

Hillsborough County Public Schools

# Bellamy Elementary School



## 2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

---

## Table of Contents

---

|   |           |
|---|-----------|
| <b>School Demographics</b>                | <b>3</b>  |
| <b>Purpose and Outline of the SIP</b>     | <b>4</b>  |
| <b>School Information</b>                 | <b>7</b>  |
| <b>Needs Assessment</b>                   | <b>10</b> |
| <b>Planning for Improvement</b>           | <b>17</b> |
| <b>Positive Culture &amp; Environment</b> | <b>23</b> |
| <b>Budget to Support Goals</b>            | <b>23</b> |

# 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

|  |   |
|--|---|
| <b>2019-20 Status</b><br>(per MSID File)   | Active  |
| <b>School Type and Grades Served</b><br>(per MSID File)  | Elementary School<br>KG-5   |
| <b>Primary Service Type</b><br>(per MSID File)   | K-12 General Education  |
| <b>2020-21 Title I School</b>  | Yes   |
| <b>2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate</b><br>(as reported on Survey 3)  | 100%  |
| <b>2020-21 ESSA Subgroups Represented</b><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>White Students<br>Economically Disadvantaged Students |
| <b>School Grades History</b>   | 2018-19: C (53%)<br>2017-18: B (56%)<br>2016-17: C (43%)  |
| <b>2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*</b>  |   |
| <b>SI Region</b>   | Central   |
| <b>Regional Executive Director</b>   | <a href="#">Lucinda Thompson</a>  |
| <b>Turnaround Option/Cycle</b>   | N/A   |
| <b>Year</b>  |   |
| <b>Support Tier</b>  |   |
| <b>ESSA Status</b>   |   |
| * As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, <a href="#">click here</a> .   |   |

## 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](http://www.floridacims.org).

## Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

---

## Table of Contents

---

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

## Bellamy Elementary School

9720 WILSKY BLVD, Tampa, FL 33615

[ no web address on file ]

### School Demographics

| School Type and Grades Served<br>(per MSID File) | 2020-21 Title I School | 2020-21 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate<br>(as reported on Survey 3) |
|--|------------------------|--|
| Elementary School<br>KG-5                        | Yes                    | 84%  |
| Primary Service Type<br>(per MSID File)          | Charter School         | 2018-19 Minority Rate<br>(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     |
|                       |                            |      |        |        |

| 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**

| <b>2021 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b> |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
|--|-----------------|---------------|--------------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|
| <b>Subgroups</b>                                 | <b>ELA Ach.</b> | <b>ELA LG</b> | <b>ELA LG L25%</b> | <b>Math Ach.</b> | <b>Math LG</b> | <b>Math LG L25%</b> | <b>Sci Ach.</b> | <b>SS Ach.</b> | <b>MS Accel.</b> | <b>Grad Rate 2019-20</b> | <b>C &amp; C Accel 2019-20</b> |
| 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              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| <b>2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b> |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| <b>Subgroups</b>                                 | <b>ELA Ach.</b> | <b>ELA LG</b> | <b>ELA LG L25%</b> | <b>Math Ach.</b> | <b>Math LG</b> | <b>Math LG L25%</b> | <b>Sci Ach.</b> | <b>SS Ach.</b> | <b>MS Accel.</b> | <b>Grad Rate 2017-18</b> | <b>C &amp; C Accel 2017-18</b> |
| 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              |                |                  |                          |                                |
| <b>2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS</b> |                 |               |                    |                  |                |                     |                 |                |                  |                          |                                |
| <b>Subgroups</b>                                 | <b>ELA Ach.</b> | <b>ELA LG</b> | <b>ELA LG L25%</b> | <b>Math Ach.</b> | <b>Math LG</b> | <b>Math LG L25%</b> | <b>Sci Ach.</b> | <b>SS Ach.</b> | <b>MS Accel.</b> | <b>Grad Rate 2016-17</b> | <b>C &amp; C Accel 2016-17</b> |
| 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.

| <b>ESSA Federal Index</b>   |     |
|---|-----|
| 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**

|   |   |
|---|---|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | 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. |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | Proficiency will increase in each grade level by at least 5% as measured by FSA ELA given in Spring 2022.   |
| <b>Monitoring:</b>                                | We will monitor using monthly assessments, tracking standards attainment.   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)  |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | We will hold continued planning sessions, coaching of instruction, individual conferencing, and ensure we are strategically accelerating content.   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | 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**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | 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. |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | 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.   |
| <b>Monitoring:</b>                                | We will monitor this through the use of Wonders Assessments, mini ELA assessments, reading formatives and data chats quarterly.  |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | 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.   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | 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**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | 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.   |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | 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.   |
| <b>Monitoring:</b>                                | Progress will be monitored through the use of mini assessments and formative assessments to track standards.   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | 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. |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | 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**

|   |  |
|---|--|
| <b>Area of Focus Description and Rationale:</b>   | 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. |
| <b>Measurable Outcome:</b>                        | 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.  |
| <b>Monitoring:</b>                                | Progress will be monitored through mini assessments, monthly assessments, formative assessments, and quarterly data chats.   |
| <b>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</b> | Jessica Hessler (jessica.hessler@hcps.net)   |
| <b>Evidence-based Strategy:</b>                   | 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.   |
| <b>Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:</b>     | 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 |