Bell High School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Bell High School

930 S MAIN ST, Bell, FL 32619

https://www.gilchristschools.org/

Demographics

Principal: Brent Douglas

Start Date for this Principal: 7/15/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
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)	82%
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 Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: A (67%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (60%)
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 was approved by the Gilchrist County School Board on 11/17/2020.

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

Bell High School

930 S MAIN ST, Bell, FL 32619

https://www.gilchristschools.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)
High School 6-12	No	73%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	16%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan was approved by the Gilchrist County School Board on 11/17/2020.

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.

To serve all students who attend our school with diligence and to educate and build skills to be productive and successful members of our community.

Provide the school's vision statement.

The vision of Bell Middle / High School is: "Student growth at BMS/BHS is the expectation."

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
Barry, Lisa	Principal	
Downs, Jackie	Teacher, K-12	
Verhaeren, Jennifer	Teacher, K-12	
Douglas, Brent	Assistant Principal	
Sites, Kathy	Teacher, K-12	
Rowe, Lesa	Teacher, K-12	
Cannon, Thomas	Teacher, K-12	
Meinholz, Jon	Teacher, K-12	
Mehl, Annette	Teacher, K-12	
Hodge, Tonia	Teacher, K-12	
Langford, Lynette	School Counselor	
Rosenboom, Jennifer	Instructional Coach	
	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/15/2019, Brent Douglas

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.*

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.*

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
45

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	High School 6-12
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)	82%
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 Hispanic Students Multiracial Students* White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: A (67%) 2017-18: A (67%) 2016-17: B (61%) 2015-16: B (60%)
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	73	77	76	0	0	0	0	226
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	8	11	0	0	0	0	22
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	4	3	0	0	0	0	8
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	9	5	6	0	0	0	0	20
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	6	4	7	0	0	0	0	17

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	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	2

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 10/14/2020

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	94	76	82	0	0	0	0	252
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	26	28	0	0	0	0	69
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	13	22	0	0	0	0	45
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	15	13	0	0	0	0	36

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	7	15	12	0	0	0	0	34

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	0	0	0	0	0	0	94	76	82	0	0	0	0	252
Attendance below 90 percent	0	0	0	0	0	0	15	26	28	0	0	0	0	69
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	10	13	22	0	0	0	0	45
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	0	0	0	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	5
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	15	13	0	0	0	0	36

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	7	15	12	0	0	0	0	34

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	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
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	63%	0%	56%	59%	0%	53%
ELA Learning Gains	58%	0%	51%	55%	0%	49%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	49%	0%	42%	38%	0%	41%
Math Achievement	62%	0%	51%	52%	0%	49%
Math Learning Gains	60%	0%	48%	50%	0%	44%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	61%	0%	45%	45%	0%	39%
Science Achievement	75%	0%	68%	68%	0%	65%
Social Studies Achievement	88%	0%	73%	75%	0%	70%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)							Total
	6	**7**	**8**	**9**	**10**	**11**	**12**	
	(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**
06	2019	65%	67%	-2%	54%	11%
	2018	55%	57%	-2%	52%	3%
Same Grade Comparison		10%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	51%	55%	-4%	52%	-1%
	2018	59%	56%	3%	51%	8%
Same Grade Comparison		-8%				
Cohort Comparison		-4%				
08	2019	66%	69%	-3%	56%	10%
	2018	73%	74%	-1%	58%	15%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison		7%				
09	2019	68%	62%	6%	55%	13%
	2018	59%	63%	-4%	53%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		9%				
Cohort Comparison		-5%				
10	2019	59%	60%	-1%	53%	6%
	2018	59%	65%	-6%	53%	6%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				

MATH						
Grade	**Year**	**School**	**District**	**School-District Comparison**	**State**	**School-State Comparison**
06	2019	50%	61%	-11%	55%	-5%
	2018	62%	66%	-4%	52%	10%
Same Grade Comparison		-12%				
Cohort Comparison						
07	2019	76%	73%	3%	54%	22%
	2018	61%	66%	-5%	54%	7%
Same Grade Comparison		15%				
Cohort Comparison		14%				
08	2019	59%	60%	-1%	46%	13%
	2018	43%	55%	-12%	45%	-2%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		16%				
Cohort Comparison		-2%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
08	2019	59%	64%	-5%	48%	11%
	2018	66%	61%	5%	50%	16%
Same Grade Comparison		-7%				
Cohort Comparison						

BIOLOGY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	85%	85%	0%	67%	18%
2018	86%	83%	3%	65%	21%
Compare		-1%			

CIVICS EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	91%	85%	6%	71%	20%
2018	83%	72%	11%	71%	12%
Compare		8%			

HISTORY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	85%	74%	11%	70%	15%
2018	76%	75%	1%	68%	8%
Compare		9%			

ALGEBRA EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	61%	67%	-6%	61%	0%
2018	63%	60%	3%	62%	1%
Compare		-2%			

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
2019	56%	61%	-5%	57%	-1%
2018	67%	64%	3%	56%	11%

GEOMETRY EOC					
Year	School	District	School Minus District	State	School Minus State
Compare		-11%			

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	24	45	45	38	49	52	33	75		95	50
HSP	42	45		41	58		58	86		45	
MUL	44	40		36	25						
WHT	66	60	48	66	62	64	78	90	72	89	70
FRL	53	55	49	55	54	53	66	86	67	80	58

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	24	38	35	49	55	35	53	56			
HSP	58	51	50	50	61	55	82	73			
MUL	47	59		57	57						
WHT	62	57	48	69	63	53	78	85	59	94	75
FRL	55	54	49	63	62	53	74	80	58	90	76

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	19	35	28	21	51	49	23	61		100	25
ELL					55						
HSP	45	48		34	57	63		55		100	50
MUL	44	20		25	33						
WHT	61	56	40	55	50	44	71	76	75	99	59
FRL	53	49	34	48	50	40	62	70	69	98	50

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	67
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	741

ESSA Federal Index	
Total Components for the Federal Index	11
Percent Tested	99%

Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	51
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
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	
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	54
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	36
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES

Multiracial Students	
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	70
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	61
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.

ELA lowest quartile learning gains was the lowest performing area at 49% proficient in the 18-19 school year. This was however, 7% above the state average. Contributing factors are finding strategies and methods of instruction that can continue to close the gap for students with disabilities, although we feel like we are continuing to improve in this area. While examining sub-group data, our multi-racial students was a low performing sub-group, at 36% proficient in Math and 25% learning gains. Thus, this is the only sub-group that is below the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Federal Index threshold of 41% that is used to identify critically low areas in schools. The inability to find successful strategies to assist our English language learners could be a contributing factor for the low performance of this sub-group, as a number of low performing students from this sub-group were identified as English Language Learners (ELL). Further, sub-group data showed that students with disabilities were 24% proficient in ELA, 38% proficient in Math, and 33% proficient in Science achievement. Use of research-based instructional strategies and differentiation could be a contributing factor to the low performance of the students with disabilities sub-group, although performance in the learning gains areas helped keep the overall performance above the ESSA federal index.

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

Overall Math Achievement in 18-19 fell from 67% to 62% from the previous year. However, this performance is still 11% above the state average. In certain grade level locations, such as 6th grade Math, new curriculum and attempts to teach advanced curriculum brought new challenges that may have effected overall performance where there was a 12% decline. Geometry also experienced a 11% decline in 2019. A contributing factor could have been a change of instructional personnel in this area, along with curriculum concerns. Newly adopted Math materials should greatly assist in addressing these math concerns for the upcoming school year. With the new materials, we have added a Professional Learning Community (PLC) that will provide professional development to the teachers throughout the year. Subgroup data showed a 32% decline in Math learning gains, and a 21% decline in math achievement for our multi-racial students. This is a concern, but close evaluation of the data shows that a very small group of students had a large effect on this data, as it is a small sub-group of students at our school. Students with disabilities showed an 11% decline in Math achievement, and a 20% decline in overall science achievement. Continued use of research-based instructional strategies and close attention to student performance to determine mastery of content will impact this area for the upcoming year.

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.

BHS performed significantly above the state average in each overall school grade component in 2018-2019. The lowest level of outperformance was by 7 percentage points. When examining grade level data, three areas of concern are 6th grade Math, and 7th grade ELA, and Geometry, which all performed slightly below the state average.

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

Math lowest quartile showed the most improvement in overall school grade components in 2018-2019, with a 6% jump from the previous year, which helped this category far outperform the state average by 16%. High quality support facilitation contributed to this improvement, as students with disabilities received small group instruction, individual or small group testing, and other accommodations. Social Studies achievement also jumped 4% to 88% proficient, which is 15% above the state average. Grade level data showed strong performance in the following areas: 6th grade ELA with a 10% improvement, 7th grade Math with a 15% improvement, 8th grade Math with a 16% improvement, Civics with a 8% improvement, and U.S. History with a 9% improvement.

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

14% of 8th grade students and 10% of the 6th-8th grade met the Early Warning criteria for attendance by missing over 10% of school in the previous year. In addition, 12% of 6th grade students scored a Level 1 in the ELA category in the 18-19 school year. A method to address these concerns will be strengthening our child study team meetings to reduce truancy, and bring academic strengths to the classroom instruction in a variety of ways to support student learning in the 6th grade, especially for the lowest quartile in ELA..

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

1. Multi-Racial sub-group performance in Math.
2. Students with Disabilities sub-group performance in ELA and Math achievement.
3. Middle School Attendance rate.
4. 7th grade Math proficiency.
5. 8th grade ELA proficiency.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Multi-Racial

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	While examining sub-group data, our multi-racial students was a low performing sub-group, at 36% proficient in Math and 25% learning gains. Thus, this is the only sub-group that is below the Every Student Succeeds Act (ESSA) Federal Index threshold of 41% that is used to identify critically low areas in schools. The inability to find successful strategies to assist our English language learners could be a contributing factor for the low performance of this sub-group, as a number of low performing students from this sub-group were identified as English Language Learners (ELL).
Measurable Outcome:	Our 2020-2021 multi-racial student sub-group will achieve greater than 50% Math proficiency, and 50% learning gains in Math for the new school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lisa Barry (barryl@mygcsd.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	State and clarify learning goals, monitor for student understanding, and give feedback to students regularly. In addition, allowing for repeated practice, create opportunities for peer-to-peer learning, and allowing additional time to learn difficult concepts are all strategies that will be used with the sub-group to increase success.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research was conducted to identify the most successful learning strategies that can provide additional support to students. The strategies listed above are powerful learning strategies that can impact student success and performance.

Action Steps to Implement

Classrooms will be monitored by administrators through the Marzano Focused model teacher evaluation system, monitoring of lesson plans, and development of "Close the Gap" plans that are required in September and January of the school year. Multi-racial students will be identified by the teachers in the various subjects, and particularly in the Math subject areas.

Person Responsible Lisa Barry (barryl@mygcsd.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	
Measurable Outcome:	The intended outcome of this improvement activity is to increase ELA achievement to 70%, ELA learning gains to 70%, and lowest-quartile proficiency to 60%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will be trained on the use of high yield teaching strategies to increase academic rigor in the classroom to promote student growth and achievement for all students, especially those in the lowest quartile. The GCSD Coordinator of Instruction Support will provide assistance to reading and ELA teachers in planning and implementing rigorous unit plans. Core Connections PLC's will model teaching strategies and lessons in middle and high school classes. Teachers and students will receive additional support in the classrooms with support facilitators and the reading coach. Support facilitators will co-teach/assist in middle and high school ELA classrooms specifically targeting students in the lowest quartile.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Use of high-yield instructional strategies is use of proven methods that impact students. Extensive study in the past years has helped educators learn the best and most likely ways to impact student learning, and helped educators learn what typically has lower impact. Teaching at the required level of rigor is critical for high performance of state assessments. Core Connections will help with this area. Providing extra support for students with disabilities is proven to impact overall student performance, Smart use of personnel and resources will positively impact this area. Use of IReady and other curriculum supports is expected to bring overall proficiency and learning gains improvement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Use of high-yield instructional strategies in classrooms.
2. Increase academic rigor to promote student growth.
3. Use of Core Connections professional development across grade levels.
4. Use of the Reading Coach to bring research-based instructional methods to classrooms.

Person Responsible Lisa Barry (barryl@mygcsd.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In 2019, school-wide Math Achievement was 62%. School-wide learning gains were 60%. School-wide lowest-quartile proficiency was 61%.
Measurable Outcome:	The intended outcome of this improvement activity is to increase Math achievement to 70%, Math learning gains to 70%, and lowest-quartile proficiency to 65%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	[no one identified]
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers will be provided with opportunities to review and adjust curriculum maps which will include resources for the teachers to use throughout the year. These resources will include technology resources (MS iReady, Canvas, Khan Academy) which teachers may use to remediate and enrich students according to their needs. Teachers will continue their training in best practices to provide strategies that meet student needs. Math teachers will have year two of implementing the new textbook and curriculum materials in math instruction. Administration will work closely with the guidance department to create a schedule that will provide teachers/students with the extra support needed for students requiring support facilitation, as well as those identified in the lowest quartile. A schedule will be created for middle school MTSS and IReady to be utilized.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Administration will be monitoring lesson plans and will have classroom walk-throughs periodically. Teachers will sign in to all professional development and PLCs. Curriculum Maps, learning goals and scales will be completed prior to the beginning of each course. Monthly consults with ESE teachers will monitor students with disabilities.

Action Steps to Implement

1. The district will have a second year of implementation K-12 textbook for math.
2. Teachers will be trained in the new textbook series.
3. Teachers will receive ongoing support/collaborative workshops to become familiar with on-line components of the new series, and participate in the Math PLC.

Person Responsible   [no one identified]

#4. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In the 2018-2019 school year proficiency on state Biology EOC was 85% and Florida Science Standards assessments for 8th grade was 59%.
Measurable Outcome:	90% of the science students will score at or above proficiency on the statewide science exams.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lisa Barry (barryl@mygcsd.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Students are taught intensive reading strategies to increase the ability to comprehend difficult text and to improve overall reading ability. Target learning goals provide students with guidance toward mastery of the standards and benchmarks. For students to have a probability of high success on the standardized test, there must be time built into the instructional days to review content that has been taught in the past. Standards that are exclusively taught in grades six and seven, and are not naturally spiraled back through the 8th grade curriculum, can be targeted for mastery.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The 8th grade curriculum maps note that March is the completion of the initial teaching of the 8th grade benchmarks and standards. The month of April and first week of May is dedicated to reteaching and enrichment of the 6-8 NGSSS in preparation of the state test in May.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Continue with successful instructional strategies utilized in the Biology EOC area.
2. Use the 8th grade curriculum maps to ensure coverage of required material.
3. Dedicate time to review and enrichment of 6th-7th grade tested science standards.
4. Use of research-based instructional strategies in the Science classrooms.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#5. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Social Studies	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	In 2019, Bell Middle/High School Socials Studies Department earned a combined proficiency rate of 88% on the End of Course Exam in 7th Grade Civics and 11th Grade U.S. History, a four point improvement over the previous year.
Measurable Outcome:	The goal for the Social Studies Department is to continue the improvement at a 4% rate until 100% is attained. The goal for the 2020-21 school year is to have a combined proficiency rate of 92%.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lisa Barry (barryl@mygcsd.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Teachers in the Social Studies Department will continue to implement and use high yield instructional and research-based teaching methods that bring high student engagement and result in strong student performance.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Use of high-yield and research-based instructional strategies have proven track records. Tremendous nation-wide studies have shown that students have greater pathways to success when the strategies used by teachers give students a greater likelihood for learning to occur. Some traditional strategies have also been shown to have little impact on student learning, but have been utilized in classrooms for decades. Having awareness and understanding of brain-based high impact strategies will bring greater achievement to the students.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Use of curriculum maps to ensure coverage of instructional standards during the year.
2. Use of high-yield, research based instructional strategies.
3. Engage students with curriculum through well-planned units and lessons.
4. Monitor student understanding through formative and summative assessments.
5. Adjust instruction using data-based decision making to ensure mastery of standards.

Person Responsible [no one identified]

#6. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Career & Technical Education

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Students should be able to connect current curriculum with future opportunities in CTE fields. By receiving program participation credit, upon graduation students are able to enter the workforce earlier than peers.
Measurable Outcome:	90% of students in Business Ed. will complete Microsoft Office Specialist by senior year. 90% of CJ students will complete industry certification in the 911 dispatch operation. 90% of Agriculture students will receive industry certifications in Foundations and/or Agricultural Mechanics. 90% of Health Academy students will receive industry certification in CNA, EKG, EMT, or other offered courses. 90% of Engineering students will receive certification in Auto Cad, Solid Works, and other offered course work.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lisa Barry (barryl@mygcsd.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Provide engaging learning environment that offers real-world opportunities for the future. Ensure that a cross curriculum approach is used especially with ELA and math. Extensive use of technology especially as it applies to CTE areas will be utilized, along with high quality course curriculum. Use of guest speakers and subject matter experts from the local community will help with student engagement and interest.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	To encourage students to be able to enter the workforce earlier than peers and to teach a sense of responsibility in serving and giving back to community.

Action Steps to Implement

1. High quality lesson planning utilized in each CTE area.
2. Use of high quality curriculum and materials to prepare each student.
3. Use of research-based instructional materials for high engagement of students.
4. Use of hands-on active learning approaches in each CTE area.
5. Use data to determine if all students are prepared for successful completion.

Person Responsible	Lisa Barry (barryl@mygcsd.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

An effective PBS program provides students with opportunities for success during the school year. After observing a successful PBS program in the 8th grade for several years, it will be expanded for the second year of implemtation to all middle school grade levels. Students will be grouped in each grade level in creative ways, and students will be awarded points for outstanding performance in many categories. Groups will be tracked and each term celebrations will occur for high performance. Teachers will be able to utilize the framework to influence students in positive ways. We believe that the overall PBS program across the middle school will lead to lower suspension rates and contribute to greater academic performance during the school year. It will also assist in a positive school culture and a sense of community at BMHS.

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.

The school year begins with an Open House where parents and students are encouraged to attend to receive schedules and meet the faculty and staff. Teachers use the Skyward internet system to record and track grades for parents to have continual access to student's academic progress at anytime. Progress reports are sent home at the mid quarter period and report cards are sent home quarterly for parents to stay informed of their child's progress. Parents are asked to participate in school surveys that focus on school involvement and improvement. The principal provides regular School Messenger phone calls home to inform families of upcoming activities and events. Many teachers use an electronic remind system for parents and students to assist with homework and upcoming class events. Also, teachers use the district web page "fusion" for students and parents to interact with daily and for homework activities/assignments, and new this year will be the online Canvas system for classrooms. Academies and extra curricular activities foster parent involvement while building the foundation for our students to become contributing citizens of our community. For the new year, we will use the official GCSD app to electronically provide information and to positively promote the great things that are happening at our school.

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: ESSA Subgroup: Multi-Racial	$0.00
2	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA	$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math	$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Social Studies	$0.00
6	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Career & Technical Education	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**