# Belleview High School



## 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# Belleview High School

10400 SE 36TH AVE, Belleview, FL 34420

[ no web address on file ]

**Demographics**

## Principal: Heather Guest

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2018

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | High School<br>9-12 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 91% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented**<br>(subgroups with 10 or more students)<br>(subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities*<br>English Language Learners*<br>Black/African American Students<br>Hispanic Students<br>Multiracial Students<br>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: B (55%)<br><br>2017-18: B (56%)<br><br>2016-17: C (53%)<br><br>2015-16: C (47%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Northeast |
| **Regional Executive Director** | Cassandra Brusca |
| **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 is pending approval by the Marion 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.](http://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

# Belleview High School

### 10400 SE 36TH AVE, Belleview, FL 34420

### [ no web address on file ]

## 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) |
|---|---|---|
| High School 9-12 | Yes | 57% |

| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 43% |

## School Grades History

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

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Marion 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.**

MISSION
The Faculty and Staff of Belleview High School are committed to providing a safe, secure and healthy learning environment as a foundation for the academic, social, and ethical development necessary for each student to become a successful adult in tomorrow's society.

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

VISION
We are committed to providing a safe and healthy learning environment as a foundation for the academic, social, and ethical development necessary for each student to become a successful citizen in tomorrow's society.

### 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 |
|------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Guest, Heather | Principal | Oversees all school operations and planning |
| Hisey, Virginia | Instructional Coach | Supports teachers in all classrooms on ELA and Math standards. |
| Brewer, Jeffrey | Administrative Support | AICE / Magnet coordinator. Supports AICE teachers. |
| Sandlin, Alisa | Assistant Principal | Supports teachers and students with curriculum and planning needs. |
| James, Sarah | Assistant Principal | Supports teachers and students with all instructional needs. |
| Wulff, James | Assistant Principal | Supports teachers and students with discipline needs. |
| Dreher, Joel | Dean | Supports teachers and students with discipline needs. |
| Pfreinder, Jason | Instructional Media | Supports teachers and students with instructional and library materials. |
| Engelhardt, Charles | Teacher, Career/ Technical | Leader in CTE department. Helps support instruction in all CTE classrooms and mentors newer teachers in CTE program. |
| Freeman, Haley | Teacher, K-12 | Team leader for English department. Models relationships and rigor for other teachers. |
| Scanlon, Christopher | Teacher, K-12 | Lead teacher in the English department. Supports other teachers with ELA strategies in the classroom. |

## Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Sunday 7/1/2018, Heather Guest

**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.*
1

**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.*
13

**Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school**
86

**Demographic Data**

| | |
|---|---|
| **2020-21 Status** (per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served** (per MSID File) | High School 9-12 |
| **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) | 91% |
| **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: B (55%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: C (53%) 2015-16: C (47%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Northeast |
| **Regional Executive Director** | [Cassandra Brusca](#) |
| **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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 411 | 435 | 424 | 406 | 1676 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 154 | 134 | 105 | 174 | 567 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 70 | 89 | 63 | 263 |
| Course failure in ELA | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82 | 113 | 110 | 85 | 390 |
| Course failure in Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 82 | 114 | 112 | 81 | 389 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 80 | 74 | 84 | 97 | 335 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84 | 78 | 68 | 127 | 357 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 | 67 | 72 | 95 | 266 |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

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

**Date this data was collected or last updated**

Wednesday 8/5/2020

### Prior Year - As Reported

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 415 | 436 | 407 | 342 | 1600 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 73 | 84 | 91 | 318 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 72 | 75 | 60 | 280 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 127 | 112 | 112 | 395 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 98 | 107 | 56 | 332 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 224 | 244 | 225 | 189 | 882 |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 25 | 7 | 11 | 64 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |

**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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 415 | 436 | 407 | 342 | 1600 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 | 73 | 84 | 91 | 318 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 73 | 72 | 75 | 60 | 280 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 44 | 127 | 112 | 112 | 395 |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 71 | 98 | 107 | 56 | 332 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 224 | 244 | 225 | 189 | 882 |

**The number of students identified as retainees:**

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 25 | 7 | 11 | 64 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |

## 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 | 49% | 46% | 56% | 44% | 43% | 53% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 49% | 48% | 51% | 46% | 46% | 49% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 36% | 39% | 42% | 40% | 40% | 41% |
| Math Achievement | 45% | 40% | 51% | 43% | 37% | 49% |
| Math Learning Gains | 49% | 43% | 48% | 42% | 38% | 44% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 33% | 37% | 45% | 27% | 37% | 39% |
| Science Achievement | 60% | 61% | 68% | 59% | 59% | 65% |
| Social Studies Achievement | 71% | 71% | 73% | 75% | 70% | 70% |

| EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Indicator** | **Grade Level (prior year reported)** | | | | **Total** |
| | **9** | **10** | **11** | **12** | |
| | (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** |
| 09 | 2019 | 50% | 50% | 0% | 55% | -5% |
| | 2018 | 46% | 46% | 0% | 53% | -7% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 4% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 10 | 2019 | 44% | 46% | -2% | 53% | -9% |
| | 2018 | 47% | 46% | 1% | 53% | -6% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | -2% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School-District Comparison** | **State** | **School-State Comparison** |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Grade** | **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School-District Comparison** | **State** | **School-State Comparison** |

| BIOLOGY EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School Minus District** | **State** | **School Minus State** |
| 2019 | 59% | 64% | -5% | 67% | -8% |
| 2018 | 61% | 61% | 0% | 65% | -4% |
| Compare | | -2% | | | |

| CIVICS EOC | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Year** | **School** | **District** | **School Minus District** | **State** | **School Minus State** |
| 2019 | | | | | |
| 2018 | | | | | |

## HISTORY EOC

| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
|------|--------|----------|----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| 2019 | 70% | 70% | 0% | 70% | 0% |
| 2018 | 68% | 69% | -1% | 68% | 0% |
| Compare | | 2% | | | |

## ALGEBRA EOC

| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
|------|--------|----------|----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| 2019 | 27% | 54% | -27% | 61% | -34% |
| 2018 | 32% | 57% | -25% | 62% | -30% |
| Compare | | -5% | | | |

## GEOMETRY EOC

| Year | School | District | School Minus District | State | School Minus State |
|------|--------|----------|----------------------|-------|--------------------|
| 2019 | 54% | 51% | 3% | 57% | -3% |
| 2018 | 62% | 54% | 8% | 56% | 6% |
| Compare | | -8% | | | |

## 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 | 14 | 31 | 30 | 24 | 39 | 41 | 23 | 32 | | 73 | 34 |
| ELL | 37 | 44 | 37 | 28 | 35 | | 28 | 28 | | 35 | |
| BLK | 37 | 39 | 26 | 30 | 41 | 27 | 51 | 40 | | 84 | 72 |
| HSP | 49 | 46 | 33 | 41 | 45 | 29 | 51 | 60 | | 71 | 72 |
| MUL | 42 | 48 | 40 | 42 | 55 | | 62 | 60 | | 94 | 81 |
| WHT | 51 | 51 | 39 | 49 | 50 | 35 | 65 | 79 | | 89 | 79 |
| FRL | 40 | 42 | 34 | 37 | 42 | 31 | 52 | 62 | | 80 | 70 |

### 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
|-----------|----------|--------|-------------|-----------|---------|--------------|----------|---------|-----------|-------------------|----------------------|
| SWD | 18 | 27 | 24 | 27 | 34 | 38 | 20 | 39 | | 67 | 38 |
| ELL | 9 | 41 | 38 | 19 | 38 | | 29 | | | 57 | 58 |
| BLK | 36 | 48 | 38 | 36 | 40 | 25 | 34 | 40 | | 79 | 52 |
| HSP | 43 | 49 | 25 | 41 | 52 | 40 | 57 | 64 | | 74 | 77 |
| MUL | 48 | 39 | | 50 | 55 | | 57 | 77 | | 76 | 69 |
| WHT | 52 | 52 | 40 | 54 | 49 | 44 | 66 | 76 | | 87 | 77 |
| FRL | 42 | 49 | 34 | 43 | 46 | 37 | 56 | 66 | | 79 | 69 |

### 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 | 9 | 25 | 25 | 13 | 42 | 45 | 30 | 41 | | 60 | 33 |

| 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 |
| ELL | 14 | 22 | 26 | 25 | 47 | 36 | 40 | 12 | | | |
| BLK | 21 | 46 | 52 | 23 | 38 | 31 | 36 | 51 | | 89 | 41 |
| HSP | 35 | 39 | 38 | 41 | 43 | 29 | 59 | 60 | | 91 | 48 |
| MUL | 43 | 47 | | 36 | 26 | | | 80 | | | |
| WHT | 50 | 47 | 36 | 47 | 42 | 27 | 63 | 82 | | 91 | 64 |
| FRL | 34 | 41 | 39 | 36 | 36 | 23 | 53 | 70 | | 88 | 47 |

## 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 | 55 |
| OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students | NO |
| Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target | 2 |
| Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency | 56 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 609 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 11 |
| Percent Tested | 98% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|---|
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 34 |
| Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| **English Language Learners** | |
| Federal Index - English Language Learners | 36 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | YES |
| 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 | 45 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

| Hispanic Students | |
|---|---|
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 50 |
| 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 | 58 |
| 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 | 59 |
| 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 | 50 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

## Analysis

**Data Reflection**

Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

**Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.**

Algebra 1. The middle school feeding students to BHS is testing all Level 3, 4 and 5 students in Algebra. This leaves BHS to have only Level 1 and 2 students in our Algebra Classes.

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

Algebra 1. The middle school feeding students to BHS is testing all Level 3, 4 and 5 students in Algebra. This leaves BHS to have only Level 1 and 2 students in our Algebra Classes.

**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.**

12 points - Math Lowest 25% . The factor contributing to this is Algebra 1. The middle school feeding students to BHS is testing all Level 3, 4 and 5 students in Algebra. This leaves BHS to have only Level 1 and 2 students in our Algebra Classes.

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

ELA achievement. Our school did an item specification training where we had the district content area specialists involved in the collaboration. Teachers looked at their students prior years' FSA scores and broke down the overall needs of their students. Collaboration was ongoing throughout the school year.

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

BHS will continue to work with our students who are emerging bilinguals and students with disabilities to bridge the learning gap. These students consistently fall below the achievement mark and do not make appropriate learning gains.

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

1. Algebra 1 Achievement
2. Algebra 1 Learning Gains
3. Algebra bottom 25% Learning Gains
4. ELA Learning Gains
5. ELA bottom 25% Learning Gains

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

**Areas of Focus:**

| #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Student Engagement through Student Centered Instruction in Math <br><br> There is a need for focused professional development on standards aligned instruction through student centered instruction. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | If teachers engage in quality professional development in Math (specifically Algebra and Geometry), then the number of students proficient in the under performing subgroup ELL will increase from 36% to 41%, the subgroup of ESE will increase from 33 to 41% and our overall achievement will increase from 45% to 50%. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Virginia Hisey (virginia.hisey@marion.k12.fl.us) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Teachers will be trained in Kagan strategies (specifically Student Engagement) during pre-school week. Strategies will be implemented each month and modeled through our Monday Morning kick off meetings. Teachers will also receive training on building effective relationships with students. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Walkthrough and observation data used during the 2019-2020 school year showed a trend that teachers were not allowing students opportunity to talk and collaborate. Unify training was given during the 2019-20 school year. Teachers did not utilize these data dig strategies with fidelity. |

## Action Steps to Implement

1. CAS - Ginnie Hisey will work with Math teachers on implementing standards based instruction
2. Standards aligned training using Unify and Performance Matters data provided by CAS
3. Learning walks through campus with teachers to observe peers and note effective strategies
4. Use of IXL in all math classrooms and data in IXL used to show growth on individual student standards
5. Schedule collaborative planning time for teachers. Subs provided.
6. Science goggles provided to Biology classrooms to enhance higher order learning in labs and connection to math standards.
7. Before school tutoring provided before school to prepare for Algebra 1, Geometry EOC and SAT / ACT
8. Chrome books and carts placed in all classrooms to enhance instruction.

| | |
|---|---|
| **Person Responsible** | Virginia Hisey (virginia.hisey@marion.k12.fl.us) |

| #2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Student Engagement through Student Centered Instruction in ELA<br><br>There is a need for focused professional development on standards aligned instruction through student centered instruction. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | If teachers engage in quality professional development in ELA, then the number of students proficient in the under performing subgroup ELL will increase from 36% to 41%, the subgroup of ESE will increase from 33 to 41% and our overall achievement will increase from 49% to 53%. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Virginia Hisey (virginia.hisey@marion.k12.fl.us) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | If teachers engage in quality professional development in ELA standards implementation, then the number of students proficient in the under performing subgroup ELL will increase from 36% to 41% and the subgroup of ESE will increase from 33 to 41%. Quality Professional development includes a focus on rigor and relevance as well as Kagan strategies. We will observe these strategies being used during walk-throughs and observations. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Walk-through and observation data used during the 2019-2020 school year, showed a trend that teachers were not allowing students opportunity to talk and collaborate. Unify training was given during the 2019-20 school<br>year. Teachers did not utilize these data dig strategies with fidelity. |

## Action Steps to Implement

1. CAS - Ginnie Hisey will work with Math teachers on implementing standards based instruction
2. Standards aligned training using Unify and Performance Matters data provided by CAS
3. Learning walks through campus with teachers to observe peers and note effective strategies
4. Use of IXL in all ELA classrooms and data in IXL used to show growth on individual student standards
5. Schedule collaborative planning time for teachers. Subs provided.
6. Before school tutoring provided before school to prepare for ELA 9/10 tests and SAT / ACT
7. Chrome books and carts placed in all classrooms to enhance instruction.
8. Achieve 3000 used in all ELA classrooms to support standards based instruction/ Training provided to teachers as needed.

**Person Responsible** Virginia Hisey (virginia.hisey@marion.k12.fl.us)

## Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

**If students feel safe and welcome at school, then discipline referrals will decrease. In the 2019-2020 school year, 11% of the students at Belleview High School had two or more suspensions.**

## 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.

Belleview High School will target specific groups of parents and meet with them in small groups to discuss concerns and needs. These specific groups include parents of our emerging bilingual students as well as our students with disabilities.

Belleview High School guidance department has an open door policy. Students are welcome to come to the front office throughout the school day to talk to your counselors. In addition, our Multi Disciplinary team meets weekly and on demand to discuss any students with social-emotional needs.

Belleview High School welcomes incoming 9th grade students by first visiting them in their 8th grade setting and discussing the positive things BHS has to offer. We also have the 8th grade invasion, where students visit BHS, allowing students to see all academic offerings. These students are also encouraged to attend the pre-school open house night in which they are given the opportunity to explore the campus, as well as obtain information on
buses, extra curricular activities, and classroom schedules. Parents and students are offered many opportunities to find out information about College, career and military through a variety of activities including; College and Career Expo at CCF, Financial Aid Night, Military presence at lunches once a week, Colleges visiting during lunches, CCF Spring Presentation, State University Tour for Counselors.

BHS works directly with our local businesses to create a positive environment for all stakeholders. We have multiple businesses who have partnered with our school and donated items to support the learning of our students. We also plan parent involvement nights where parents came come see our school and all that we offer. We survey our parents to see what time of day would be best for them to participate in our SAC meetings.

We work directly with our staff to include them in decision making including both a discipline and testing planning committee team. These teams are used to get direct teacher input on decision making that impacts the entire staff. We also have a Sunshine committee that celebrates all aspects of our staff's lives. Administration supports and acknowledges teachers' individual successes both publicly and privately.

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