use his leadership, supervisory and administrative skills, and knowledge of curriculum to promote the educational development and well-being of each student. The assistant principal also engages in PLCs to support and guide instructional decisions among grade level teams based on data. The assistant principal facilitates the SAC meetings to ensure that opportunities for stakeholder input and questions are heard and responded to.
Lewter, Kari	Other	The Curriculum Coordinator uses her skills and curriculum knowledge to help teachers develop a better school curriculum and guide data discussions to better their instructional practices. She is also involved with working with the school administrators on assessing students' data with the goal of helping the school raise their overall test scores. The curriculum coordinator engages in curriculum nights designed for stakeholders to offer information based on curriculum implementation taking place within the school.
Sanford, Amanda	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal is to use their leadership, supervisory and administrative skills, and knowledge of curriculum to promote the educational development and well-being of each student. The assistant principal also engages in PLC's to support and guide instructional decisions among grade level teams based on data. The assistant principal facilitates the SAC meetings to ensure that opportunities for stakeholder input and questions are heard and responded to.

Demographic Information**Principal start date**

Monday 5/1/2017, Shannon Treece

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.*

1

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

32

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Combination School KG-12
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	No
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	3%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students Multiracial Students White Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (52%) 2017-18: A (63%) 2016-17: No Grade 2015-16: No Grade
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Southwest
Regional Executive Director	

Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here .	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	48	43	66	49	53	51	46	50	47	0	0	0	0	453	
Attendance below 90 percent	5	1	1	1	2	0	2	3	1	0	0	0	0	16	
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	
Course failure in ELA	1	1	1	0	0	1	9	19	5	0	0	0	0	37	
Course failure in Math	1	1	1	0	2	3	4	7	3	0	0	0	0	22	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	2	0	6	4	5	0	0	0	0	17	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	2	7	10	7	7	0	0	0	0	33	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	0	2	1	8	7	10	1	0	0	0	29

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Date this data was collected or last updated

Thursday 9/17/2020

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	39	58	45	47	39	46	53	50	49	0	0	0	0	426	
Attendance below 90 percent	4	8	0	3	3	1	5	7	4	0	0	0	0	35	
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	7	0	0	0	0	0	26	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	17	8	0	0	0	0	37	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Number of students enrolled	39	58	45	47	39	46	53	50	49	0	0	0	0	426	
Attendance below 90 percent	4	8	0	3	3	1	5	7	4	0	0	0	0	35	
One or more suspensions	1	0	0	0	1	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	8	
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	19	7	0	0	0	0	0	26	
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	3	9	17	8	0	0	0	0	37	

The number of students with two or more early warning indicators:

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

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level														Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12		
Retained Students: Current Year	1	0	0	4	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0		

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data

Please note that the district and state averages shown here represent the averages for similar school types (elementary, middle, high school, or combination schools).

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	59%	65%	61%	0%	70%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	47%	49%	59%	0%	61%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	46%	46%	54%	0%	0%	51%
Math Achievement	55%	60%	62%	0%	50%	58%
Math Learning Gains	44%	43%	59%	0%	51%	56%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	35%	35%	52%	0%	0%	50%
Science Achievement	49%	60%	56%	0%	67%	53%
Social Studies Achievement	79%	75%	78%	0%	67%	75%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(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	70%	69%	1%	58%	12%
	2018	78%	63%	15%	57%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	62%	57%	5%	58%	4%
	2018	41%	54%	-13%	56%	-15%
Same Grade Comparison		21%				
Cohort Comparison		-16%				
05	2019	60%	56%	4%	56%	4%
	2018	70%	56%	14%	55%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison		19%				
06	2019	57%	49%	8%	54%	3%
	2018	59%	48%	11%	52%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		-2%				
Cohort Comparison		-13%				
07	2019	42%	46%	-4%	52%	-10%

ELA						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-17%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
09	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
10	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	41%	70%	-29%	62%	-21%
	2018	83%	69%	14%	62%	21%
Same Grade Comparison		-42%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	60%	-8%	64%	-12%
	2018	32%	61%	-29%	62%	-30%
Same Grade Comparison		20%				
Cohort Comparison		-31%				
05	2019	51%	56%	-5%	60%	-9%
	2018	75%	62%	13%	61%	14%
Same Grade Comparison		-24%				
Cohort Comparison		19%				
06	2019	57%	51%	6%	55%	2%
	2018	64%	46%	18%	52%	12%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		-18%				
07	2019	67%	62%	5%	54%	13%
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		3%				
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		0%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	45%	52%	-7%	53%	-8%
	2018	75%	63%	12%	55%	20%
Same Grade Comparison		-30%				
Cohort Comparison						

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019					
	2018					
Cohort Comparison		-75%				

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	79%	78%	1%	71%	8%
2018					
HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					
GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019					
2018					

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	18			27							
WHT	59	47	47	54	43	37	49	80			

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
WHT	64	63	40	64	70	64	72				
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

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	52
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	414
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	100%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	23
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	1
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	
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	
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
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	52
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	
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
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.

In analyzing the 2018-2019 data, due to no 2020 data, our students with disabilities in ELA Achievement remains the lowest performing component. The introduction of a new curriculum and the depth of academic gaps with limited resources. Another impact was the growth of BNS in the 18-19 school, we more than doubled our population of the school and nearly tripled our ESE population.

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

The math L25 was 64% in 17-18 and 35% in 18-19. The curriculum used was extremely difficult for students who were not on grade level and there was a lack of resources to serve the students with academic gaps.

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.

3rd-grade math was 22% below the state average for proficiency. The curriculum used was extremely difficult for students who were not on grade level and there was a lack of resources to serve the students with academic gaps. The students struggled significantly in reading which could have also contributed to their math performance.

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

In comparing actual cohort group scores, our 6th and 7th-grade math proficiency increased. For 6th grade, they increased from 70% to 82% and 7th grade increased from 65% to 70%. This was the result of the teacher consistently reviewing data and responding to specific academic gaps.

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

The amount of 7th grade failures is a concern for BNS. This mimics our concern last year as this is the same group of students. There were 18 failures in ELA and 7 in math, there were some students in both categories.

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

1. ESE population performance.
2. Math L25 learning gains.
3. Math learning gains.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: Our ESE population was 18% proficient in ELA and 27% proficient in math.

Measurable Outcome: Our goal is to achieve at least 41% proficient in both ELA and Math achievement with our ESE population.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shannon Treece (streece@babcockneighborhoodschool.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Our main strategy will be driven by data-based decisions from diagnostics and continuous monitoring of all student performance in programs to help determine small group interventions. We have added ALEKS as a main intervention tool for our 6-9 math students. We have also added Achieve3000 as a main intervention for our 6-9 reading students. Other small group intervention resources include Dreambox (k-5 math interventions), Lexia (K-5 reading intervention), NWEA, and Barton (K-9 reading intervention).

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

There is a clear need to support our ESE students and small group instruction is a proven best practice. The programs used to support instruction will allow for consistent monitoring of data to drive other instructional supports. Most importantly, it allows for personalization of learning pathways based on diagnostic data and progress monitoring.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Gather baseline data for specified students.
2. Develop a learning pathway based on diagnostic data.
3. Create a schedule that provides sufficient time for instructional support.
4. Monitor specific data for core areas.
5. Adjust as needed.

Person Responsible

Shannon Treece (streece@babcockneighborhoodschool.org)

#2. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The math L25 proficiency rate for BNS was 37% and the gains decreased from 64% to 35%.
Measurable Outcome:	The goal is to achieve a 64% in the math L25 learning gains performance indicator.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Shannon Treece (streece@babcockneighborhoodschool.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Our main strategy will be driven by data-based decisions from diagnostics and continuous monitoring of all student performance in programs to help determine small group interventions. We have added ALEKS as a main intervention tool for our 6-9 math students. Our small group intervention resources specific to math also include Dreambox (K-5 math interventions) and NWEA (benchmark). We are also utilizing our teachers and created a schedule so that we have all three middle level math teachers teaching the same grade level of students at one time. This design allows for the small group interventions to take place, which will allow us to really differentiate our instruction based on the diagnostics and progress monitoring.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	There is a clear need to support our L25 students and small group instruction is a proven best practice. The programs used to support instruction will allow for consistent monitoring of data to drive other instructional support. Most importantly it allows for personalization of learning pathways based on diagnostic data.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Gather baseline data for specified students.
2. Develop a learning pathway based on diagnostic data.
3. Create a schedule that provides sufficient time for instructional support.
4. Monitor specific data for core areas.
5. Adjust as needed.

Person Responsible Chris Fennell (cfennell@babcockneighborhoodschool.org)

#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups**Area of Focus**

Description and Rationale: The math learning gains for BNS were 43%, very close to the required 41%.

Measurable Outcome: The goal is to achieve a 64% in the math learning gains performance indicator for all students.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Shannon Treece (streece@babcockneighborhoodschool.org)

Evidence-based Strategy:

Our main strategy will be driven by data-based decisions from diagnostics and continuous monitoring of all student performance in programs to help determine small group interventions. Our small group intervention resources include: ALEKS (6-9 math intervention), Dreambox (K-5 math interventions), and NWEA (benchmark). We also utilized our resources (teachers) and created a schedule that would allow for them to all work together with one grade level at a time to be able to differentiate instruction in small groups based on diagnostics and progress monitoring.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:

There is a clear need to support our math students and small group instruction is a proven best practice. The programs used to support instruction will allow for consistent monitoring of data to drive other instructional support. Most importantly it allows for personalization of learning pathways based on diagnostic data.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Gather baseline data for specified students.
2. Develop a learning pathway based on diagnostic data.
3. Create a schedule that provides sufficient time for instructional support.
4. Monitor specific data for core areas.
5. Adjust as needed.

Person

Responsible Chris Fennell (cfennell@babcockneighborhoodschool.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

Through these areas of focus we should see an increase in all of our priorities addressed previously. The programs we have integrated into our instruction, our teachers, and the strategic use of our time within our schedule should provide what is necessary to achieve our goals in all of our priority areas.

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.

BNS utilizes committees at both the Governing Board and school level. Each Governing Board member chairs one committee. The additional members are selected based on their expertise in specific areas to support the growth of the school. The committees include: academic, finance, advancement, audit, and nominating. The school-level committees include academic, finance, PBIS (Culture), teacher leader, parent rep, SAC, and threat assessment. Our team is being intentional in designing strategic goals from the Governing Board, driven by school level needs. The Governing Board is currently in the process of fine-tuning the Strategic Plan for the system. The school-level committees have been working specifically to prioritize our areas of focus for this school year.

Our school is in the process of obtaining our accreditation and we are utilizing surveys for input with all stakeholders to ensure we are meeting the needs of all stakeholders while ensuring our mission and vision are at the focus of our work.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

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