

Escambia County School District

Bellview Elementary School



2022-23 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

School Demographics	3
Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Positive Culture & Environment	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Bellview Elementary School

4425 BELLVIEW AVE, Pensacola, FL 32526

www.escambiaschools.org

Demographics

Principal: Christine Jenkins L

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2016

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: D (32%) 2018-19: C (42%) 2017-18: C (46%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northwest
Regional Executive Director	Rachel Heide
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	N/A
Support Tier	N/A
ESSA Status	CSI

* 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 Escambia County School Board.

SIP Authority

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

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

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

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

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

Purpose and Outline of the SIP

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

Table of Contents

Purpose and Outline of the SIP	4
School Information	7
Needs Assessment	10
Planning for Improvement	14
Title I Requirements	0
Budget to Support Goals	0

Bellview Elementary School

4425 BELLVIEW AVE, Pensacola, FL 32526

www.escambiaschools.org

School Demographics

<p>School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Elementary School KG-5</p>	<p>2021-22 Title I School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Yes</p>	<p>2021-22 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">100%</p>
<p>Primary Service Type (per MSID File)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">K-12 General Education</p>	<p>Charter School</p> <p style="text-align: center;">No</p>	<p>2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)</p> <p style="text-align: center;">59%</p>

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Escambia 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.

Our school will hold all stakeholders accountable to provide a structured, positive educational environment with high expectations that include and encourage all students to SOAR.

Provide the school's vision statement.

United for every student to succeed.

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
Baggett, Angelyn	Transition Specialist	
Catalani, Katie	Curriculum Resource Teacher	
Bartush, Erin	Instructional Coach	
Diaz, Stephanie	Behavior Specialist	
Cunningham, Kristen	Teacher, K-12	
Dixon, Omer	Teacher, K-12	
Graber, Ryan	Curriculum Resource Teacher	
Jenkins, Christine	Assistant Principal	
McEachern, Brianna	Teacher, K-12	
Capuano, Patricia	Teacher, K-12	
Dolak, Natalie	Teacher, K-12	
Lynch, Kelcie	Teacher, K-12	

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Friday 7/1/2016, Christine Jenkins L

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.*

1

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.*

3

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

40

Total number of students enrolled at the school

538

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

2

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

9

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	91	75	79	101	56	82	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	484
Attendance below 90 percent	19	36	37	40	18	33	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	183
One or more suspensions	0	8	3	8	8	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Course failure in ELA	0	2	7	14	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	30
Course failure in Math	0	3	5	11	5	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	31
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	26	8	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
Level 1 on 2022 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	22	21	43	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	86
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	6	11	21	36	8	39	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	121

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	4	8	10	3	26	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	51

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	4	5	1	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	37
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	7

Date this data was collected or last updated

Tuesday 8/16/2022

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	78	74	80	86	91	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	509
Attendance below 90 percent	7	33	28	32	29	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	163
One or more suspensions	0	3	1	2	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	0	9	5	6	10	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Course failure in Math	0	5	0	5	12	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	25	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	34	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	5	29	12	46	39	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	163

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	10	4	5	13	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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	12	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	78	74	80	86	91	100	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	509
Attendance below 90 percent	7	33	28	32	29	34	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	163
One or more suspensions	0	3	1	2	3	6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15
Course failure in ELA	0	9	5	6	10	11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	41
Course failure in Math	0	5	0	5	12	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	42
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA ELA assessment	0	0	0	4	25	44	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	73
Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment	0	0	0	4	34	45	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	83
Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency	5	29	12	46	39	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	163

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	10	4	5	13	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46

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	12	2	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	21
Students retained two or more times	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1

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	31%	51%	56%				47%	53%	57%
ELA Learning Gains	37%						55%	55%	58%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	29%						54%	52%	53%
Math Achievement	27%	46%	50%				40%	57%	63%
Math Learning Gains	35%						39%	60%	62%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	38%						19%	52%	51%
Science Achievement	30%	52%	59%				42%	54%	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	45%	56%	-11%	58%	-13%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	48%	52%	-4%	58%	-10%
Cohort Comparison		-45%				
05	2022					
	2019	41%	51%	-10%	56%	-15%
Cohort Comparison		-48%				

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	42%	55%	-13%	62%	-20%
Cohort Comparison		0%				
04	2022					
	2019	43%	58%	-15%	64%	-21%
Cohort Comparison		-42%				
05	2022					
	2019	29%	55%	-26%	60%	-31%
Cohort Comparison		-43%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2022					
	2019	41%	55%	-14%	53%	-12%
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	6	26	33	8	31	35	12				
BLK	19	33	27	15	32	45	14				
HSP	34	50		24	22						
MUL	42	33		35	38		60				
WHT	38	37	25	35	37	38	35				
FRL	28	34	21	24	36	42	23				
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	10	11	15	13							
ELL	20			27							
BLK	21	26	31	14	18	23	24				
HSP	43			36							
MUL	54			38							
WHT	38	30		33	24	10	33				
FRL	33	30	35	26	21	16	35				
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	16	39	45	21	30	18	13				
BLK	29	43	47	24	31	16	27				
HSP	48	58		43	42						
MUL	52	64		52	47						
WHT	56	60	60	46	41	26	52				
FRL	40	51	53	35	34	21	41				

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)	CSI
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	32
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	YES
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	5
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	227
Total Components for the Federal Index	7
Percent Tested	99%
Subgroup Data	

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	22
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	3
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	26
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	2
Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	33
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	42
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
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	35
White Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years White Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Economically Disadvantaged Students	
Federal Index - Economically Disadvantaged Students	30
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	1

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?

The percentage of students performing at level 1 in ELA and Math make up half of the 3rd-5th grade population. While 4th and 5th grade achieved learning gains at a higher percentage than proficiency, only one third of the 3rd-5th grade students are making learning gains in ELA and Math. The following subgroups are performing below the federal index of 41%: Students with Disabilities, Economically Disadvantaged students, and African American students.

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

All data components are in high need for improvement; achievement in ELA and Math stand out as having the greatest need for improvement. Due to the high number of students performing at level 1 in both ELA and Math, increasing achievement in ELA and Math will be the focus.

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

The learning gaps experienced due to the pandemic, the option for remote learning, the increased absences, and higher than average turnover of teachers contributed to this need. We will be tracking attendance, improving our RTI process, and focusing on the delivery of high quality and well-planned tier 1 instruction.

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

Our overall ELA learning gains were higher in 2022 than in 2021. Our overall Math learning gains and the learning gains for the lowest quartile were higher in 2022 than in 2021.

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

Our strategic implementation of WIN (What I Need) time provides a section of the day where students receive the appropriate interventions in ELA and Math. The students in the grade level move to the room where the necessary intervention or enrichment is happening during this time.

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

Tier 1 instruction needs improvement in order to accelerate learning. Lesson planning coaching and assistance will be provided so teachers regularly plan for the delivery of instruction and internalize the plans before delivery.

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 and coaching related to planning will be provided.

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

We will have additional teachers trained to deliver tier 3 reading interventions, we will utilize coaches from the School Transformation Office, the MTSS team will implement a coaching plan for teachers to work on planning and delivery of instruction.

Areas of Focus

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

:

#1. Positive Culture and Environment specifically relating to Attendance and discipline

Area of Focus
Description and Rationale: Based upon SWBMP data, our attendance rate was lower in 21-22 (87.99%) than previous years (92% average) and our exclusionary discipline rate increased as compared to previous years, resulting in 6.14% of students receiving out of school suspensions and 5.99% of students receiving in school suspensions. This data points the need to review and restructure our PBIS plan.
Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Measurable Outcome: The number of students with 10 or more absences will be reduced from 90 students to 45 students.
State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome. The percentage of students receiving Office Discipline referrals will be reduced from 15% to 7.5% of the student body. Economically Disadvantaged, SWD and Black student subgroups will also increase ADA by decreasing students absent 10 or more days and reducing percentage receiving office discipline referrals.

Monitoring: Average attendance will be monitored each week. Students with consistent absences will be discussed at weekly MTSS meetings followed by the scheduling of parent meetings. The PBIS team will review discipline data monthly and develop plans based upon the data reviewed.
Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Summer McLellan (smclellan@ecsdfi.us)

Evidence-based Strategy: Teach and reinforce new skills to increase appropriate behavior and preserve a positive classroom climate.
Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. Assess whether schoolwide behavior problems warrant adopting schoolwide strategies or programs and, if so, implement ones shown to reduce negative and foster positive interactions.
 Modify the classroom learning environment to decrease problem behavior.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: When teachers actively teach students socially- and behaviorally-appropriate skills to replace problem behaviors using strategies focused on both individual students and the whole classroom, it helps students with behavior problems learn how, when, and where to use these new skills; increase the opportunities that the students have to exhibit appropriate behaviors; preserve a positive classroom climate; and manage consequences to reinforce students' display of positive "replacement" behaviors and adaptive skills.
Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/criteria used for selecting this strategy.

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.

Hold monthly PBIS meetings where discipline and attendance data is reviewed with the team and plans are made regarding classroom level or individual level interventions needed.

Person Responsible Stephanie Diaz (sdiaz1@ecsdfl.us)

Discuss attendance and behavior concerns each week in MTSS team meeting, make decisions about next steps for students in relation to attendance or behavior support and interventions.

Person Responsible Christine Jenkins (cjenkins@ecsdfl.us)

Regularly hold child study meetings, implementing strategies that will support increased attendance.

Person Responsible Summer McLellan (smclellan@ecsdfl.us)

Use in-class coaching opportunities with the PBIS Coordinator related to student behavior concerns, allowing teachers and students to see the behavior, intervention, and interactions modeled for them.

Person Responsible Stephanie Diaz (sdiaz1@ecsdfl.us)

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

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: STAR AP3 Proficiency in grades 3-5 in ELA (29%) and Math (30%), classroom walkthrough evidence, and PLC agendas indicate a need for in-depth planning that focuses on aligning instruction to benchmarks and explicitly planning the delivery methods of the benchmark aligned instruction. In-depth planning will include school-level coaching and district-level support from coaches and subject area specialists.

Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.

Measurable Outcome: By May 2023, 41% or above of the student body will be proficient in ELA, Math, and Science as shown on summative district and state assessments: FAST, SSA Science, & Star 360. The achievement gap between overall students and SWD and Black subgroups will close, raising all ESSA subgroups to 41% or above.

State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.

Monitoring: Schoolnet assessments, FAST Progress monitoring, classroom grades, walkthrough data, and lesson plans will be monitored and reviewed on a regular basis to track the effectiveness of benchmark aligned instruction.

Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome: Melissa Groff (mgroff@ecsdfl.us)

School leadership ensures that teachers have a shared understanding of the curriculum and standards across the grades.

Evidence-based Strategy: Schools minimize the teaching of decontextualized facts that might be tested and focus instead on deep, integrated instruction of content standards.

Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus. Schools use assessment to enhance student learning, beyond just measuring it.

All students are regularly assessed to see whether they have learned and mastered the concepts, knowledge, and skills being taught and to determine whether they can apply that learning.

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: According to the Meadows Center for Preventing Educational Risk, there is strong evidence to suggest that teachers knowing the content standards including vertical alignment and the process of assessing students can lead to improved instruction. By aligning curriculum, instruction, and assessment, teachers will be equipped to evaluate

Explain the

rationale for selecting this specific strategy.

Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

the effectiveness of their lesson planning and delivery process. Walk through data from the 21-22 school year indicate that teachers planned the "what" but not the "how," and alignment to the benchmarks, curriculum materials, and assessment can be improved.

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.

Teachers will implement before, during, and after protocol for planning and will participate in planning sessions with the School Transformation Office (STO) coaches weekly for each subject. Teachers will plan for the methods of delivery across content areas as aligned with the benchmarks.

Teachers will engage in the following planning protocol:

- Read and understand benchmarks
- Read texts, review lessons prior to planning meetings
- Rehearse key lesson plan parts
- Plan and script the gradual release model
- Time stamp plans
- Plan accommodations and modifications

Person Responsible Katie Catalani (kcatalani@ecsdfi.us)

The leadership team will conduct classroom walks on a weekly basis in the core content areas to monitor the implementation of in-depth planning. The leadership team will provide feedback to teachers and implement coaching support based on the data collected through walk throughs. The team will determine future instructional practices and identify needs for remediation or reteaching.

Person Responsible Melissa Groff (mgroff@ecsdfi.us)

Weekly PLC meetings will be used to provide professional development and teacher learning related to walk-through trends, data analysis, or high need instructional areas.

Person Responsible Christine Jenkins (cjenkins@ecsdfi.us)

Teachers will be provided with weekly written feedback that outlines the look-fors observed and an action step to implement. Look-fors related to this goal are:

Teacher lesson plans are present in the classroom

Teacher lesson plans include delivery methods for the intended benchmark

Teaching and learning match the plans and targets posted.

Teacher engages students in an observable stage of the gradual release model

Teacher engages students in benchmark aligned instruction using visuals, charts, models, handouts...

Teacher has materials prepared and ready for immediate use

Teacher plans and uses strategies to move lesson components along without delay

Students know the intended learning target when asked

90% of students engage in the stage of the gradual release model by tracking the teacher, referencing visuals, engaging in discussion, working with groups, or applying intended learning to complete a task

Person Responsible Melissa Groff (mgroff@ecsdfi.us)

Data analysis of district assessments will occur following each assessment given during weekly PLC meetings. All members of the MTSS team will be present during the meetings to provide input and plans for support for individual students. The team (teachers, admin, MTSS) will develop a plan of action in response to the data reviewed.

Person Responsible Christine Jenkins (cjenkins@ecsdfi.us)

#3. Transformational Leadership specifically relating to Specific Teacher Feedback/Walkthroughs

<p>Area of Focus</p> <p>Description and Rationale: Include a rationale that explains how it was identified as a critical need from the data reviewed.</p>	<p>School grade data and BSI walks indicated a need for explicit and intentional leadership support to implement feedback strategies that result in quality benchmark aligned instruction. The school will implement Get Better Faster (GBF) Observation and Feedback practices and action steps to improve benchmark aligned instruction.</p>
<p>Measurable Outcome: State the specific measurable outcome the school plans to achieve. This should be a data based, objective outcome.</p>	<p>GBF Observation and feedback strategies will improve teacher practices that produce increased student performance in achievement with a goal of 41% or higher achieving on grade level performance (level 3) on the FAST assessment.</p>
<p>Monitoring: Describe how this Area of Focus will be monitored for the desired outcome.</p>	<p>The School Transformation Office (STO) will be supporting the school-based leadership team to monitor the implementation of the observation and feedback system through monthly Principal meetings, and monthly classroom walks. Feedback about implementation will be provided through STO on a monthly basis.</p>
<p>Person responsible for monitoring outcome:</p>	<p>Hollie Wilkins (hwilkins@ecsdfl.us)</p>
<p>Evidence-based Strategy: Describe the evidence-based strategy being implemented for this Area of Focus.</p>	<p>The leadership team will utilize a systematic observation and feedback structure. Through this system the leaders are able to provide immediate support for teachers to have a positive effect size on student academic achievement.</p>

Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy: Explain the rationale for selecting this specific strategy. Describe the resources/ criteria used for selecting this strategy.

This systematic approach to coaching teachers is a blend of directive and nondirective techniques. The focus is on small, specific, and focused moves and responses that have an immediate positive effect on student achievement. These are followed up by direct rehearsal and practice of the moves with the leader. The learning for the teachers is not rote or formulaic. It helps the teacher to anticipate and adjust to ensure learning is occurring. The objective is mindful behavior with management and rigor. Through the guidance of the BSI field team and the STO department, the school leadership team will be learning and implementing this system throughout the entire year receiving feedback from the STO and BSI teams.

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.

Outline and monitor before-planning expectations (Identify understandings of the benchmark, review curriculum resources, solve assessment questions, review student learning data for prior learning)

Person Responsible Hollie Wilkins (hwilkins@ecsdfi.us)

Attend structured planning with STO/District coaches and school-based coaches utilizing a planning protocol to align Tier 1 instruction to the explicit intent of the standards. (Review benchmarks, identify practice, sequence the instructional strategies, determine tasks and item progression, and practice and solve benchmark aligned tasks and questions)

Person Responsible Hollie Wilkins (hwilkins@ecsdfi.us)

Schedule weekly classroom walks for identified teachers/ grade levels to monitor implementation of planning.

Person Responsible Hollie Wilkins (hwilkins@ecsdfi.us)

Conduct weekly classroom walk (when needed utilize coach/specialist to calibrate walk) and identify an action step from Get Better Faster (GBF) for teacher based on GBF waterfall and schedule feedback meeting with teacher. (Utilize GBF waterfall, plans, and video lesson)

Person Responsible Hollie Wilkins (hwilkins@ecsdfi.us)

Conduct weekly classroom walk (when needed utilize coach/specialist to calibrate walk) and identify an action step from Get Better Faster (GBF) for teacher based on GBF waterfall and schedule feedback meeting with teacher. (Utilize GBF waterfall, plans, and video lesson)

Person Responsible Hollie Wilkins (hwilkins@ecsdfi.us)

Meet with identified teacher for feedback meeting (follow GBF feedback meeting protocol) to discuss, practice, and stamp learning for teacher action step and schedule follow up classroom walk.

Person Responsible Hollie Wilkins (hwilkins@ecsdfi.us)

Conduct follow up classroom walks to identify implementation of action steps, provide feedback to teacher, and determine if action step will be continued or changed based on data.

Person Responsible Hollie Wilkins (hwilkins@ecsdfi.us)

Document teacher action steps, classroom observations, feedback meeting scripts, and notes on teacher tracker for stakeholder alignment. (School-based admin, coaches/ specialist, district, BSI)

Person Responsible Hollie Wilkins (hwilkins@ecsdfi.us)

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

The following data was used to determine the critical need:

Kindergarten ELA proficiency rate was 44% on the Spring 2022 STAR Early Literacy Assessment.

First grade ELA proficiency rate was 31% on the Spring 2022 STAR Early Literacy Assessment.

Second grade ELA proficiency rate was 27% on the Spring 2022 STAR Reading Assessment.

Students who score at the 50th percentile on STAR Early Literacy or STAR Reading are considered proficient. The number of students who were not considered proficient at the end of 2021-2022 indicates a need to 1) improve core instruction and 2) identify student deficiencies and provide interventions immediately in order to close achievement gaps.

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

The following data was used to determine the critical need:

Third grade ELA proficiency rate was 27% on the 2022 FSA.

Fourth grade ELA proficiency rate was 31% on the 2022 FSA.

Fifth grade ELA proficiency rate was 39% on the 2022 FSA.

Achievement in ELA for grades 3rd - 5th has (not) reached 41% proficiency in all subgroups:

Economically Disadvantaged (28%)

ELL (N/A)
 Students with Disabilities (6%)
 African American (19%)
 Hispanic (34%)

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)

ELA proficiency as determined by those scoring at or above the 53rd percentile on STAR Early Literacy or STAR Reading in 2022 will increase from 44% in K, 31% in 1st grade, and 30% in 2nd grade on STAR AP4 to 50% proficiency or higher on FAST-STAR PM3.

Grades 3-5: Measureable Outcome(s)

ELA proficiency will increase from 27% in 3rd grade, 31% in 4th grade, and 39% in 5th grade on the 2022 FSA to 50% or higher in each grade on the 2023 FAST.

The ELA Proficiency for all identified ESSA subgroups will increase to 50% or higher on new 2023 FAST Progress Monitoring assessments by 23-24.

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.

1. To monitor for desired outcomes, we will collect data, analyze, and track the percent of students scoring satisfactorily each quarter. We will identify students in need of intervention according to the intervention decision tree.
 - a. Kindergarten: STAR Early Literacy results and percent of students earning satisfactory performance on the standards-based grading rubric.
 - b. First grade: STAR Early Literacy/Reading results and track the percent of students meeting benchmark on the first grade quarterly decoding probe per classroom.
 - c. Second grade: STAR Reading results and track the percent of students whose fluency rate is average per the time of year on the Hasbrouck and Tindal fluency norms chart.
 - d. Grades 3-5: analyze results by classroom of district module assessments.
2. Administration will conduct weekly classroom walkthroughs to observe delivery of Pre-K to Grade 5 literacy instruction and suggest improvements through the use of the Literacy Practice Profile tool.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Select the person responsible for monitoring this outcome.

Catalani, Katie, kcatalani@ecsdfl.us

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. Â§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?

Bellview Elementary uses HMH Into Reading 2022 for its Comprehensive Core Reading/Language Arts Program (CCRP)

The district's K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-based Reading Plan outlines in detail how the various components Into Reading meets Florida's definition of evidence-based. The district ELA Department mapped B.E.S.T. and created curriculum frameworks to ensure that Tier I instruction is standards-aligned.

In order to ensure the measurable outcomes are reached in K-5, our school will 1) focus on five key literacy instructional practices (explicit, systematic, scaffolded, differentiated instruction with corrective feedback) required by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C., K-12 CERP and 2) provide intensive, systematic instruction on foundational reading skills according to the K-12 CERP Intervention Decision Trees.

Tier 1 instruction is monitored by the school's administration team through weekly classroom walkthroughs and by being present during collaborative lesson planning. Teachers and Rtl teams monitor the effectiveness of interventions with individual students by collecting data and tracking student progress.

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 use of Houghton Mifflin Into Reading 2022 as a Comprehensive Core Language Arts/Reading Program is supported by recommended practices in the The Institute of Education Sciences Practice Guides as described in the K-12 CERP. The core curriculum includes accommodations for students with a disability, and students who are English language learners; provides print-rich explicit and systematic, scaffolded, and differentiated instruction; builds background and content knowledge; incorporates writing in response to reading; and incorporates the principles of Universal Design for Learning.

A focus on five key literacy instructional practices (explicit, systematic, scaffolded, differentiated instruction with corrective feedback) with this comprehensive curriculum will increase the proficiency of our students in K-5.

Furthermore, following the Institute of Education Sciences recommendations (strong evidence) for interventions, teachers follow the K-12 CERP Intervention Decision Trees to provide interventions in decoding and building fluency, matched to student need during a dedicated intervention period daily.

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
-------------	-----------------------------------

Action Step 1: Literacy Leadership-

- Develop a schoolwide reading plan to increase student academic achievement and monitor student reading growth.
- Provide professional development regarding the B.E.S.T. ELA Standards.
- Review grade-level data from core curriculum assessments and overall classroom walkthrough trends to problem solve.

Catalani, Katie,
kcatalani@ecsdf1.us

Action Step 2: Literacy Coaching-

- District coaches and/or school mentor teachers will facilitate common lesson planning using the district adopted curriculum and pacing guides, including how to effectively deliver instruction of B.E.S.T. ELA Standards and engagement strategies, etc.).
- Administration seeks coaching support from district coaches and the State Regional Literacy Director for walkthroughs and intervention support.

Action Step 3: Assessment

- Our school utilizes the MTSS 4-step problem solving process to analyze data and determine need for differentiated instruction/ intervention.
- Grade level teams will meet to discuss the use of formative assessment to guide differentiation in the classroom; analyze core reading material assessment results, and use STAR for screening, diagnostics, and progress monitoring.

Action Step 4: Professional Learning -

We will provide training to teachers at our school on the following:

- Use of STAR360 reports, core reading program data, and the intervention decision trees
- Differentiation during the 90 minute block, and use of Tier 2 and Tier 3 interventions during the language arts intervention period.
- Five key literacy instructional practices (explicit, systematic, scaffolded, differentiated instruction with corrective feedback) required by Rule 6A-6.053, F.A.C., K-12 Comprehensive Evidence-Based Reading Plan
- The B.E.S.T. ELA standards and the science of reading

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.

Along with the full implementation of PBIS for the 2022-2023 school year, school-wide structures that support a positive culture have been developed, providing students and teachers with a clear and unified procedure for morning arrival, classroom circles, transitions, lunch, and afternoon dismissal. PBIS expectations have been reviewed and retaught, to include plans to reward students for displaying the school-wide expectations. Our PBIS team will meet monthly to discuss data and trends related to discipline, culture, and the implementation of the PBIS plan. The morning news highlights positive office referrals and positive features from around the school.

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

Teachers- providing and maintaining a positive classroom focused on student learning and success while ensuring student's academic, social, emotional, and behavioral needs are met.

Students- actively participating in their education, adhering to the school-wide expectations, and engaging in positive interactions throughout the school community.

Families- actively participating in their child's education, advocating for their child, holding their children accountable for adhering to the school-wide expectations, and engaging in positive interactions throughout the school community.

Administration- providing and maintaining a positive school focused on student learning and success while holding teachers accountable for upholding the school's purpose, mission, and vision.

MTSS team- supporting teachers in order to allow the appropriate levels of academic, behavioral, social, and emotional support for students.