

Hillsborough County Public Schools

Bellamy Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Positive Culture & Environment	23
Budget to Support Goals	23

Bellamy Elementary School

9720 WILSKY BLVD, Tampa, FL 33615

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Michele Toscani

Start Date for this Principal: 7/29/2021

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School KG-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2020-21 Title I School	Yes
2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2020-21 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 White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (53%) 2017-18: B (56%) 2016-17: C (43%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	
* 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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	17
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	23

Bellamy Elementary School

9720 WILSKY BLVD, Tampa, FL 33615

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2020-21 Title I School	2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	84%
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	91%

School Grades History

Year	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18
Grade		C	C	B

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.

Bellamy Elementary builds Leaders with HEART (Honesty, Effort, Achievement, Respect, Teamwork).

Provide the school's vision statement.

Bellamy Elementary will be among the top achieving schools in the district.

School Leadership Team

Membership

Identify the name, email address, position title, and job duties/responsibilities for each member of the school leadership team.:

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Hessler, Jessica	Principal	Instructional Leadership, Data Analyzer and Instructional Outcomes, Management and Operations, and Human Resources/Capital.
Dominguez, JohnMichael	Teacher, K-12	SAC Co-Chair, Instructional Leadership, Data Analyzer and Instructional Outcomes
Scotto, Dorothy	Teacher, K-12	SAC Co-Chair, Instructional Leadership, Data Analyzer and Instructional Outcomes

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Thursday 7/29/2021, Michele Toscani

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Highly Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

0

Number of teachers with a 2019 3-year aggregate or a 1-year Algebra state VAM rating of Effective. *Note: For UniSIG Supplemental Teacher Allocation, teachers must have at least 10 student assessments.*

8

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

27

Total number of students enrolled at the school

535

Identify the number of instructional staff who left the school during the 2020-21 school year.

3

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2021-22 school year.

3

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

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	68	72	95	92	91	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	506
Attendance below 90 percent	20	18	20	15	17	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	108
One or more suspensions	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	4	15	31	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	50
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	4	20	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	56
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

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

Date this data was collected or last updated

Wednesday 9/22/2021

2020-21 - 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	64	89	88	84	88	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	506
Attendance below 90 percent	9	15	10	14	7	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	1	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

2020-21 - 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	64	89	88	84	88	93	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	506
Attendance below 90 percent	9	15	10	14	7	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	70
One or more suspensions	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	
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	1	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	1	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	14

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	0	0	0	0	

The number of students identified as retainees:

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	1	6	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	11
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 Review

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	2021			2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement				43%	52%	57%	48%	52%	56%
ELA Learning Gains				50%	55%	58%	54%	52%	55%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile				51%	50%	53%	53%	46%	48%
Math Achievement				60%	54%	63%	59%	55%	62%
Math Learning Gains				68%	57%	62%	71%	57%	59%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile				54%	46%	51%	56%	44%	47%
Science Achievement				46%	50%	53%	53%	51%	55%

Grade Level Data Review - State Assessments

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	2021					
	2019	36%	52%	-16%	58%	-22%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	38%	55%	-17%	58%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-36%				
05	2021					
	2019	48%	54%	-6%	56%	-8%
Cohort Comparison		-38%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2021					
	2019	61%	54%	7%	62%	-1%
Cohort Comparison						
04	2021					
	2019	58%	57%	1%	64%	-6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Cohort Comparison		-61%				
05	2021					
	2019	53%	54%	-1%	60%	-7%
Cohort Comparison		-58%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2021					
	2019	43%	51%	-8%	53%	-10%
Cohort Comparison						

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

Provide the progress monitoring tool(s) by grade level used to compile the below data.

iReady data is used by grade level to monitor the percent of proficient students.

Grade 1				
English Language Arts	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	32	45	59
	Economically Disadvantaged	30	42	59
	Students With Disabilities	0	33	17
	English Language Learners	19	29	42
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	26	42	62
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	40	61
	Students With Disabilities	20	13	23
	English Language Learners	26	28	46
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
	All Students	26	42	62

Grade 2				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	37	40	63
	Economically Disadvantaged	32	37	59
	Students With Disabilities	20	30	30
	English Language Learners	17	20	52
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	25	38	54
	Economically Disadvantaged	24	35	52
	Students With Disabilities	18	36	48
	English Language Learners	10	21	46
Grade 3				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	39	50	65
	Economically Disadvantaged	38	47	63
	Students With Disabilities	41	41	52
	English Language Learners	10	24	45
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	15	28	54
	Economically Disadvantaged	16	29	53
	Students With Disabilities	19	23	44
	English Language Learners	8	20	36

Grade 4				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	29	37	37
	Economically Disadvantaged	26	33	32
	Students With Disabilities	24	32	25
	English Language Learners	12	12	12
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	20	32	47
	Economically Disadvantaged	17	27	43
	Students With Disabilities	26	36	53
	English Language Learners	12	14	32
Grade 5				
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
English Language Arts	All Students	25	38	41
	Economically Disadvantaged	21	35	36
	Students With Disabilities	42	39	47
	English Language Learners	0	27	21
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Mathematics	All Students	32	43	50
	Economically Disadvantaged	29	40	47
	Students With Disabilities	34	53	49
	English Language Learners	11	32	46
	Number/% Proficiency	Fall	Winter	Spring
Science	All Students	42	47	51
	Economically Disadvantaged	42	45	37
	Students With Disabilities	54	54	22
	English Language Learners	24	31	13

Subgroup Data Review

2021 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 2019-20	C & C Accel 2019-20
SWD	18	22	30	20	41	50	12				
ELL	43	53		49	59		31				
BLK	29			33							
HSP	44	49	33	49	56	58	40				
WHT	45			65							
FRL	41	46	30	47	51	55	34				
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	12	36	48	28	55	54	13				
ELL	34	44	52	51	64	58	29				
ASN	86	83		93	83						
BLK	24	50		33	43						
HSP	40	47	49	59	68	57	42				
WHT	59	58		68	65		50				
FRL	41	49	53	57	67	54	42				
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	22	55	55	35	61	59	25				
ELL	31	58	63	44	67	65	33				
ASN	81	83		100	100						
BLK	36	36		52	68		54				
HSP	43	54	56	54	69	53	48				
WHT	63	54		74	77		62				
FRL	46	54	54	58	68	54	52				

ESSA Data Review

This data has been updated for the 2021-22 school year as of 10/19/2021.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	46
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	52
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	369
Total Components for the Federal Index	8

ESSA Federal Index	
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	
Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	29
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	48
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	
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%	
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	31
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	48
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	
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%	

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%	
White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	55
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	45
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	

Analysis

Data Analysis

Answer the following analysis questions using the progress monitoring data and state assessment data, if applicable.

What trends emerge across grade levels, subgroups and core content areas?

Reading proficiency is stagnant. Writing is a concern as it greatly impacts our ability to show growth and maintain proficiency levels. Science was our lowest scoring area on standardized tests as determined by 2019 FSA given.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

As stated above writing greatly impacts our students performance in the area of reading. We need to have a strong focus on evidence and elaboration in relation to reading. Science is a concern- nature of science specifically has been as area of need for many years. Though this is inline with the district, it is an area we would like to increase the likelihood of success.

What were the contributing factors to this need for improvement? What new actions would need to be taken to address this need for improvement?

Science. Lack of instruction in lower grades as well as how much curriculum is assessed and not revisited until the tested grade level. Lack of instructional time given to these subjects and the amount of content in the tested grades is increasingly difficult to cover. Lack of resources to cover these prior taught subjects.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2019 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

Math. We have seen a great increase in this area of the two years of assessing as measured by FSA in 2019. This has since experienced a bit of a decrease due to the loss of learning last year and the

spiraling of curriculum. In years past, we have implemented RtI groups, used ELP tutors, increased our standards knowledge, used data to increase their understanding.

What were the contributing factors to this improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

We have seen a great increase in this area of the two years of assessing as measured by FSA in 2019. This has since experienced a bit of a decrease due to the loss of learning last year and the spiraling of curriculum. In years past, we have implemented RtI groups, used ELP tutors, increased our standards knowledge, used data to increase their understanding.

What strategies will need to be implemented in order to accelerate learning?

Conferencing will be implemented in the area of writing to increase proficiency. We will use trend data to specifically address the standards students need assistance with. In science, we are using IXL to assist in accelerating prior knowledge content, as well as providing professional development and district level coaching with grade leading up to 5th grade.

Based on the contributing factors and strategies identified to accelerate learning, describe the professional development opportunities that will be provided at the school to support teachers and leaders.

Professional development will take place using our site based science content planning support, district level planning support and district level coaching support.

Provide a description of the additional services that will be implemented to ensure sustainability of improvement in the next year and beyond.

We will continue to emphasize target standards aligned with 5th grade standards to ensure students are receiving effective instruction in the areas most likely to impact science proficiency on SSA.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	It will be important to continue the focus on standards taught in each subject area. We will progress monitor the instruction using a monthly assessment in ELA and Math. We will hold continued planning sessions, coaching of instruction, individual conferencing, and ensure we are strategically accelerating content.
Measurable Outcome:	Proficiency will increase in each grade level by at least 5% as measured by FSA ELA given in Spring 2022.
Monitoring:	We will monitor using monthly assessments, tracking standards attainment.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will hold continued planning sessions, coaching of instruction, individual conferencing, and ensure we are strategically accelerating content.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We have chosen this because this will have the greatest impact on our instruction.

Action Steps to Implement

Facilitate Planning PLCs

Person Responsible Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)

Conduct coaching cycles focused on planning, instruction, use of data, etc.

Person Responsible Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)

Provide professional development regarding standards aligned instruction, tasks, etc.

Person Responsible Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)

Conduct informal and formal data chats with students and teachers.

Person Responsible Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)

Ensure tasks are aligned with grade level standards.

Person Responsible Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)

Ensure collaborative structures and accountable talk stems are incorporated in all lessons.

Person Responsible Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	We will include the 30 minutes designated for explicit phonics instruction. To address reading comprehension skills, we continue to plan for strategic small group instruction during a protected time of 60 minutes designated for small group instruction in addition to 30 minutes of intensive intervention. We will also incorporate content-specific texts in small group instruction to increase proficiency in reading, writing and science.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase the proficiency of our students in each grade level in ELA by at least 5% as measured by FSA given in Spring 2022. We will use monthly assessment to track standards mastery so we can target specific standards and students in small group instruction.
Monitoring:	We will monitor this through the use of Wonders Assessments, mini ELA assessments, reading formatives and data chats quarterly.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will ensure our teachers are trained and provide on-going coaching in the area. We will hold grade level standards based planning. We will use monthly assessment to track standards mastery so we can target specific standards and students in small group instruction.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We chose this strategy due to the changes in curriculum. We know that coaching teachers and ensuring fidelity of implementation is present is critical. We have to progress monitor to ensure what we are doing is working so we can make adjustments and target more strategically the skills needed.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Ensure training of every teacher in Wonders with coaching in grades K-2.

Person Responsible Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)

2. Standards Based Planning will be implemented with the assistance of the literacy coaches.

Person Responsible Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)

3. Gather monthly assessments and conduct data reviews of each tracking standards.

Person Responsible Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)

4. Provide acceleration training to all teachers focusing on targeted standards.

Person Responsible Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)

5. Ensure the rigor of tasks aligned with grade level standards.

Person Responsible Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)

Provide training and coaching during planning sessions to ensure accountable talk and collaborative structures occur during reading and writing.

Person Responsible Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Instructional practice specifically related to science instruction because it is our lowest area of proficiency and it is an area where all grade levels are represented in the questions.
Measurable Outcome:	Increase proficiency by at least 5% as measured by the SSS given in spring 2022. We will use the 9-week progress monitoring tests to assess student performance.
Monitoring:	Progress will be monitored through the use of mini assessments and formative assessments to track standards.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will ensure there is standards-based planning as teams occurring. We will use small group instruction as necessary with some technology to target prior grade level standards. We will implement long term investigations across all grade levels. As well, fidelity checks will be critical to ensure science instruction is being done in all grade levels.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We chose these strategies because we know using standards to drive our instruction is critical. Small group instruction is a way to target difficulties with prior grade level standards. Fidelity checks are a way to ensure accountability of teachers.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Standards based planning with the support of district coach.

Person Responsible Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)

2. Training on long-term investigations and nature of science.

Person Responsible Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)

3. Small group targeted instruction.

Person Responsible Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)

4. Ensure tasks are aligned with grade level standards.

Person Responsible Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)

5. Ensure accountable talk stems and collaborative structures are used during science instruction.

Person Responsible Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Our SWD group fell below the federal index in the year of 2018-2019 school year. This area is identified as a critical due to 12% of our students showing proficiency as well as only indicating 36% making gains and 48% of our bottom-quartile students making gains in ELA. In math, the numbers were equally as low.

Measurable Outcome: Our percent of students in these areas will increase by at least 5% on the ELA, Math and Science Assessments given in Spring 2022.

Monitoring: Areas will be monitored through mini assessments, monthly assessments, formative assessments, quarterly data chats.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)

Evidence-based Strategy: Brainspring implementation with fidelity must occur for our students to achieve. Specific standards based planning collaboratively with the general education teacher. Monitoring the data of our students to ensure we are meeting standards as outlined by the specific grade level as well as skills deficits. Rtl groups will be targeted for reading and math to address multiple levels of skills deficits.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: There is research to support growth of students who use Brainspring with fidelity. We also know it is best practice to plan and progress monitor students as a whole but specifically are engaging all stakeholders this group of students.

Action Steps to Implement

Brainspring implementation will occur.

Person Responsible Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)

Standards based planning in collaboration with general education teachers.

Person Responsible Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)

Data tracking and strategic grouping

Person Responsible Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Black/African-American

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our African-American group of students fell below the federal index in the year of 2018-2019 school year. This area is identified as a critical due to 22% of our students showing proficiency as well as only indicating 50% making gains in ELA. In math, the numbers were equally as low.
Measurable Outcome:	Our African-American students will increase by at least 5% in both reading and math regarding proficiency and gains when give the Spring 2022 Statewide Assessment. We will progress monitor through monthly assessments in both areas.
Monitoring:	Progress will be monitored through mini assessments, monthly assessments, formative assessments, and quarterly data chats.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Progress monitor this particular subgroup of students in all academic areas. Ensuring our teachers are aware of students who are not performing often will allow us to target with more intentionality rather than loosely identify the needs.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We know progress monitoring is a critical way to see if strategies implemented are resulting in increase student achievement.

Action Steps to Implement

1. Identify African American students in each grade level not performing

Person Responsible Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)

2. Hold quarterly data chats to more closely monitor progress.

Person Responsible Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the [SafeSchoolsforAlex.org](https://www.safeschoolsforalex.org), compare the discipline data of the school to discipline data across the state and provide primary or secondary areas of concern that the school will monitor during the upcoming school year. Include how the school culture and environment will be monitored through the lens of behavior or discipline data.

Bellamy is ranked 1, 340 out of 1, 395 schools in the state. Our primary area of concern was regarding physical aggression and a secondary is disruptive behavior. We will monitor these incidents during our monthly team leader meetings with the behavior representatives as well as with our student services team. We will develop action plans based on these measures.

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.

Our school sends out a monthly/weekly newsletter to inform stakeholders of upcoming events and critical information related to instruction. We have three family events to celebrate multiculturalism, holiday spirit, and a science night. Next year, provided CDC guidelines allow us to do so, we will continue to hold these events for our families. We have multiple business partners who have donated school supplies, backpacks, certificates, coupons for student achievement, and gift cards to purchase items for our students and staff. We partner with other agencies to obtain items for monthly behavior celebrations. Our student services team also provides resources to families for basic needs such as food, clothing, in addition to offering and connecting families with outside counseling services. Often times are families are afforded opportunities for tutoring services through these agencies, but we also partner with a local high school for volunteers and tutors for our students.

Identify the stakeholders and their role in promoting a positive culture and environment at the school.

Parents play a large role in planning and participating in building a positive school culture. We need parents to be able to support the instruction in the school and building a strong climate. Our business partners have already and continue to support us financially, as well as volunteering when we are allowed to do so. We accept donations from other agencies to help with our events for families and students.

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: Instructional Practice: ELA	\$0.00
3	III.A.	Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science	\$0.00
4	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities	\$0.00
5	III.A.	Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Black/African-American	\$0.00
Total:			\$0.00