Bailey Elementary School

2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Bailey Elementary School

4630 GALLAGHER RD, Dover, FL 33527

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Kristin Willis

Start Date for this Principal: 12/17/2018

2019-20 Status (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
2021-22 Title I School	Yes
2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2021-22 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities* English Language Learners* Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students* Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students*
School Grades History	2021-22: B (59%) 2018-19: C (47%) 2017-18: B (54%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	N/A
* 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.](www.floridacims.org)

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Bailey Elementary School

4630 GALLAGHER RD, Dover, FL 33527

[no web address on file]

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	**2021-22 Title I School**	**2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate** (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School KG-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	**Charter School**	**2018-19 Minority Rate** (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	56%

School Grades History

Year	2021-22	2020-21	2019-20	2018-19
Grade	B		C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Hillsborough County School Board.

SIP Authority

Section 1001.42(18), Florida Statutes, requires district school boards to annually approve and require implementation of a school improvement plan (SIP) for each school in the district that has a school grade of D or F.

The Florida Department of Education (FDOE) SIP template meets all statutory and rule requirements for traditional public schools and incorporates all components required for schools receiving Title I funds. This template is required by State Board of Education Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code, for all non-charter schools with a current grade of D or F (see page 4). For schools receiving a grade of A, B, or C, the district may opt to require a SIP using a template of its choosing. This document was prepared by school and district leadership using the FDOE's school improvement planning web application located at https://www.floridaCIMS.org.

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

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

Provide the school's vision statement.

Preparing students for life

"90 X 20"

School Leadership Team

Membership
For each member of the school leadership team, select the employee name and email address from the dropdown. Identify the position title and job duties/responsibilities.**:**

Name	Position Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Valdez, Scott	Principal	As specified by his contract and specifically with this SIP process, part of the decision making team supporting teachers, reviewing of data, giving targeted feedback to all teachers and ensure that all of our teachers meet the academic needs of all Bailey students.
Willis, Kristin	Assistant Principal	As specified by his contract and specifically with this SIP process, part of the decision making team supporting teachers, reviewing of data, giving targeted feedback to all teachers and ensure that all of our teachers meet the academic needs of all Bailey students
Moyer, Staci	Teacher, ESE	As specified by his contract and specifically with this SIP process, part of the decision making team supporting teachers, reviewing of data, giving targeted feedback to all teachers and ensure that all of our teachers meet the academic needs of all Bailey students. Also the Chairperson of the SIP Committee.
Sabo, Stephanie	Teacher, ESE	As specified by his contract and specifically with this SIP process, part of the decision making team supporting teachers, reviewing of data, giving targeted feedback to all teachers and ensure that all of our teachers meet the academic needs of all Bailey students. Also the ESE Lead Contact for ESE Team.
Groubert, Cheryl	Teacher, K-12	As specified by his contract and specifically with this SIP process, part of the decision making team supporting teachers, reviewing of data, giving targeted feedback to all teachers and ensure that all of our teachers meet the academic needs of all Bailey students.
Wood, Michelle	Reading Coach	As specified by his contract and specifically with this SIP process, part of the decision making team supporting teachers, reviewing of data, giving targeted feedback to all teachers and ensure that all of our teachers meet the academic needs of all Bailey students

Demographic Information

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

Number of teachers with a 2022 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.*
3

Number of teachers with a 2022 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

37

Total number of students enrolled at the school

703

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

4

Identify the number of instructional staff who joined the school during the 2022-23 school year.

6

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

Using prior year's data, complete the table below with the number of students by current 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	108	111	122	127	110	110	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	688
Attendance below 90 percent	29	25	18	23	31	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	136
One or more suspensions	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	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		
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	52	30	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	109
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	40	26	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	87
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	0	5	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30

Using the table above, complete the table below with the number of students by current grade level who have 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	16	20	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	54

Using current year data, complete the table below with the number of students identified as being "retained.":

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Retained Students: Current Year	3	0	0	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	24
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2

Date this data was collected or last updated

Monday 8/15/2022

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	101	115	122	111	104	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	657
Attendance below 90 percent	5	21	19	14	18	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	22	33	30	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105

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	3	1	2	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	101	115	122	111	104	104	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	657
Attendance below 90 percent	5	21	19	14	18	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	90
One or more suspensions	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3
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 FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	0	0	16	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	16
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	3	22	33	30	0	17	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	105

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	3	1	2	16	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	23
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	3

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	2022			2021			2019		
	School	District	State	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	39%	53%	56%				45%	52%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	59%						55%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	71%						43%	50%	53%
Math Achievement	53%	50%	50%				43%	54%	63%
Math Learning Gains	76%						51%	57%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	72%						46%	46%	51%
Science Achievement	44%	59%	59%				43%	50%	53%

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
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	44%	52%	-8%	58%	-14%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	49%	55%	-6%	58%	-9%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				
05	2022					
	2019	40%	54%	-14%	56%	-16%
Cohort Comparison		-49%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
01	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison						
02	2022					
	2019					
Cohort Comparison		0%				
03	2022					
	2019	39%	54%	-15%	62%	-23%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	44%	57%	-13%	64%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		-39%				
05	2022					
	2019	41%	54%	-13%	60%	-19%
Cohort Comparison		-44%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	43%	51%	-8%	53%	-10%
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data Review

2022 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 2020-21	C & C Accel 2020-21
SWD	15	43	57	38	55	57					
ELL	28	56	67	49	76	74	37				
BLK	33	75		37	58						
HSP	34	54	68	52	75	74	38				
WHT	44	62	67	54	80	68	56				
FRL	34	58	69	48	73	74	39				

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	22	33	38	37	72		20				
ELL	30	43	42	39	78	79	29				
BLK	29			53							
HSP	38	53	42	42	78	76	45				
WHT	53	52	30	57	80	64	58				
FRL	40	50	33	47	77	71	45				

2019 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS										
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2017-18	C & C Accel 2017-18
SWD	19	32	25	14	30	40	13				
ELL	23	44	52	30	38	44	16				
BLK	38	53		38	47						
HSP	38	51	44	39	47	50	34				
WHT	53	60	38	47	54	46	50				
FRL	39	51	45	38	45	45	36				

ESSA Data Review

This data has not been updated for the 2022-23 school year.

ESSA Federal Index	
ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I)	N/A
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	60
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	0
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	62
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	476
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	44
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	0
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	56
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	51
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	57
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	62
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	57
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Part III: Planning for Improvement

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?

Although we have seen improvement in grades 3-5 for ELA proficiency, bottom quartile (BQ), and Gains; Math proficiency, bottom quartile (BQ), and Science proficiency we continue to focus on maintaining our growth for ELA and Math, while still improving our proficiency incrementally for all students, especially for those that are designated as ESE, and Hispanic students overall as well as ELL students.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, demonstrate the greatest need for improvement?

We need to support and develop proficiency in ELA for the economically disadvantaged students, ELL students, Hispanic students.
We need to support and develop proficiency in Math for the economically disadvantaged students, ELL students, Hispanic students.
We need to support and develop proficiency in Science for the economically disadvantaged students, ELL students, Hispanic students

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

We are still building foundational skills attributed to 2 years of COVID effects on families, education (both e-learning and face to face) and the economy in our Title One school. We had extended leave for one teacher who was responsible for 40% of our 5th grade Math and Science scores.

What data components, based off progress monitoring and 2022 state assessments, showed the most improvement?

ELA Gains, ELA Bottom Quartile (BQ), and Math Bottom Quartile (BQ)

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

We supported students with more concentration of data analysis, targeting the specific needs of individuals and sub groups. We continued our approach to coaching for both ELA and Math with weekly before school planning sessions throughout the year and coaching support for PLCs after school.

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

Since our State has adopted a new State Assessment Florida Assessment of Student Thinking (FAST) as well as new comprehensive standards Benchmarks for Excellent Student Thinking (BEST) for all grades K-5, we will be diving into all of these standards and assessment for all ELA and Math teachers K-5. We have used the FSA for 3-5 grades as a measure of instructional performance as well as students mastery of former standards. Holding all teachers accountable for learning and student achievement will need to be messaged and supported throughout the year. Adjustments to instruction based on data which will influence how we instruct, and re-teach standards for subgroups and individual students K-5.

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.

We are using the before school coaching as Professional Development opportunities to collectively learn as ELA teachers, and as Math teachers to provide learning opportunities. Standards and instructional methods will be shared, and supported by our academic coaches as well as collegially within grade level teams. We are also using Title One dollars to support the in-house opportunities for teachers to watch other teachers instruction which will build the instructional knowledge base for all teachers here at Bailey Elementary School.

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

We will also be focusing on the new Evaluation Model and Rubric for teacher effectiveness, giving teachers specific insight on how they will be observed to receive feedback for on their instruction adn the impact on learning by students.

We have a plan to invite instructional coaches from the district level to support teacher planning, thought sharing for student lessons and the analysis for student performance.

Areas of Focus
Identify the key Areas of Focus to address your school's highest priorities based on any/all relevant data sources.

:

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.	The data that we have looked at historically indicate that we need to be better aligned with standards to meet the needs of our students. 3rd Grade retention based on FSA ELA Level 1s hovers around 20% of our students FSA for ELA needed to improve Proficiency for all students 3, 4 and 5 - which was 39% for 2022 FSA for ELA Proficiency subgroups for Disadvantaged students (67% Level 1s), Hispanic students(36% Level 1s), ESE students (63% of Level 1s). This data indicates the need for improved instruction but will no longer correlate as the BEST standards are being used for all grades k-5, and the FSA no longer exists and will now be measured by the FAST assessment.
Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.	ELA Proficiency measured for all students K-5 will be 55% of all students; which include all subgroups. * THIS EXAM HAS YET TO BE SEEN, SHARED or ADMINISTERED TO ANY STUDENTS IN THE STATE OF FLORIDA AT THIS TIME (AUGUST 2022).
Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.	We will use the new BEST standards for ELA Coaching and Planning. Data that will be provided through the new FAST assessment will be monitored and disaggregated in September of 2022 as well as December 2022 or JANUARY in 2023. The PLCs and data analysis will indicate our successes with students; challenges that may not have been taught OR need to be retaught to support the academic performance of all students K-5. The results of this assessment will be aligned with out new BEST standards and implemented for planning for instruction and meeting the needs of all of our students.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Scott Valdez (scott.valdez@hcps.net)
Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.	Teacher clarity with a Hattie effect of .75. All members of the instructional community- which include our Reading Coach, the individual classroom teachers, as well as the Administrative Team will provide clarity for: what is being taught, standard alignment with the lesson as well as how performance will be measured.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this	Teacher clarity- students knowing what their learning target is and/or learning objective, then they have a target for planning standards based lessons for student achievement. Feedback - student success in ELA curricular area specifically will provide the clear path for students and teachers knowing what the standards are, what they are learning,

specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.	how to implement reading strategies in their daily work and assessed on the inaugural FAST assessment 3 times during the 2022-23 school year.

Action Steps to Implement
List the action steps that will be taken as part of this strategy to address the Area of Focus. Identify the person responsible for monitoring each step.

Retain and support the needs of our Reading Coach at Bailey Elementary. We will support her "before school coaching" which will provide teachers opportunities to deepen understanding of the Florida BEST standards, as well as provide coaching support. The three-pronged approach are: master standards, plan effective lessons and find areas of growth opportunities after analyzing student performance. Student data will be analyzed through out the year using the new FAST assessment and monthly progress monitoring of iReady diagnostics for Reading K-5th grades.

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

RAISE
The RAISE program established criteria for identifying schools for additional support. The criteria for the 2022-23 school year includes schools with students in grades Kindergarten through fifth, where 50 percent or more of its students, for any grade level, score below a level 3 on the most recent statewide English Language Arts (ELA) assessment.

Area of Focus Description and Rationale
Include a description of your Area of Focus (Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA) for each grade below, how it affects student learning in literacy, and a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed. Data that should be used to determine the critical need should include, at a minimum:

- The percentage of students below Level 3 on the 2022 statewide, standardized ELA assessment. Identification criteria must include each grade that has 50 percent or more students scoring below level 3 in grades 3-5 on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- The percentage of students in kindergarten through grade 3, based on 2021-2022 end of year screening and progress monitoring data, who are not on track to score Level 3 or above on the statewide, standardized ELA assessment.

- Other forms of data that should be considered: formative, progress monitoring and diagnostic assessment data.

Grades K-2: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

We will use the data from the new BEST assessment given 3 times a year (beginning, middle and end of the year) for ELA progress for our students K-2. Student successes and areas of growth opportunities will be identified and used in PLCs and planning to best meet the needs of these students. Our RtI/ MTSS process will support those students that have been identified as students that are critically low/in danger of one or more years below grade level in reading. We will also identify these student using the

iReady toolkit and assessments to progress monitor those students as well. We will identify and focus on the areas that are in need of development; Phonological Awareness, Phonics, High Frequency words, Vocabulary, Comprehension of literature, and Comprehension of informational text.

2021-22 Data
iReady
Kindergarten 4% on track to be critically low
1st Grade 26% on track to be critically low
2nd Grade 28% on track to be critically low

Grades 3-5: Instructional Practice specifically relating to Reading/ELA

We will use the data from the new BEST assessment given 3 times a year (beginning, middle and end of the year) for ELA progress for our students grades 3-5 Student successes and areas of growth opportunities will be identified and used in PLCs and planning to best meet the needs of these students. Our RtI/MTSS process will support those students that have been identified as students that are critically low/in danger of one or more years below grade level in reading. We will also identify these student using the iReady toolkit and assessments to progress monitor those students as well. We will identify and focus on the areas that are in need of development; Phonological Awareness, Phonics, High Frequency words, Vocabulary, Comprehension of literature, and Comprehension of informational text.

2021-22 Data
iReady
3rd Grade 22% on track to be critically low
4th Grade 16% on track to be critically low
5th Grade 17% on track to be critically low

2021-22 FSA Level 1
3rd Grade 36% on track to be critically low
4th Grade 29% on track to be critically low
5th Grade 26% on track to be critically low

Measurable Outcomes:
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve for each grade below. This should be a data based, objective outcome. Include prior year data and a measurable outcome for each of the following:

- Each grade K-3, using the new coordinated screening and progress monitoring system, where 50 percent or more of the students are not on track to pass the statewide ELA assessment.

- Each grade 3-5 where 50 percent or more of its students scored below a level 3 on the most recent statewide, standardized ELA assessment and

- Grade 6 measurable outcomes may be included, as applicable.

Grades K-2: Measureable Outcome(s)

55 Kindergarteners will be in the 50%ile or above as measured by the BEST assessment given 3 times a year starting in the 2022-23 school year.
53 1st Graders will be in the 50%ile or above as measured by the BEST assessment given 3 times a year starting in the 2022-23 school year.
55 2nd Graders will be in the 50%ile or above as measured by the BEST assessment given 3 times a year starting in the 2022-23 school year.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

71 3rd Graders will be in the 50%ile or above as measured by the BEST assessment given 3 times a year starting in the 2022-23 school year.
48 4th Graders will be in the 50%ile or above as measured by the BEST assessment given 3 times a year starting in the 2022-23 school year.
56 5th Graders will be in the 50%ile or above as measured by the BEST assessment given 3 times a year starting in the 2022-23 school year.

Monitoring:
Describe how the school's Area(s) of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcomes. Include a description of how ongoing monitoring will take place with evaluating impact at the end of the year.

We will use the data from the new BEST assessment given 3 times a year (beginning, middle and end of the year) for ELA progress for our students K-2. Student successes and areas of growth opportunities will be identified and used in PLCs and planning to best meet the needs of these students. Our RtI/MTSS process will support those students that have been identified as students that are critically low/in danger of one or more years below grade level in reading. We will also identify these student using the iReady toolkit and assessments to progress monitor those students as well. We will identify and focus on the areas that are in need of development; Phonological Awareness, Phonics, High Frequency words, Vocabulary, Comprehension of literature, and Comprehension of informational text.

We will evaluate grade level performance after each BEST assessment is given; evaluate and identify areas of strength/areas of growth opportunities

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:
Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Valdez, Scott, scott.valdez@hcps.net

Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Describe the evidence-based practices/programs being implemented to achieve the measurable outcomes in each grade and describe how the identified practices/programs will be monitored. The term "evidence-based" means demonstrating a statistically significant effect on improving student outcomes or other relevant outcomes as provided in 20 U.S.C. §7801(21)(A)(i). Florida's definition limits evidence-based practices/programs to only those with strong, moderate or promising levels of evidence.

- ◦ Do the identified evidence-based practices/programs meet Florida's definition of evidence-based (strong, moderate or promising)?

- ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs align with the district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan?

- ◦ Do the evidence-based practices/programs align to the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards?

The steps for Evidence-based practice align with how we meet the needs for teachers building BEST Standards mastery.
1. We will give pre-assessment at beginning of unit of study; use assessment as progress monitoring as year and/or unit progresses to support "Problem identification with learning outcomes"
2. We plan for instruction using the BEST Standards and the new curriculum provided by our county.
3. We will use Grade level team and Reading Coach to synthesize plans and ensure that we are planning meeting the outcomes of the standards.
4. We will use the lessons that have been planned for to teach standards that will support student mastery.

5. We will use the data provided using the District assessments and the FAST assessment given 3 times a year to see our teaching successes and areas of growth for student learning and teachers meeting the BEST standards.
4.

Rationale for Evidence-based Practices/Programs:
Explain the rationale for selecting the specific practices/programs. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting the practices/programs.

- Do the evidence-based practices/programs address the identified need?

- Do the identified practices/programs show proven record of effectiveness for the target population?

The evidence based "Continuous Improvement Cycle" supports all 5 steps:
- using the data and assessment results to identify the challenges
- plan for instruction using the data and standards as our guide
- look at plans as curricular team to ensure lessons are on target
- teach the agreed upon lessons
- then assess for student understanding and mastery.

The cycle then begins again

Action Steps to Implement:
List the action steps that will be taken to address the school's Area(s) of Focus. To address the area of focus, identify 2 to 3 action steps and explain in detail for each of the categories below:

- Literacy Leadership

- Literacy Coaching

- Assessment

- Professional Learning

Action Step	Person Responsible for Monitoring
Literacy Coaching- Is the steps we take here at Bailey to use the District focus brought back to us by our Reading Coach to help teachers understand the new standards, the new curriculum, and how to assess. We are using our "before school coaching" and weekly after school planning as time to meet with our colleagues to ensure that we are teaching the standards and planning for student mastery of standard success.	Wood, Michelle, michelle.wood@hcps.net
Assessment- We are using the District and state assessments (FAST) to see our areas of success, areas of growth, and discuss planning suing the 5 steps for our "Continuous Improvement Cycle". As grade level teams with support of our Reading Coach we will analyze the effectiveness of planning , instruction and student outcomes.	Wood, Michelle, michelle.wood@hcps.net

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 is critical in formulating a statement of vision, mission, values, goals, and employing school improvement strategies that impact the school culture and environment. 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.

Describe how the school addresses building a positive school culture and environment.

Tee results of our school culture can be seen now as a result of 2 consecutive school grades of "B" during the COVID era. We have NO VACANCIES in our instructional staff, custodial staff, cafeteria staff, no office staff.

This is directly attributed to the efforts and work of our entire school family here at Bailey.

Treat all stakeholders with respect, a smile, a hello: parents, fellow faculty members, students and community partners. We support all of our family with a family approach. Building classroom families, and a school that believes that we are a family, using grace and compassion with all who we interact with is key.

We have teachers from other schools lined up to come here to teach. We treat our employees right. Is it some sort of program; no - it is the expectations and the "Bailey Way" for all of our stakeholders: positive and supported employees want to come to work, want to work hard, and want to see our students succeed.

Positivity is contagious and word on the street with in our District is: come to Bailey if you have the heart it takes to promote student success academically and emotionally.

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

Scott Valdez - Principal - ensure that all current and new employees have the compassion and heart to teach our kids. Hold themselves to a high instructional standard and have high instructional expectations for our students

Kristin Willis - Assistant Principal - supports the principal to ensure that all current and new employees have the compassion and heart to teach our kids. Hold themselves to a high instructional standard and have high instructional expectations for our students.

Kimberly Downing - Guidance Counselor - Supports students that come to the office with emotional challenges, to provide students the skills and tools to manage their emotions and problem solve with others as needed. Hold themselves to a high instructional standard and have high instructional expectations for our students. Provides individual counselling and small group counselling for struggles, grief or interpersonal relationship skills as needed.

Brooke Hencke - Social Worker- Supports students that come to the office with emotional challenges, to provide students the skills and tools to manage their emotions and problem solve with others as needed. Hold themselves to a high instructional standard and have high instructional expectations for our students. Offers and provides outside agencies for support as needed for individual students and families.

Dr. Woody Bodden - School Psychologist - Supports students that come to the office with emotional challenges, to provide students the skills and tools to manage their emotions and problem solve with others as needed. Hold themselves to a high instructional standard and have high instructional expectations for our students. If students need further assistance in class or with peers can recommend assessment to provide support for academic and emotional success.