**Hillsborough County Public Schools**

# Bailey Elementary School



# 2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

## Table of Contents

# Bailey Elementary School

4630 GALLAGHER RD, Dover, FL 33527

[ no web address on file ]

## Demographics

## Principal: Kristin Willis

Start Date for this Principal: 12/17/2018

| | |
|---|---|
| **2019-20 Status**<br>(per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served**<br>(per MSID File) | Elementary School<br>KG-5 |
| **Primary Service Type**<br>(per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2019-20 Economically<br>Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate**<br>(as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| **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: C (47%)<br><br>2017-18: B (54%)<br><br>2016-17: C (45%)<br><br>2015-16: B (56%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Central |
| **Regional Executive Director** | Lucinda Thompson |
| **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 Hillsborough County School Board.

## SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

## Table of Contents

# Bailey Elementary School

## 4630 GALLAGHER RD, Dover, FL 33527

### [ 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) |
|---|---|---|
| Elementary School KG-5 | Yes | 77% |

| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | **Charter School** | **2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2) |
|---|---|---|
| K-12 General Education | No | 54% |

## School Grades History

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

## School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough 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.**

Developing and maintaining a lifelong learner in a safe, accepting, and nurturing environment that the Bailey school community provides.

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

Preparing students for life

"90 X 20"

### 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 |
|------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Valdez, Scott | Principal | As specified by his contract, and specifically with this SIP process, part of the decision making team supporting teachers, reviewing of data, giving feedback and ensuring that our instruction meets the needs of all Bailey students. |
| Willis, Kristin | Assistant Principal | Part of the SIP decision making team supporting teachers, reviewing of data, giving feedback and ensuring that our instruction meets the needs of all Bailey students. |
| Groubert, Cheryl | Teacher, K-12 | Part of the SIP decision making team, being a teacher leader, supporting teachers, reviewing of data, giving feedback and ensuring that our instruction meets the needs of all Bailey students. |
| Krout, Stephanie | Teacher, K-12 | Part of the SIP decision making team, being a teacher leader, supporting teachers, reviewing of data, giving feedback and ensuring that our instruction meets the needs of all Bailey students. |
| Sabo, Stephanie | Teacher, ESE | Part of the SIP decision making team, being a teacher leader, supporting teachers, reviewing of data, giving feedback and ensuring that our instruction meets the needs of all Bailey students - especially ensuring the needs are met by students identified for ESE instructional support and services. |

### Demographic Information

**Principal start date**
Monday 12/17/2018, Kristin Willis

**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.*

10

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

39

**Demographic Data**

| | |
|---|---|
| **2020-21 Status** (per MSID File) | Active |
| **School Type and Grades Served** (per MSID File) | Elementary School KG-5 |
| **Primary Service Type** (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| **2019-20 Title I School** | Yes |
| **2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3) | 100% |
| **2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented** (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk) | Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students* |
| **School Grades History** | 2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: B (54%) 2016-17: C (45%) 2015-16: B (56%) |
| **2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*** | |
| **SI Region** | Central |
| **Regional Executive Director** | Lucinda Thompson |
| **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 | 118 | 117 | 117 | 124 | 128 | 126 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 730 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 8 | 4 | 8 | 9 | 5 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 |
| One or more suspensions | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 3 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| 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 | 11 | 21 | 28 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 60 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 23 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 72 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 1 | 1 | 0 | 10 | 14 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 41 |

**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 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 16 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 4 |

**Date this data was collected or last updated**
Monday 6/29/2020

### 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 | 106 | 106 | 120 | 147 | 135 | 125 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 739 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 12 | 17 | 13 | 20 | 14 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62 | 58 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 176 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 1 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 7 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |

**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 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |

**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 | 106 | 106 | 120 | 147 | 135 | 125 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 739 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 12 | 17 | 13 | 20 | 14 | 20 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 96 |
| One or more suspensions | 1 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |
| Course failure in ELA or Math | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on statewide assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 62 | 58 | 56 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 176 |

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

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | Total |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 1 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 7 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 33 |

**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 | 2 | 0 | 2 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 1 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 |

## 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 | 45% | 52% | 57% | 51% | 52% | 55% |
| ELA Learning Gains | 55% | 55% | 58% | 50% | 55% | 57% |
| ELA Lowest 25th Percentile | 43% | 50% | 53% | 34% | 51% | 52% |
| Math Achievement | 43% | 54% | 63% | 48% | 53% | 61% |
| Math Learning Gains | 51% | 57% | 62% | 45% | 54% | 61% |
| Math Lowest 25th Percentile | 46% | 46% | 51% | 36% | 46% | 51% |
| Science Achievement | 43% | 50% | 53% | 54% | 48% | 51% |

| | EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Indicator** | **Grade Level (prior year reported)** | | | | | | **Total** |
| | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | |
| | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | (0) | 0 (0) |

**Grade Level Data**
**NOTE: This data is raw data and includes ALL students who tested at the school. This is not school grade data.**

| ELA | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 44% | 52% | -8% | 58% | -14% |
| | 2018 | 41% | 53% | -12% | 57% | -16% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 3% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 49% | 55% | -6% | 58% | -9% |
| | 2018 | 40% | 55% | -15% | 56% | -16% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | 9% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 8% | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 40% | 54% | -14% | 56% | -16% |
| | 2018 | 50% | 51% | -1% | 55% | -5% |
| Same Grade Comparison | | -10% | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | 0% | | | | |

| MATH | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison |
| 03 | 2019 | 39% | 54% | -15% | 62% | -23% |

| MATH | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison | |
| | 2018 | 49% | 55% | -6% | 62% | -13% | |
| Same Grade Comparison | -10% | | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | | |
| 04 | 2019 | 44% | 57% | -13% | 64% | -20% | |
| | 2018 | 54% | 57% | -3% | 62% | -8% | |
| Same Grade Comparison | -10% | | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | -5% | | | | | | |
| 05 | 2019 | 41% | 54% | -13% | 60% | -19% | |
| | 2018 | 55% | 54% | 1% | 61% | -6% | |
| Same Grade Comparison | -14% | | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | -13% | | | | | | |

| SCIENCE | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School-District Comparison | State | School-State Comparison | |
| 05 | 2019 | 43% | 51% | -8% | 53% | -10% | |
| | 2018 | 55% | 52% | 3% | 55% | 0% | |
| Same Grade Comparison | -12% | | | | | | |
| Cohort Comparison | | | | | | | |

## Subgroup Data

### 2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS

| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2017-18 | C & C Accel 2017-18 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SWD | 19 | 32 | 25 | 14 | 30 | 40 | 13 | | | | |
| ELL | 23 | 44 | 52 | 30 | 38 | 44 | 16 | | | | |
| BLK | 38 | 53 | | 38 | 47 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 38 | 51 | 44 | 39 | 47 | 50 | 34 | | | | |
| WHT | 53 | 60 | 38 | 47 | 54 | 46 | 50 | | | | |
| FRL | 39 | 51 | 45 | 38 | 45 | 45 | 36 | | | | |

### 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 | 68 | 71 | 29 | 57 | 46 | | | | | |
| ELL | 23 | 74 | 81 | 43 | 72 | 67 | 48 | | | | |
| BLK | 52 | 43 | | 43 | 43 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 35 | 62 | 70 | 49 | 66 | 66 | 48 | | | | |
| MUL | 30 | | | 55 | 60 | | | | | | |
| WHT | 53 | 42 | 47 | 60 | 58 | 32 | 64 | | | | |
| FRL | 38 | 48 | 60 | 49 | 58 | 53 | 51 | | | | |

| 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 |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **2017 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| SWD | 16 | 27 | 18 | 24 | 29 | 26 | 9 | | | | |
| ELL | 19 | 27 | 26 | 33 | 37 | 42 | 16 | | | | |
| BLK | 63 | 50 | | 56 | 67 | | | | | | |
| HSP | 34 | 37 | 27 | 41 | 42 | 44 | 42 | | | | |
| MUL | 82 | | | 64 | | | | | | | |
| WHT | 60 | 59 | 40 | 51 | 44 | 24 | 64 | | | | |
| FRL | 43 | 46 | 29 | 40 | 42 | 37 | 42 | | | | |

## 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 | 47 |
| 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 | 50 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 376 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |

| Subgroup Data | |
|---|---|
| **Students With Disabilities** | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 27 |
| 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 | 37 |
| 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 | 44 |
| 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 | 44 |
| 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 | |
| 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 | 50 |
| 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 | 44 |
| 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.**

Math Proficiency had the lowest performance on FSA in Spring 2019. The former principal transferred in November of 2018; our Math Coach was reduced from full-time to half time in October of 2018. This coupled with long-term substitutes in 3rd, 4th and 5th grades for at least 50% of the year.

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

ELA Bottom Quartile (BQ) dropped 15% overall; our Students with Disabilities (SWD) increased significantly and we had a vacancy for a Full-time VE resource. RtI time for meeting the instructional needs of each student was inconsistent overall coupled with no Reading Coach after November of 2018, in addition to 3 long-term subs in 3rd, 4th and 5th grades.

**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 proficiency was 23% lower than the state average for Proficiency. Bailey' Elementary's 3rd Grade math Proficiency was 39% and the state average for proficiency was 62%. We only had a 0.5 FTE unit for a Math Coach during the 2018-19 school year. We had a vacancy in 3rd grade that was not filled for the entire year. Our current allocation for a 1.0 full-time Math Coach will continue to support teacher mastery of instructional standards; meet the needs of all the students, provide opportunities for deep dives into our data to meet the needs of all of our students; building great foundational knowledge for our Kindergarten, 1st grade and 2nd grade students, in addition to improving mastery levels of standards by all students, including SWD, ELL students and Bottom Quartile (BQ) categorized students.

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

4th grade Proficiency for ELA increased from 40% to 49% - now only 7% points from the state average as measured by the 2019 FSA test. We will continue to be strategic in meeting the needs of our ELA teachers by continuing bi-weekly coaching sessions with our current 1.0 allocation for a Reading Coach, ensuring teachers understand the demands and rigor for instruction based on standards and measured by student performance. We will continue to monitor with our observation and feedback. Our emphasis for our Reading Coach will be to continue to build and focus on 3rd, 4th and 5th grade student mastery of standards, but will also emphasize the Foundational skills by building teachers and learners in our Kindergarten, 1st grade, and 2nd grades

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

Level 1 performance increased from 92 students on ELA FSA in the Spring 2018 to 176 students on ELA FSA in the Spring of 2019.

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

1. ELA Bottom Quartile (BQ)- percentage of students showing gains in the BQ needs to increase significantly.
2. Math Proficiency for 3rd, 4th and 5th grade students needs to increase significantly for all studnents regardless of subgroup identification.

3 Attendance - the number students showing Early Warning Indicators for attendance needs to continue to be monitored and addressed. Continue the progress we steadily made for the 2019-2020 school year.

4. Continue to assess and monitor progress using common assessments for both ELA and Math using the data to provide next steps for instruction to help meet all of the needs for all of our students including RtI/MTSS support.

5. Ensuring our students identified as SWD will continue to receive Tier level support appropriate for their needs from the classroom teacher and their assigned VE Resource teacher.

## Part III: Planning for Improvement

### Areas of Focus:

### #1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Standards-aligned Instruction

| | |
|---|---|
| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | As a school focused on standards mastery and targeted use of "Visible Learning Standards", we expect that all children will be successful and grow academically in ELA at acceptable rates during the 2020-2021 school year. |
| **Measurable Outcome:** | We expect 100% of our retained 3rd graders, and at least 80% of our 4th and 5th grade students making adequate growth (a years worth of gains in a years worth of time) as measured by FSA or comparable, District approved method of assessment for all 3rd, 4th and 5th grade students. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Scott Valdez (scott.valdez@hcps.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Standards will be posted for all standards being taught in all curricular areaas, and plans to meet the individual needs based on student performance will drive the re-teaching of students, great core instruction and extended enrichment learning for all students. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | The relence of this strategy is to ensure that all students are aware of the learning objectives and their alignment with standards being taught. Students should be able to connect the "why" they are learning a standard and how it connects to the instruction and practice of the lesson |

### Action Steps to Implement

1. Standards will be posted (WHAT are the students learning? WHY are they learning this standard? HOW will they learn and WHEN will they know they have learned it and how confident are they / self-rate their level of understanding).

2. Students will demonstrate or provide evidence through Formal and Informal observations and using classroom assessments.

3. Teacher will be able to rate their own instructiional effectiveness based on their students' performance, data disaggregation during Coaching and PLCs which will lead to effective additional instruction or next steps.

| **Person Responsible** | Kristin Willis (kristin.willis@hcps.net) |
|---|---|

| **#2. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance** |
|---|

| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Students rate of attendance have a direct correlation to their success in learning and in the assessmentof the stanrds being taught. Increasing the students time and days in a successful learning environment will show improvement, this will be seen in learning proficience and gains in both ELA and Math as measured by the FSA or of ther District approved assessment measuring growth. |
|---|---|
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Bailey Elementary Students will improve their overall attendance rate to 97%. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Scott Valdez (scott.valdez@hcps.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | We will provide school-wide incentives for attendance which will include Bailey Bucks (token system), as well as quarterly recognition of 100% attendance rates in addition to supporting those students who made needs support from our Student Services Team - which inlcude our Guidance Counselor, School social worker and Leadership Team. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | Student attendance has been shown to improve with the support we used during the 2019-20 sdchool year, and helped those students who needed assistance using our Student Support Team. |

| **Action Steps to Implement** |
|---|

1. Our School Social worker will monitor student attendance weekly and monthly and provideing incentives, recognitions and awards for those who have demonstrated outstanding attendance, as well as those students who have attendance challenges, being recognized for maked improvement.
2. School Social Worker will recognize and celebrate 100% attendance by classroom.
3. Quarterly attendance awards.
4. Bike raffle for students who have perfect attendance during our FSA, NGSSS, or other District measure of student success during the spring of 2021.

| **Person Responsible** | Scott Valdez (scott.valdez@hcps.net) |
|---|---|

| **#3. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups** |
|---|

| **Area of Focus Description and Rationale:** | Common Assessments across subject areas, using spiralling curriculum and using these assessments to ensuring we are meeting the needs of all children especially students in the ESSA subgroups of SWD, and ELL students. The outcomes with these assessments will help us target successes and challenges all children are experiencing especially those previously mentioned identified subroups of SWD and ELL populations. |
|---|---|
| **Measurable Outcome:** | Increase student mastery of ELA and Math standards throughout the year to ensure all grade level standards are mastered by the end of the 2020-2021 school year as measured by FSA, NGSSS, or District approved assessments to demonstrate successes, areas of growth and teacher effectiveness. |
| **Person responsible for monitoring outcome:** | Scott Valdez (scott.valdez@hcps.net) |
| **Evidence-based Strategy:** | Collaborative grade level bi-weekly planning facilitated by our Math and Reading Coaches, analyzing standards, and ensuring that differentiation is polanned for using data points to show successes and areas that students need re-teaching to master the standard. Instructional Leadership Team (ILT) will look at data as a collective group to make suggestions and to look for trends both positively and negatively across curricular areas. Our ELL Resource teacher and our Migrant advocate will help support those Englis Language Learner (ELL)students with remediation for succes. In addition to our ELL students , data will be unpacked with plans for improvement for our students that are identified as SWD with support by their assigned VE teacher and the VE team as a collective unit. |
| **Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:** | The consistent monitoring and adjustment of instruction using the data from FORM 1 and 2 Tests for both Math and Science, Interim tests and FORM Tests for ELA, as well as the Math MOnthlies will give us data to ensure and adjust intruction based on assessments performance. |

| **Action Steps to Implement** |
|---|

1. Bi monthly PLCs
2. Biweekly Team Planning lead by our Math and Reading Coaches
3. ILT
4. Quarterly data review by Administrative and Leadership teams will occur based on data and student performance to help teachers determine "Next steps" for all of their students.

| **Person Responsible** | Michelle Wood (michelle.wood@hcps.net) |
|---|---|

| **Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities** |
|---|

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

**School leadership which includes, Team leaders, Academic coaches (both READING and MATH) will be part of the ILT and PLC models to monitor instructional and academic success. Our PLCs will be lead by our Academic Coaches to help teachers analyze their own students' success and challenges, and come up with how to meet the needs of students still needing to master content areas of both Reading/ELA and Math. Our ILT will support the trends that we are noticing in the data that has been analyzed during PLCs and brainstorm ways to better lead teacher during planning and standards based instruction**

## 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.

Our school has established as the "way of work" to promote a positive and safe culture. Mr. Valdez - Principal of Bailey Elementary, has demonstrated and now expects from ALL stakeholders to use welcoming and respectful tones when communicating with all stakeholders. We use our AsQI data as well as out TELL Survey to monitor our successes here at Bailey. We use social media as a way to communicate what great things are happening here at bailey, which includes Facebook, Twitter, and Parent Links communication. We also provide opportunities for parents to help us here at Bailey through volunteering and joiningg out PTA and SAC committees. This happens with every day interactions with faculty, staff, parents, community, and especially: Students. The respect and way of work is customer service. We use non-verbals such as positive facial expressions, tone of voice and a repeated message of "I know that you can do it. Always do your BEST". This style of leadership has been communicated as a place for students to be respected and be successful. We welcome all students and families walking through the door. These expectations are used in classrooms every day when students interact with the teacher. When successes occur, or significant growth is made, we use Social Media, Facebook, and Twitter to help celebrate the good things happening here at Bailey. Our HOST program is spotlighted as the premier afterschool program for students, we have multiple clubs which include our Running Club, our Trendsetter Team that is supported by Strawberry Crest' student mentorship, an after school Dance Club, as well as securing a local church for our Beach Club program that promotes positive role models and positive behavior both in and out of school. We use quarterly Awards and token incentives for students to be recognized for efforts and performance, We are also instituting a Mentor Program which will provide time and access for all students to have a role model ang "go to person" that may offer support, advice, and counsel as needed which includes weekly check-ins. When teachers, students and community feel welcome, their approach lends itself to a more positive and productive students who will be socially, psychologically and academically safe and provided opportunity to be successful This supports our District vison of "Preparing Students for Life" which really what our task as educators really is.

**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: Standards-aligned Instruction | $0.00 |
|---|--------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance | $0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Outcomes for Multiple Subgroups | $0.00 |
| | | Total: | $0.00 |