Flagler Schools

Belle Terre Elementary School



2021-22 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

| School Demographics | 3 |
|--------------------------------|----|
| Purpose and Outline of the SIP | 4 |
| School Information | 5 |
| Needs Assessment | 9 |
| Planning for Improvement | 18 |
| Positive Culture & Environment | 23 |
| Budget to Support Goals | 25 |

Belle Terre Elementary School

5545 BELLE TERRE PKWY, Palm Coast, FL 32137

www.flaglerschools.com

Demographics

Principal: Jessica Deford Start Date for this Principal: 8/9/2021

| 2019-20 Status (per MSID File) | Active |
|---|---|
| School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File) | Elementary School PK-6 |
| Primary Service Type (per MSID File) | K-12 General Education |
| 2018-19 Title I School | No |
| 2018-19 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3) | [Data Not Available] |
| 2018-19 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups in orange are below the federal threshold) | Asian Students Black/African American Students Economically Disadvantaged Students English Language Learners Hispanic Students Multiracial Students Students With Disabilities White Students |
| School Grades History | 2018-19: A (66%) 2017-18: B (60%) 2016-17: B (60%) |
| | 2015-16: B (59%) |
| 2019-20 School Improvement (| (SI) Information* |
| SI Region | Northeast |
| Regional Executive Director | <u>Dustin Sims</u> |
| 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, <u>click</u> <u>here</u>.

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Flagler 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.

Last Modified: 10/6/2021 https://www.floridacims.org Page 4 of 25

Part I: School Information

School Mission and Vision

Provide the school's mission statement.

The mission of Flagler County Public Schools ensures educational success through high expectations and innovative thinking in a safe learning environment to empower students to reach their full potential as responsible, ethical and productive citizens in a diverse and changing world.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Our district's vision statement is that as a courageous, innovative leader in education, Flagler County Public Schools will be the Nation's premier learning organization where ALL students graduate as socially responsible citizens with the skills necessary to reach their maximum potential.

School Leadership Team

Membership

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

Last Modified: 10/6/2021 https://www.floridacims.org Page 5 of 25

| Name | Title | Job Duties and Responsibilities | |
|----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------------|---|
| Deford, Jessica | Principal | | Oversees daily operations in facilities, teaching and learning, and provides support to students, staff and family members to raise student achievement. |
| Rinaldi Jr., Mike | Assistant Principal | | Oversees daily operations in facilities, teaching and learning, and provides support to students, staff and family members to raise student achievem |
| Muldoon, Natalie | Instructional Coach | | Provide professional development and coaching for all teachers grades K-6 in the area. Facilitates data meetings, assists in whole-school screening programs that provide early intervention services for children considered to be "at risk," identifies scientifically-based intervention programs and instruction, participates in the design andcdelivery of professional development, support colleagues to provide consistency in reinforcing skills, assists in the implementation of progress monitoring, data collection and data analysis, and supports assessment and implementation monitoring. |
| Tincher, Chris | Assistant Principal | | Oversee daily operations in facilities, teaching and learning, providing support to students, staff and family members to raise student achievement. |

Demographic Information

Principal start date

Monday 8/9/2021, Jessica Deford

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.

13

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.

13

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

69

Total number of students enrolled at the school

1,446

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

2

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

12

Demographic Data

Early Warning Systems

2021-22

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator listed:

| Indicator | | | | | | Gra | ade | e L | ev | el | | | | Total |
|--|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|----|----|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | iotai |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 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 FSA ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide FSA Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Number of students with a substantial reading deficiency | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 3 | 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 | | | | | | Gra | ade | e L | ev | el | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|----|----|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | iotai |
| 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 | | | | | | Gra | ade | e L | ev | el | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|----|----|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 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

Monday 8/9/2021

2020-21 - As Reported

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

| Indicator | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Number of students enrolled | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| 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 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | |

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

| Indiantor | | | | | | Gra | ade | e L | ev | el | | | | Total |
|--------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|----|----|----|----|----|-------|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | iotai |
| 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 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|-------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|--|
| Indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total | | |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | | | |

2020-21 - Updated

Last Modified: 10/6/2021

The number of students by grade level that exhibit each early warning indicator:

| Indicator | | | | | Gra | de L | evel | | | | | | | Total |
|---|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|------|------|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | iotai |
| Number of students enrolled | 157 | 165 | 178 | 192 | 186 | 211 | 233 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1322 |
| Attendance below 90 percent | 17 | 25 | 15 | 28 | 37 | 28 | 39 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 189 |
| One or more suspensions | 2 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 3 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Course failure in ELA | 3 | 9 | 7 | 9 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 32 |
| Course failure in Math | 1 | 4 | 3 | 5 | 2 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 32 | 33 | 23 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 108 |
| Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment | 0 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 36 | 39 | 21 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 121 |

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

| Indicator | | Grade Level | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|-------------|----|----|----|----|----|---|---|---|----|----|----|-------|--|--|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total | | |
| Students with two or more indicators | 7 | 11 | 11 | 19 | 13 | 29 | 37 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 127 | | |

The number of students identified as retainees:

| Indicator | | | | | | Gra | ade | e L | ev | el | | | | Total |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|-----|-----|-----|----|----|----|----|----|-------|
| indicator | K | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 11 | 12 | Total |
| Retained Students: Current Year | 1 | 4 | 2 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 15 |
| Students retained two or more times | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 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).

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 | | | | | | |

| | | | ELA | | | |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| | 2019 | 69% | 68% | 1% | 58% | 11% |
| Cohort Com | nparison | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 69% | 60% | 9% | 58% | 11% |
| Cohort Com | nparison | -69% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 68% | 58% | 10% | 56% | 12% |
| Cohort Com | parison | -69% | | | | |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 67% | 62% | 5% | 54% | 13% |
| Cohort Com | nparison | -68% | | | | |

| | | | MAT | Н | | |
|------------|----------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison |
| 03 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 69% | 72% | -3% | 62% | 7% |
| Cohort Con | nparison | | | | | |
| 04 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 65% | 60% | 5% | 64% | 1% |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -69% | | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 70% | 58% | 12% | 60% | 10% |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -65% | | | | |
| 06 | 2021 | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 73% | 67% | 6% | 55% | 18% |
| Cohort Con | nparison | -70% | | | | |

| | SCIENCE | | | | | | | | |
|------------|---------|--------|----------|-----------------------------------|-------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|
| Grade | Year | School | District | School- District Comparison | State | School- State Comparison | | | |
| 05 | 2021 | | | | | | | | |
| | 2019 | 69% | 53% | 16% | 53% | 16% | | | |
| Cohort Com | parison | | | | | | | | |

Grade Level Data Review - Progress Monitoring Assessments

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

Grades K-6, i-Ready Diagnostic, Math and ELA

| | | Grade 1 | | | |
|--------------------------|--|--|---|---|--|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring | |
| | All Students | 149/98 | 162/98 | 161/100 | |
| English | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| Language Arts | Students With Disabilities | 23/91 | 23/87 | 23/100 | |
| | English Language Learners | 6/67 | 6/83 | 7/100 | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring | |
| | All Students | 149/97 | 160/98 | 164/98 | |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 | |
| | Students With Disabilities | 23/87 | 25/84 | 26/88 | |
| | English Language Learners | 6/67 | 7/86 | 7/100 | |
| | | | | | |
| | | Grade 2 | | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Grade 2 Fall | Winter | Spring | |
| | Proficiency All Students | | Winter 177/90 | Spring 178/95 | |
| English | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | Fall | | | |
| English Language Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities | Fall 166/87 | 177/90 | 178/95 | |
| _ | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With | Fall 166/87 0 | 177/90 0 | 178/95 0 | |
| _ | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language | Fall 166/87 0 20/55 | 177/90 0 20/55 | 178/95 0 22/86 | |
| _ | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students | Fall 166/87 0 20/55 6/25 | 177/90 0 20/55 10/60 | 178/95 0 22/86 10/80 | |
| _ | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | Fall 166/87 0 20/55 6/25 Fall | 177/90 0 20/55 10/60 Winter | 178/95 0 22/86 10/80 Spring | |
| Language Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically | Fall 166/87 0 20/55 6/25 Fall 166/84 | 177/90 0 20/55 10/60 Winter 177/92 | 178/95 0 22/86 10/80 Spring 178/93 | |

Last Modified: 10/6/2021

| | | Grade 3 | | |
|--------------------------|---|---|---|---|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 177/84 | 189/90 | 190/97 |
| English | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Language Arts | Students With Disabilities | 20/35 | 21/67 | 17/88 |
| | English Language Learners | 8/75 | 9/78 | 9/78 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 177/80 | 189/92 | 190/97 |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 20/50 | 21/67 | 17/82 |
| | English Language Learners | 8/88 | 9/89 | 9/100 |
| | | | | |
| | | Grade 4 | | |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Grade 4 Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | Proficiency All Students | | Winter 176/92 | Spring 179/96 |
| English | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | Fall | | |
| English Language Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities | Fall 44/93 | 176/92 | 179/96 |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With | Fall 44/93 0 | 176/92 0 | 179/96 0 |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language | Fall 44/93 0 9/78 | 176/92 0 29/69 | 179/96 0 27/81 |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students | Fall 44/93 0 9/78 2/100 | 176/92 0 29/69 16/94 | 179/96 0 27/81 16/94 |
| | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged | Fall 44/93 0 9/78 2/100 Fall | 176/92 0 29/69 16/94 Winter | 179/96 0 27/81 16/94 Spring |
| Language Arts | Proficiency All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Number/% Proficiency All Students Economically | Fall 44/93 0 9/78 2/100 Fall 90/94 | 176/92 0 29/69 16/94 Winter 176/89 | 179/96 0 27/81 16/94 Spring 178/94 |

Last Modified: 10/6/2021

| | | Grade 5 | | |
|---------------|--|---------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 194/81 | 203/86 | 203/87 |
| English | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Language Arts | Students With Disabilities | 32/28 | 31/42 | 30/50 |
| | English Language Learners | 9/78 | 10/90 | 9/78 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 101/91 | 200/88 | 205/89 |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 13/54 | 31/55 | 33/61 |
| | English Language Learners | 6/100 | 10/90 | 10/80 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| Science | All Students Economically Disadvantaged Students With Disabilities English Language Learners | 0 | 0 | 0 |

| | | Grade 6 | | |
|---------------|---------------------------------|---------|--------|--------|
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 216/72 | 226/81 | 225/75 |
| English | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Language Arts | Students With Disabilities | 23/30 | 25/52 | 24/58 |
| | English Language Learners | 9/67 | 10/80 | 10/70 |
| | Number/% Proficiency | Fall | Winter | Spring |
| | All Students | 216/81 | 225/86 | 227/86 |
| Mathematics | Economically Disadvantaged | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| | Students With Disabilities | 23/39 | 25/48 | 24/54 |
| | English Language Learners | 9/78 | 9/78 | 10/80 |

Subgroup Data Review

Last Modified: 10/6/2021

| | 2 | 021 S | СНОС | L GRAD | E COM | PONE | NTS BY | SUB | GROUPS | 5 | |
|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| 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 |
| | 2 | 019 S | CHOO | L GRAD | E COM | PONE | NTS BY | SUB | GROUPS | 5 | |
| 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 | 30 | 43 | 49 | 29 | 54 | 52 | 38 | | | | |
| ELL | 66 | 68 | | 66 | 81 | | 77 | | | | |
| ASN | 71 | 56 | | 77 | 65 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 54 | 54 | 52 | 53 | 58 | 41 | 63 | | | | |
| HSP | 71 | 71 | 66 | 70 | 75 | 71 | 70 | | | | |
| MUL | 69 | 65 | 61 | 75 | 72 | 61 | 65 | | | | |
| WHT | 72 | 65 | 60 | 73 | 70 | 59 | 74 | | | | |
| FRL | 64 | 61 | 57 | 64 | 67 | 56 | 65 | | | | |
| | 2 | 018 S | CHOO | L GRAD | E COM | PONE | NTS BY | SUB | GROUPS | 5 | |
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| SWD | 28 | 42 | 34 | 37 | 54 | 43 | 29 | | | | |
| ELL | 57 | 72 | | 57 | 50 | | | | | | |
| ASN | 58 | 57 | | 53 | 50 | | | | | | |
| BLK | 51 | 52 | 41 | 64 | 63 | 52 | 52 | | | | |
| HSP | 63 | 58 | 47 | 68 | 61 | 52 | 66 | | | | |
| MUL | 61 | 59 | | 61 | 54 | 30 | 53 | | | | |

| | 2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------|---|-----------|-------------------|--------------|------------|--------------------|-------------|------------|--------------|-------------------------|---------------------------|
| Subgroups | ELA Ach. | ELA LG | ELA LG L25% | Math Ach. | Math LG | Math LG L25% | Sci Ach. | SS Ach. | MS Accel. | Grad Rate 2016-17 | C & C Accel 2016-17 |
| WHT | 68 | 62 | 52 | 74 | 61 | 54 | 71 | | | | |
| FRL | 58 | 57 | 46 | 65 | 59 | 49 | 61 | | | | |

ESSA Data Review

| This data has been updated for the 2018-19 school year as of 7/16/2019. | |
|---|-----|
| ESSA Federal Index | |
| ESSA Category (TS&I or CS&I) | N/A |
| OVERALL Federal Index - All Students | 66 |
| 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 | 65 |
| Total Points Earned for the Federal Index | 529 |
| Total Components for the Federal Index | 8 |
| Percent Tested | 99% |
| Subgroup Data | |
| Students With Disabilities | |
| Federal Index - Students With Disabilities | 42 |
| 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 | 71 |
| English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Asian Students | |
| Federal Index - Asian Students | 67 |
| Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Black/African American Students | |
| Federal Index - Black/African American Students | 54 |
| Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| | |

| Black/African American Students | |
|--|-----|
| Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |
| Hispanic Students | |
| Federal Index - Hispanic Students | 71 |
| 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 | 67 |
| Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students 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 |
| 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 | 68 |
| 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 | 61 |
| Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year? | NO |
| Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32% | 0 |

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?

Across grade levels ELA Integration of Knowledge and Ideas was an area of concern. FSA Writing is below 70% across all grade levels. In Operations, Algebraic Thinking and Numbers in Base Ten, we dropped below 70% across all grade levels in Math.

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

Three out of the four tested grades dropped in percentage points from 2019 to 2021 on the ELA FSA.

All grade levels dropped at least 6 percentage points in Text-Based Writing on the ELA FSA from 2019 to 2021.

All grades levels dropped at least 3 percentage points from 2019 to 2021, with a significant drop in fifth grade.

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

Contributing factors include student and staff attendance and gaps in professional learning. We need to provide specific professional learning in the areas of need. We also need consistent progress monitoring. Teachers need to use progress monitoring data from diagnostic, progress monitoring, and summative data to plan daily small group instruction the meets the identified needs of students who are not achieving grade level proficiency.

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

Third grade ELA was the only area of growth from 2019 to 2021.

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

The contributing factors were consistent progress monitoring, attendance in PLCs, and a lack of planning effective daily small group interventions for all learners.

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

Consistent professional development in the identified areas of need. Progress monitoring of summative assessment. This data will then be used to planned differentiated tiered interventions allowing us to close learning gaps and accelerate student learning growth.

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.

Teachers will participate in professional learning communities. During these meetings teachers will analyze summative and progress monitoring data in order to pinpoint specific classroom trends. This data will then be used to plan small group instruction for tier one students. We will also have professional development in using our progress monitoring tool i-ready, so that teachers are able to better understand areas of need as determined by the systems diagnostic and progress monitoring tests. Teacher will also be trained in the number talks system, which will allow them to develop new strategies to close identified learning gaps in number sense and algebraic thinking.

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

Last Modified: 10/6/2021 https://www.floridacims.org Page 17 of 25

This year at Belle Terre Elementary we will be recommitting to providing daily tiered small group intervention in both math and ELA by implementing several Marzano based intervention strategies. Students will participate in small group instruction multiple times per day based on their summative assessment (Bench Mark and HMH unit tests) and progress monitoring (iready)results). These small groups will be targeted and planned based on identified student need. Teachers will plan for daily small group tier one intervention for both the math and ELA blocks. In addition to these blocks teachers will be identifying students at each grade level who are nearing grade level proficiency (as determined by the iReady diagnostic) these students will have specifically designed intervention blocks to close their instructional gaps and rapidly move them towards grade level proficiency. Each of our 90 minute ELA blocks have an additional thirty minutes, totaling 120 minutes, during which classroom teachers will work with tier 2 students who demonstrate a greater need of intervention. Tier three students demonstrating the highest need of intervention will have an additional level of support with individualized tier three plans and the most intensive interventions.

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Small Group Instruction

Area of Focus Description and Rationale: After analyzing past trends in Math proficiency we realized that Belle Terre has dropped below 70 percent of our students scoring a level three or higher in Math. In the areas of Algebraic Thinking and Numbers in Base Ten, Belle Terre dropped to 66% proficient across all grade levels in Math according to FSA and iReady diagnostic data. We believe this decline in math scores is do to a lack of small group instruction in the area of math.

Measureable Outcome:

At least 70 percent of students will demonstrate proficiency, as assessed by math FSA, in the areas of Operations, Algebraic Thinking and Numbers in Base Ten.

Achievement in the area of Math (Algebraic Thinking and Numbers in Base Ten) will be measured three times per year with the iReady diagnostic test, and with summative assessments based on the FSA standards.

Person responsible

Monitoring:

for Jessica Deford (defordj@flaglerschools.com) monitoring

Evidencebased Strategy:

outcome:

We will be using Marzano based strategies for creating professional learning communities that will meet to analyze data and plan daily small group differentiated instruction for Math.

Rationale for Evidencebased Strategy: The only way to raise our proficiency scores in the areas of math (Operations, Algebraic Thinking and Numbers in Base Ten) is through small group instruction that targets specific demonstrated needs for individual students. The strategies we are using to create data PLC will allow teachers to better plan for different student needs so that we can close learning gaps and increase the number of students reaching proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

Step 1: Students will be take the iReady diagnostic three times per year.

Step 2: After the diagnostic is given teachers will meet as a grade level to plan small group differentiated tier one instruction based on demonstrated student need.

Step 3: After planning Tier 1 small group instruction teachers will meet in PLC groups to plan Tier 1, Tier 2, and Tier 3 interventions based on students needs.

Person Responsible

Jessica Deford (defordj@flaglerschools.com)

#2. Leadership specifically relating to Teacher Recruitment and Retention

Area of Focus **Description** and Rationale:

At the beginning of the 2021-22 school year our county population grew dramatically. Belle Terre Elementary grew to 1,446 students. This required us to recruit 9 additional teachers and ensure that, through a positive climate, we could retain those that we had in order to meet the requirements of the class size amendment. We also want to guarantee learning environments that are productive to ensure we are successful in raising over all student academic proficiency.

Outcome:

Measureable We will retain at least 85% of our 2021-2022 K-5 staff that are rated Effective or Highly Effective.

> Throughout the year, we will be in contact with surrounding Universities to place interns with clinically educated certified teachers who are rated as highly effective. In order to retain new teachers this year, they will be placed with a mentor that is highly effective and has daily check ins to make sure

their needs are met.

Person responsible for monitoring

Monitoring:

Chris Tincher (tincherc@flaglerschools.com)

Evidencebased Strategy:

outcome:

We will encourage teachers to seek clinical education training to serve as mentors for both interns and first year teachers. This will help us to increase our hiring pool and retain teachers through a positive supportive work environment. In effect this strategy will enable our newly hired teachers to be effective and highly effective master teachers.

Rationale for Evidencebased

Strategy:

In the past, we have implemented a mentoring model that we adopted and modified from PK Young (professional learning partners), in which teacher mentors have a regular schedule to support their mentees. This has proven to be an effective model for growing and retaining highly effective new teachers.

Action Steps to Implement

Step 1: Each new teacher will be assigned a 180 eighty day mentor. The mentor teacher must be rated a highly effective teacher.

Step 2: The Mentor will have weekly contact with their mentee to help problem solve and collaborate on lesson plans and data analysis.

Step 3: Universities will contact Mr. Tincher who will assign interns to a directing teacher who has completed training as a clinical educator.

Step 4: The teacher will work to train the intern in valuable classroom management and instructional strategies. These interns once trained will form a new talent pool for our school to hire from.

Person Responsible

Chris Tincher (tincherc@flaglerschools.com)

#3. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement

Area of Focus Description and Rationale:

During the onset of the COVID 19 pandemic last year, no volunteers were allowed on our campus do to safety and wellness concerns. There were zero in person PTO meetings and zero in person SAC meetings. This lead to a less than 2 percent parent attendance rate, on zoom at PTO and SAC meetings and zero PTO sponsored extracurricular events. All meetings that traditionally increase parent involvement were limited to zoom online meetings. This also greatly hindered our ability to have parents involved as volunteer members or working in collaboration with teachers and staff to run extra curricular clubs. These connections that were lost with our parents negatively impacted the positive climate and culture of our school that greatly enriches the students overall experience during the school year.

Outcome:

Measureable We will increase parent involvement at PTO and SAC monthly meetings by

25%.

Monitoring: Attendance will be taken at each monthly PTO and SAC meeting.

Person

responsible Natalie Muldoon (muldoonn@flaglerschools.com) for

monitoring outcome:

Evidence-

based

Using social media and online platforms, we will increase awareness of on

campus opportunities for parents to get more involved at BTES.

Strategy: Rationale

for Evidence-

Strategy:

In order to create better connections with the community, we are working on having more parents involved. This will increase community support. based

Action Steps to Implement

Step 1: We will announce PTO/SAC meetings on monthly Bobcat Blasts to all parents.

Step 2: We will put the monthly PTO/SAC meetings on the marquee.

Step3: We will advertise through a flyer on social media, including Facebook and Peachjar.

Person Responsible

Chris Tincher (tincherc@flaglerschools.com)

#4. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities

Area of Focus **Description** and **Rationale:**

After disaggregating data form the 2021 ELA FSA in grades 3-6, it was identified that only 25% of our SWD students scored a level 3 or higher. Comparably, in 2019, 30% of our SWD students were proficient. We dropped 5% in proficiency for ELA.

Outcome:

Monitoring:

Measureable Our objective is to raise our percentage of SWD students in ELA scoring a level 3 or higher by 16% to 41% proficient.

> We will monitor this through our ELA progress monitoring, which is the i-Ready Diagnostic. This is administered 3 times per year. During each administration we will pull data for SWD students to ensure that the percentage is rising. In addition, we will analyze our 2022 FSA ELA data for

our SWD population.

Person responsible for monitoring outcome:

Mike Rinaldi Jr. (rinaldim@flaglerschools.com)

We will use our new research based ELA curriculum resource, Benchmark Advanced, for tier one instruction. This new resource will allow teachers to deliver tier instruction that focuses more on independent reading skills coupled with student discussion and writing with evidence. These skills are crucial in the student's journey towards proficiency. In the past, our curriculum was not inclusive to all areas of reading. Teachers had to use several different programs to piecemeal their Reading instruction.

Evidencebased Strategy:

With Benchmark, instruction will close learning gaps in the areas of phonics, fluency and vocabulary so that students with disabilities can more easily digest and comprehend text. Students with academic goals in their IEPS will be pulled for an additional round of intensive small group instruction designed around their identified unique needs.

The Support Facilitator and General Education Teacher will work collaboratively to meet individual student needs. They will also plan and disaggregate i-Ready data.

Rationale for Evidencebased Strategy:

This strategy was selected because the new Benchmark resources are researched based and have built in teacher routines that reflect strategies proving to be effective such as independent reads with note taking, the use of graphic organizers, routines for discussion about what was read, and writing about text with citing text based evidence. Enhancing these skills in students will allow the students to move towards proficiency much more rapidly. We will also be able to use the unit test to analyze item analysis data and student trends to better form small group instruction for students with demonstrated need so that a greater percentage will be able to reach grade level proficiency.

Action Steps to Implement

Step 1: Teachers will plan rigorous ELA instruction using the new Benchmark curriculum Language arts resource.

Step 2: Unit tests from this curriculum will be given every three to four weeks.

Step 3: Teachers, the Academic Coach, and Administration will meet in regular PLCs to analyze data from these unit tests and plan specific small group instruction to address standards and skills in which students did not demonstrate mastery.

Step 4: The iReady diagnostic test will be given three times per year as a progress monitoring tool.

Step 5: Teachers, the Academic Coach, and Administration will meet in regular PLCs to analyze specific subgroups in reading where students are struggling and plan small group instruction to address these gaps.

Person Responsible

Mike Rinaldi Jr. (rinaldim@flaglerschools.com)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

Using the <u>SafeSchoolsforAlex.org</u>, 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.

According to the Safe Schools for Alex site, BTES falls into the low category when compared to all elementary schools with .2 incidences per student. We received the PBIS Resilience School Award last year. We will continue to meet monthly as a PBIS Team to analyze discipline data and share disciplinary classroom trends. We will also share strategies for behavior management with teachers at faculty meetings. We have a schoolwide positive reinforcement system called Pawprint Rewards, in which students earn tickets for modeling positive behavior. There is a weekly drawing for prizes.

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.

Last Modified: 10/6/2021 https://www.floridacims.org Page 23 of 25

Building a positive school culture and environment starts by making sure that every member of our staff feels supported and valued. This begins with the newest members of our staff. New teachers receive a staff mentor (or Professional Learning Partner) for one year. This person serves as a point of contact for any questions or needs that may arise during the teacher's first year at Belle Terre. The mentor/mentee relationship allows for new teachers to feel more valued and less frustrated because they have assistance that is readily provided.

Another aspect of ensuring a positive school culture is clear and honest communication with all of our campus stakeholders. We have Team Leader meetings monthly (Java with Jess) where leads can bring the concerns of their team directly to Principal DeFord and the Leadership Team. This allows for direct communication of needs and allows the staff to make sure their needs are heard and responded to in a timely manner. For teachers who are not grade level leads there are various committees that allow teachers to provide team feedback on campus concerns, such as PBIS, technology, flagship development, reflection, etc...

The Belle Terre faculty works diligently to make sure that our campus is a welcoming place where every student placed in our charge is afforded the best academic experience possible. Teachers reach out to families personally by phone during pre-planning each year. Teachers use use a variety of communication techniques to ensure families receive notifications and can participate with their student's education. We also hold evening parent conferences at least twice per year. We have robust parent participation in our volunteer programs and all parent opportunities to be on campus (lunch, award shows, etc.). We also have an involved PTO and supportive SAC team which our School Board representative also attends.

The Belle Terre team strives to meet the needs of our students on all levels. We have an extensive system of data review and interventions based on student need. Administration, coaches, and guidance attend these reviews to ensure fidelity. These processes ensure that student needs are identified and addressed in a quick yet comprehensive manner. We also hold several social gatherings each year in which students are able to come and have an engaging experience with their peers and teachers outside the academic arena.

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

There are many stakeholders that help promote a positive culture and environment at BTES. Our parents at BTES do a great job communicating and collaborating with school employees to make sure that all of the needs of their children are met. We have many parents who volunteer on campus in a variety of different roles, including mentoring students, working in classrooms, and helping with daily routines and procedures.

Teachers and staff, including transportation, cafeteria, office staff, custodial and paraprofessionals help promote a positive culture by working diligently, often beyond expectations to ensure a safe and happy environment for all students.

Administration, Guidance and Coaches work to support the teachers and make sure that they have all they need to drive student success.

The School Board supports our school by attending our SAC committee meetings. They are frequently on campus and invested in the success of BTES.

Our business partners, partner financially to help fund extra projects and clubs.

Last Modified: 10/6/2021 https://www.floridacims.org Page 24 of 25

| Part V: Budget | | | |
|----------------|--------|---|--------|
| 1 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Small Group Instruction | \$0.00 |
| 2 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Leadership: Teacher Recruitment and Retention | \$0.00 |
| 3 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement | \$0.00 |
| 4 | III.A. | Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities | \$0.00 |
| | | Total: | \$0.00 |