Pinellas County Schools

Belleair Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Belleair Elementary School

1156 LAKEVIEW RD, Clearwater, FL 33756

http://www.belleair-es.pinellas.k12.fl.us

Demographics

Principal: Renee Kelly N

Start Date for this Principal: 7/1/2019

2019-20 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I

* 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 Pinellas 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

Belleair Elementary School

1156 LAKEVIEW RD, Clearwater, FL 33756

http://www.belleair-es.pinellas.k12.fl.us

School Demographics

School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	2019-20 Title I School	2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)
Elementary School PK-5	Yes	100%

Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	Charter School	2018-19 Minority Rate (Reported as Non-white on Survey 2)
K-12 General Education	No	83%

School Grades History

Year	2019-20	2018-19	2017-18	2016-17
Grade	C	C	C	C

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Pinellas 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.

Belleair Elementary School's mission is to provide a safe learning environment and create lifelong learners who achieve at least a year or more of growth.

Provide the school's vision statement.

100% Student Success ~ Each and every scholar makes at least a year of learning gains

School Leadership Team

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

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Austin, Kelly	Principal	*oversees the teaching and learning at the site *oversees operational tasks at the site
Kelly, Renee	Assistant Principal	*oversees teaching and learning at the site *oversees operations at the site
Morehouse, Michelle	School Counselor	*assists in overseeing the PBIS/Restorative Practices/Culturally Responsive Teaching and Learning *guidance lessons *small groups based on needs assessments
Collins, Camilla	Teacher, K-12	PreK - grade 3 Interventionist; Title One audit box facilitator
Valentine, Deborah	Instructional Coach	Literacy Coach
Center, Laura	Teacher, K-12	Kindergarten Teacher; Team Leader
Santana, Christine	Teacher, K-12	4th grade Math and science teacher; science lab manager; math leader

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Monday 7/1/2019, Renee Kelly N

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.*
1

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.*

9

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school

26

Demographic Data

2020-21 Status (per MSID File)	Active
School Type and Grades Served (per MSID File)	Elementary School PK-5
Primary Service Type (per MSID File)	K-12 General Education
2019-20 Title I School	Yes
2019-20 Economically Disadvantaged (FRL) Rate (as reported on Survey 3)	100%
2019-20 ESSA Subgroups Represented (subgroups with 10 or more students) (subgroups below the federal threshold are identified with an asterisk)	Students With Disabilities English Language Learners Black/African American Students* Hispanic Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (51%) 2017-18: C (47%) 2016-17: C (42%) 2015-16: B (55%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Central
Regional Executive Director	Lucinda Thompson
Turnaround Option/Cycle	N/A
Year	
Support Tier	
ESSA Status	TS&I
* As defined under Rule 6A-1.099811, Florida Administrative Code. For more information, click here.	

Early Warning Systems

Current Year

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	94	67	79	73	81	79	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	473
Attendance below 90 percent	1	29	16	17	13	18	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	94
One or more suspensions	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	2
Course failure in ELA	0	0	0	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Course failure in Math	0	0	0	1	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	1	17	15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	33
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	1	11	23	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	0	2	1	12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	15

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	2	0	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	5
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 6/29/2020

Prior Year - As Reported

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	61	77	93	90	89	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	498
Attendance below 90 percent	1	15	20	12	15	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
One or more suspensions	4	4	1	3	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	27	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	2	1	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Prior Year - Updated

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Number of students enrolled	61	77	93	90	89	88	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	498
Attendance below 90 percent	1	15	20	12	15	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	77
One or more suspensions	4	4	1	3	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25
Course failure in ELA or Math	0	0	0	2	1	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	6
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	2	27	32	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61

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

Indicator	Grade Level													Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	
Students with two or more indicators	0	0	2	1	9	13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	25

The number of students identified as retainees:

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

Part II: Needs Assessment/Analysis

School Data
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	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
ELA Achievement	38%	54%	57%	32%	53%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	56%	59%	58%	34%	53%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	54%	54%	53%	29%	47%	52%

School Grade Component	2019			2018		
	School	District	State	School	District	State
Math Achievement	63%	61%	63%	54%	62%	61%
Math Learning Gains	62%	61%	62%	51%	61%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	51%	48%	51%	41%	48%	51%
Science Achievement	31%	53%	53%	50%	53%	51%

EWS Indicators as Input Earlier in the Survey

Indicator	Grade Level (prior year reported)						Total
	K	1	2	3	4	5	
	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	(0)	0 (0)

Grade Level Data
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	2019	34%	56%	-22%	58%	-24%
	2018	44%	53%	-9%	57%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		-10%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	41%	56%	-15%	58%	-17%
	2018	29%	51%	-22%	56%	-27%
Same Grade Comparison		12%				
Cohort Comparison		-3%				
05	2019	40%	54%	-14%	56%	-16%
	2018	37%	50%	-13%	55%	-18%
Same Grade Comparison		3%				
Cohort Comparison		11%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	66%	62%	4%	62%	4%
	2018	53%	62%	-9%	62%	-9%
Same Grade Comparison		13%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	54%	64%	-10%	64%	-10%
	2018	49%	62%	-13%	62%	-13%
Same Grade Comparison		5%				
Cohort Comparison		1%				
05	2019	59%	60%	-1%	60%	-1%
	2018	55%	61%	-6%	61%	-6%

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
Same Grade Comparison		4%				
Cohort Comparison		10%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	31%	54%	-23%	53%	-22%
	2018	51%	57%	-6%	55%	-4%
Same Grade Comparison		-20%				
Cohort Comparison						

Subgroup Data

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	23	41	36	51	56	57	12				
ELL	39	55	50	68	64	69	24				
BLK	28	40	33	41	56	45	14				
HSP	42	57	50	69	64	57	36				
WHT	44	86		77	70		36				
FRL	37	56	50	63	63	52	32				

2018 SCHOOL GRADE COMPONENTS BY SUBGROUPS											
Subgroups	ELA Ach.	ELA LG	ELA LG L25%	Math Ach.	Math LG	Math LG L25%	Sci Ach.	SS Ach.	MS Accel.	Grad Rate 2016-17	C & C Accel 2016-17
SWD	16	24	33	37	38	40					
ELL	31	42	36	55	51	58	35				
BLK	38	45	45	46	49	57	50				
HSP	38	45	38	59	53	57	51				
WHT	28	27		53	50						
FRL	36	41	35	51	51	53	51				

2017 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 2015-16	C & C Accel 2015-16
SWD	9	19	27	36	14						
ELL	21	25	14	61	50	36	36				
BLK	26	43	43	35	36	40	14				
HSP	31	28	15	63	51	25	57				
MUL	40			40							
WHT	39	39		53	63		79				
FRL	30	34	28	55	50	42	50				

ESSA Data

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)	TS&I
OVERALL Federal Index – All Students	53
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	1
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	70
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	425
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	55
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years English Language Learners Subgroup Below 32%	0
Native American Students	
Federal Index - Native American Students	
Native American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Native American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Asian Students	
Federal Index - Asian Students	
Asian Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Asian Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Black/African American Students	
Federal Index - Black/African American Students	37
Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Black/African American Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Hispanic Students	
Federal Index - Hispanic Students	56
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	
Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	N/A
Number of Consecutive Years Pacific Islander Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

White Students	
Federal Index - White Students	63
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	53
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	NO
Number of Consecutive Years Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 32%	0

Analysis

Data Reflection
Answer the following reflection prompts after examining any/all relevant school data sources (see guide for examples for relevant data sources).

Which data component showed the lowest performance? Explain the contributing factor(s) to last year's low performance and discuss any trends.

According to the 19/20 FSA data, ELA Proficiency is at 38%. While this is a 2 point increase from the previous year, we would like to see the proficiency increase to over 50%. In addition, our ELA Proficiency
has been our lowest percentage in a three year trend. We had a large number of students who earned a Level 2. This is partly good news in that the number of students earning a Level 1 is decreasing. Therefore, we are seeing gains in students ELA scores but not enough to meet proficiency. The other concerning data component is with the black subgroup. This subgroup declined in ESSA index from 47% to 37% over the last school year.

Our 20/21 ELA MAP data showed in the Winter that in Grades 1 -2, 46.5% of students were proficient and 53% of the students made learning gains. We believe our students have foundational gaps and they need a diagnostic assessment completed in order to determine what gaps need to be filled. In addition, much of the teaching focuses on the comprehension standards in ELA and not enough time is spent differentiating for our students in the foundational standards. In grades 3 - 5, MAP showed 41% of students were proficient and 48% made learning gains. We believe students lack stamina, the teaching is not at the depth of the standard(s) and students are struggling with transferring their knowledge to tests.

Which data component showed the greatest decline from the prior year? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this decline.

Science showed the greatest decline going from the prior year at 51% to 31%, a 20 point drop. One contributing factor may be the loss of our science coach for the 18/19 school year. In addition, it is unclear if the science block was done to fidelity in third and fourth grades. Also, the science assessment was day 5 and 6 of a long week of testing for 5th graders.

Which data component had the greatest gap when compared to the state average? Explain the factor(s) that contributed to this gap and any trends.

When compared to the state average, the 18/19 3rd grade ELA proficiency shows the biggest gap with 24 points. One contributing factor is that students struggle with stamina. Also, the various type of questions and answer choices may have confused students.

According to our 2019/20 MAP data, the 4th grade cohort has shown significant loss in ELA gains with only 39% of students showing gains from the fall to the winter testing cycles. Only 33% of the 4th grade cohort are considered proficient. We believe this trend is due to a lack of stamina in reading, difficulty reading grade level text, not being exposed to the rigor of the standards, and teacher understanding of the depth of the standards.

Which data component showed the most improvement? What new actions did your school take in this area?

The 18/19 FSA data component showing the most improvement was 3rd grade math with a 13 point increase from the year prior. One of the biggest actions was the work our teacher leaders did with their colleagues. These leaders were part of the district's cohort in math leadership. They provided PD on lesson planning and delivery as well as how to differentiate within the math block. Also, learning walks and fish bowl lessons were provided.

In 19/20, the data component showing the most gains was our 5th grade ELA cohort with 61% showing learning gains and 44% proficient according to the Winter MAP cycle. We believe the collaborative planning, constant reflection on student evidence, and the collaboration with the ESE/ ELL/general education teachers contributed to these gains in proficiency and growth.

Reflecting on the EWS data from Part I (D), identify one or two potential areas of concern?

Two potential area of concern are attendance and number Level of 1s. However, the attendance has dropped by 47% and Level 1's has dropped by 33%, indicating a positive trend.

Rank your highest priorities (maximum of 5) for schoolwide improvement in the upcoming school year.

1. Increase ELA Proficiency in grades K - 5
2. Increase our percentage of Level 2 ELA to Level 3 - 5.
3. Increase science proficiency
4. Continue to maintain and grow the LG and L25 LG for both ELA and Math
5. Increase proficiency in black subgroup for ELA and Math

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Instructional practice was determined as our main area of focus because a teacher's delivery and facilitation of the grade level standards must be data-driven in order for students to master the grade level standards. Looking at our data, it is clear that students are not mastering the standards of their grade level based on the proficiency scores in ELA, yet they are showing they are making progress because learning gains for all students and the L25 subgroup are at or near the district and state average. This is evident on the 18/19 FSA for ELA and the 19/20 Winter Map results.
Measurable Outcome:	The percentage of ALL students reaching ELA proficiency will increase from 38% to 50% as measured by FSA and/or MAP. The percentage of all students making ELA gains will increase from 56% to 60% as measured by FSA and/or MAP. The percentage of L25 students making ELA gains will increase from 54% to 60% as measured by FSA and/or MAP.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategy will be to collaboratively plan and teach standards-based lessons with an emphasis on task alignment to the standard(s) of the grade level, develop and apply foundational skills, as well as, teacher monitoring/tracking student evidence in order to take action throughout each lesson.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Prior to teaching any lesson, instructional staff must plan with the end of the standard(s) in mind and then break it down into smaller tasks to get to the end result. When teachers work together collaboratively to comprehend the standard(s) and plan the unit in its entirety, they have a greater understanding of where student mastery should be at the end of instruction. In addition, it requires teachers to do the tasks themselves in order to anticipate misconceptions and plan for them in advance. When teaching the lessons, teachers are observing and monitoring the student work and making instructional decisions to facilitate/support small groups or individuals. The end goal of this cycle is student mastery of that standard(s).

Action Steps to Implement

Prior to collaborative planning sessions, individual teachers (ESE/ELL/Gen ed) will read through the modules, complete the tasks, and jot notes of possible misconceptions by students.

Person Responsible Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)

ESE/ELL/Gen ed teachers collaborative plan units at a time by first dissecting the standards, discuss the tasks and plan for possible misconceptions, create lesson sequence with step outs for each learning target and learning trackers to maintain records of mastery.

Person Responsible Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)

Utilize the learning board matrix to include the standard, target, task, and evidence.

Person Responsible Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)

Use gradual release model to increase student-centered learning.

Person Responsible Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)

Formal/informal assessments are used to pull small groups and conferring individually.

Person Responsible Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)

ELL and ESE students will be clustered and the General education and ESE/ELL teacher will co-teach the lessons to provide a more seamless approach within the programs and to ensure all students, regardless of their program, receive the support they need just in time.

Person Responsible Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)

PreK - grade 3 teachers will utilize a foundational skills diagnostic to develop an instructional prescription for each student. The prescription will be based on the levels of reading acquisition: love of reading/ concepts of print, phonemic awareness levels, phonics levels, power word levels, vocabulary, leveled reading in decodables and predictable texts with the end goal being fluency and comprehension.

Person Responsible Renee Kelly (kellyre@pcsb.org)

The repeated reading routine for grades 3-5 will be utilized in the intervention block for students who need extra support with core text. The focus will be on the vocabulary and fluency in the text they will use in core instruction the next week.

Person Responsible Deborah Valentine (valentinede@pcsb.org)

A common language for writing text-based essays across grades 3-5 will be used.

Person Responsible Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)

All students will be provided with 20 minutes of self-selected, just right book reading. During this time, teachers will follow their pre-planned conference schedule with the goal of a 1:1 conference with each student across a 10 - 14 day period.

Person Responsible Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)

The PLC focus each week will be to analyze student task evidence and utilize the problem-solving process to take action on the data.

Person Responsible Renee Kelly (kellyre@pcsb.org)

Due to Covid 19 and possible gaps, students will take a (3 - 5 question) mini-assessment on the prior year's standard that is foundational to the matching current standard so teachers can tuck a review in at the launch of the unit.

Person Responsible Deborah Valentine (valentinede@pcsb.org)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our current level of performance shows 63% of students are proficient in mathematics according to the 18/29 FSA for Mathematics. However, we found during the 19/20 MAP assessments that we had a double digit dip on the proficiency projections and a larger concern with the learning gains of the L25 subgroup. This could be due to the new curriculum that was provided, not differentiating enough to meet the individual needs of the students, and/or not meeting the complexity of the standards.
Measurable Outcome:	The percent of all students achieving math proficiency will increase from 63% to 70%, as measured by FSA and MAP. The percent of all students making gains will increase from 62% to 65%, as measured by FSA and MAP. The percent of all L25 students making gains will increase from 51% to 55% as measured by FSA and MAP.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategy will be to collaboratively plan and teach standards-based lessons with an emphasis on task alignment to the standard(s) of the grade level, as well as, teacher monitoring/tracking student evidence in order to take action throughout the lesson.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Prior to teaching any lesson, instructional staff must plan with the end of the standard(s) in mind and then break it down into smaller tasks to get to the end result. When teachers work together collaboratively to comprehend the standard(s) and plan the unit in its entirety, they have a greater understanding of where student mastery should be at the end of instruction. In addition, it requires teachers to do the tasks themselves in order to anticipate misconceptions and plan for them in advance. When teaching the lessons, teachers are observing and monitoring the student work and making instructional decisions to facilitate/support small groups or individuals. The end goal of this cycle is student mastery of that standard(s).

Action Steps to Implement

Prior to collaborative planning sessions, individual teachers (ESE/ELL/Gen ed) will watch the unit overview, read through the unit, completing the tasks and end of unit assessment, jotting notes of possible misconceptions by students. Manipulatives and tools should be used during this time to determine a variety of ways to solve the problems.

Person Responsible Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)

ESE/ELL/Gen ed teachers collaborative plan units at a time by first dissecting the standards, discuss the tasks and plan for possible misconceptions, create lesson sequence and learning trackers to maintain records of mastery.

Person Responsible Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)

Utilize the learning board matrix to include the standard, target, task, and evidence.

Person Responsible Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)

Formal/informal assessments are used to pull small groups and conferring individually.

Person Responsible Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)

ELL and ESE students will be clustered and the General education and ESE/ELL teacher will co-teach the lessons to provide a more seamless approach within the programs and to ensure all students, regardless of their program, receive the support they need just in time.

Person Responsible Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)

Use of manipulatives and math tools will be used intentionally with each lesson (as appropriate) in order to move students from concrete to abstract thinking

Person Responsible Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)

Use of the MTLI leaders to support PD on making connections between the variety of strategies students use to solve the same word problem(s)

Person Responsible Christine Santana (santanac@pcsb.org)

Intentional spiral review based on previously taught standards will begin in October in all grade levels to build fluency in problem solving.

Person Responsible Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)

A purposefully planned intervention block will be 20 minutes of the math block each day in each classroom. 1/2 of the students will utilize Dreambox while the other 1/2 of the students are working with the teacher on either enrichment of the current standard(s), front loading standard(s) coming up, or teaching a foundational math standard(s) that may be needed according to student data.

Person Responsible Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)

The PLC focus each week will be to analyze student task evidence and utilize the problem-solving process to take action on the data.

Person Responsible Renee Kelly (kellyre@pcsb.org)

Due to Covid 19 and possible gaps, students will take a (3 - 5 question) mini-assessment on the prior year's standard that is foundational to the matching current standard so teachers can tuck a review in at the launch of the unit. This mini-assessment could be attached to the end of a unit assessment students are taking.

Person Responsible Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)

All students will complete a minimum of 6 lessons per week in Dreambox.

Person Responsible Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Science	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	31% of our 5th grades achieved proficiency on the 18/29 SSA. We expect a minimum of 50% of our students to achieve proficiency. We believe the gap occurred because not all teachers were teaching the science standards at the level of rigor required. In addition, vocabulary and the nature of science was not explicitly taught across all the grade levels leading to 5th grade.
Measurable Outcome:	The percent of 5th grade students achieving science proficiency will increase from 31% to 51%, as measured by SSA Science.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The evidence-based strategy will be to collaboratively plan and teach standards-based lessons using the 10-70-20 instructional model, with an emphasis on task alignment to the standard(s) of the grade level, as well as, teacher monitoring/tracking student evidence in order to take action throughout the lesson.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Prior to teaching any lesson, instructional staff must plan with the end of the standard(s) in mind and then break it down into smaller tasks to get to the end result. When teachers work together collaboratively to comprehend the standard(s) and plan the unit in its entirety, they have a greater understanding of where student mastery should be at the end of instruction. In addition, it requires teachers to do the tasks themselves in order to anticipate misconceptions and plan for them in advance. When teaching the lessons, teachers are observing and monitoring the student work and making instructional decisions to facilitate/support small groups or individuals. The end goal of this cycle is student mastery of that standard(s).

Action Steps to Implement

Prior to collaborative planning sessions, individual teachers (ESE/ELL/Gen ed) will read through the modules, complete the tasks, and jot notes of possible misconceptions by students.

Person Responsible Jennifer Tice (ticej@pcsb.org)

ESE/ELL/Gen ed teachers collaborative plan units at a time by first dissecting the standards, discuss the tasks and plan for possible misconceptions, create lesson sequence with step outs for each learning target and learning trackers to maintain records of mastery.

Person Responsible Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)

Utilize the learning board matrix to include the standard, target, task, and evidence.

Person Responsible Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)

Develop and implement an instructional review plan of academic vocabulary gaming and ongoing support with the 3rd and 4th grade standards. The review should match the current unit of study in 5th grade. For example, if the core is teaching physical science, the academic gaming review should include the 3rd/4th grade standards in physical science. A connection to the 5th grade standards should be clear.

Person Responsible Jennifer Tice (ticej@pcsb.org)

Use of assessment posters in which students predict answers to the questions prior to the launch of the unit and then revisit/revise their answers as learning targets are taught through the entirety of each unit.

Person Responsible	Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)

Spiral review 3rd/4th/5th grade standards biweekly in a gamelike format, with an emphasis on Life Science due to a possible learning gap that may have occurred during Covid quarantine.

Person Responsible	Jennifer Tice (ticej@pcsb.org)

#4. Other specifically relating to Bridging the Gap & African-American ESSA subgroup	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our current level of performance (18/19 FSA) is 26% of black students proficient in ELA and 37% proficient in math. While our referral rate is appropriate, our administrative support calls to classrooms was not. According to the 19/20 Winter MAP cycle grades 1 - 5, 36% of black students are proficient in ELA (with 41% making gains) and 40% are proficient in math (grades 1 - 5) with 55% making gains. 87% of the calls for support were for black students, yet only 30% of our population is black. We expect our proficiency in ELA for our black students to be at least 50% in ELA and 70% in math. Our administrative support calls should be closer to 30% calling for black students to match the percentage of race demographic percentages. We believe that we need to have a stronger equity belief system within our school and increase the culturally relevant teaching practices to engage students at a greater rate.
Measurable Outcome:	The percent of black students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 26% to 50% as measured by FSA. The percent of black students achieving Math proficiency will increase from 37% to 50% as measured by FSA. The percent of black students having an administrative call will decrease from 88% to 30% as measured by the call log data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Renee Kelly (kellyre@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will increase staff awareness of equity, implicit bias, and cultural sensitivity by providing professional development on culturally relevant teaching practices and monitor their usage in the classrooms.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We chose this strategy due to the gaps in academic and behavior data.

Action Steps to Implement

Once a month professional development will be provided at staff meetings around equilty, implicit bias, restorative practices, relationship building, and/or culturally relevant teaching practices.

Person Responsible Michelle Morehouse (morehousem@pcsb.org)

Increase culturally relevant books to classroom libraries so black students see themselves in the characters of the literature and they see success stories of black individuals.

Person Responsible Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)

Ensure 80% or more of our black subgroup that are below level in reading and/or math attend and engage in the after school ELP.

Person Responsible Renee Kelly (kellyre@pcsb.org)

Counselor will provide lessons on bias and equity to grades 3 - 5 and focus groups will be established with counselor and/or social worker with black students (any grade) struggling with trauma.

Person Responsible Michelle Morehouse (morehousem@pcsb.org)

#5. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to Students with Disabilities	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our current level of ELA proficiency performance is 42% for our ESE population according to the ELA FSA. We expect our performance to be 50%. On the 19/20 ELA Winter MAP Data, 45% of our grade 3 - 5 ESE students were meeting proficiency and 54% of our grade 1 - 2 ESE students were meeting proficiency. We believe this problem is occurring because of a foundational literacy gap with our ESE students.
Measurable Outcome:	The percent of all ESE students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 42% to 50%, as measured by FSA or MAP. The percent of all ESE students making learning gains will increase from 41% to 50%, as measured by FSA or MAP. The percent of all L25 ESE students making learning gains will increase from 36% to 50% as measured by MAP and/or FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Renee Kelly (kellyre@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We are clustering ESE students based on IEP goals/academic/social needs and ESE teachers are co-teaching with the general education teacher to provide an inclusive and strong core environment for ESE students. In addition, a prescription is being made for each ESE student below grade level to determine exact foundational gap needs and instruction will occur during the intervention block when all students attend group based on need.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We know that all students learn best and have a greater likelihood of mastering grade level standards if they spend most to all of their day in a general education classroom, rather than being pulled out and taught isolated skills that do not transfer to the work occurring in the core instructional part of their day. ESE teachers will co-teach in the general education classrooms in order to provide specialized instruction to the ESE students while also aligning it to the grade level standards. Foundational gaps will be addressed during the intervention block when all students attend a smaller group setting based on their need.

Action Steps to Implement

ESE students will be clustered and the General education and ESE teacher will co-teach the lessons to provide a more seamless approach within the programs and to ensure all students, regardless of their program, receive the support they need just in time.

Person Responsible Renee Kelly (kellyre@pcsb.org)

Prior to collaborative planning sessions, individual teachers (ESE/ELL/Gen ed) will read through the modules, complete the tasks, and jot notes of possible misconceptions by students.

Person Responsible Renee Kelly (kellyre@pcsb.org)

ESE and Gen ed teachers collaborative plan units at a time by first dissecting the standards, discuss the tasks and plan for possible misconceptions, create lesson sequence with step outs for each learning target and learning trackers to maintain records of mastery.

Person Responsible Renee Kelly (kellyre@pcsb.org)

ESE teachers will utilize a foundational skills diagnostic to develop an instructional prescription for each student that is below proficiency level according to MAP and/or FSA. The prescription will be based on the levels of reading acquisition: love of reading/concepts of print, phonemic awareness levels, phonics levels,

power word levels, vocabulary, leveled reading in decodables and predictable texts with the end goal being fluency and comprehension. Instruction on their "just-right" level will be done during the intervention block.

Person Responsible Renee Kelly (kellyre@pcsb.org)

Side-by-side coaching will occur with the district ESE coach.

Person Responsible Renee Kelly (kellyre@pcsb.org)

#6. ESSA Subgroup specifically relating to English Language Learners	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Our current level of FSA 18/19 ELA proficiency is 39% for our ELL students with a Federal Index of 55. While this index is above the 41 threshold, we believe looking at the MAP gains in the 19/20 school year, a new approach is needed for our ELL students. On the 19/20 ELA Winter MAP cycle, only 29% of our ELL students (grades 1 - 5) were proficient and 55% made gains (grades 1 - 5).
Measurable Outcome:	The percent of all ELL students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 29% to 50%, as measured by FSA or MAP.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We are clustering ELL students based on language proficiency and ELL teachers are co-teaching with the general education teacher to provide an inclusive, core environment for ELL students. In addition, a prescription is being made for each student to determine exact foundational gap needs. Instruction will occur during the intervention block when all students attend group based on need.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We know that all students learn best and have a greater liklihood of mastering grade level standards if they spend most to all of their day in a general education classroom, rather than being pulled out and taught isolated skills that do not transfer to the work occurring in the core instructional part of their day. ELL teachers will co-teach in the general education classrooms in order to provide specialized instruction to the ELL students while also aligning it to the grade level standards. Foundational gaps will be addressed during the intervention block when all students attend a smaller group setting based on their need.

Action Steps to Implement

ELL students will be clustered based on language proficiency levels and the General education and ELL teacher will co-teach the lessons to provide a more seamless approach within the programs and to ensure all students, regardless of their program, receive the support they need just in time.

Person Responsible Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)

Prior to collaborative planning sessions, individual teachers (ESE/ELL/Gen ed) will read through the modules, complete the tasks, and jot notes of possible misconceptions by students.

Person Responsible Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)

ELL and Gen ed teachers will collaboratively plan units at a time by first dissecting the standards, discuss the tasks and plan for possible misconceptions, create lesson sequence with step outs for each learning target and develop learning trackers to maintain records of mastery. WIDA Can Do Descriptors and Model Performance Indicators (MPI's) will be utilized in the planning for ELL students.

Person Responsible Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)

ELL teachers will utilize a foundational skills diagnostic to develop an instructional prescription for each student that is below proficiency level. The prescription will be based on the levels of reading acquisition: love of reading/concepts of print, phonemic awareness levels, phonics levels, power word levels, vocabulary, and running records. Instruction on their "just-right" level will be done during the intervention block.

Person Responsible Renee Kelly (kellyre@pcsb.org)

Grades 3 - 5 ELL students will receive the repeated reading routine in the intervention block in order to front-load the following week's core text. A focus during this routine is on vocabulary and fluency.

Person Responsible Deborah Valentine (valentinede@pcsb.org)

ELL teachers will receive side-by-side coaching with Dr. Walters from UCF.

Person Responsible Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)

Book study will be conducted with Gen ed and ELL teachers that are co-teaching. The title of the book is Collaboration and Co-Teaching: Strategies for English Learners.

Person Responsible Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)

Monitor the LF student performance to ensure academic success or provide appropriate supports

Person Responsible Renee Kelly (kellyre@pcsb.org)

Increase meaningful communication with families via the website, newsletter, parent letters, phone calls, etc and ensure communication is available in languages spoken by ELs; utilize LionBridge interpretation phone services

Person Responsible Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)

#7. Other specifically relating to Climate and Conditions for Learning	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	The 19/20 school year had a reduction in referrals by 90% from the previous school year (18/19). In addition, the number of administrative support calls decreased by 82%. We believe this reduction occurred due to the revamp of the PBIS with a seamless inclusion of restorative practices and social emotional learning. One area we found that we want to improve is the percentage of administrative calls to support black students. 87% of the calls for support were for black students, yet only 30% of our population is black.
Measurable Outcome:	The percent of black students receiving an administrative support call will decrease from 87% of the calls to 30% of the calls as measured by the tracking system in the front office.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Renee Kelly (kellyre@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will continue to grow the PBIS culture, following the PCS Tier 1 Stoic Walkthrough document. In addition, we will have monthly training on equity and implicit bias.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Continuing the work we did in the 19/20 school year with the PBIS/RP/SEL program provides a continuity for a positive learning environment for all students. The Equity and Implicit bias will allow for courageous conversations to be had in order for all staff members to see how they can have an impact on ALL students feeling safe and accepted.

Action Steps to Implement	
Provide monthly professional development by our equity team for all staff members to include implicit bias, culturally responsive teaching, and how to close the cultural gap.	
Person Responsible	Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)
Continue and monitor the PBIS/RP/SEL using the PCS Tier 1 Stoic Walkthrough document. Feedback will be provided at a minimum of quarterly.	
Person Responsible	Renee Kelly (kellyre@pcsb.org)
Daily circles will be expected in each classroom with an emphasis on equity to remove the barrier of the cultural gap.	
Person Responsible	Renee Kelly (kellyre@pcsb.org)
The Restorative Practices questions are an added step that will be completed prior to turning in a discipline referral.	
Person Responsible	Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)

#8. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Student Attendance	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	During the 19/20 school year, we made several changes to our attendance plan and we were seeing positive results. However, once the school closed for Covid 19, the attendance rate declined. There are many reasons why families are not sending their child to school, however, we found that the more contact we had with families, the better the attendance was for the child. In addition, we started an incentive plan that was showing to be successful.
Measurable Outcome:	The percent of all students who are absent 10% or more will decrease from 32% to 10%, as measured by attendance dashboard in School Profiles.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Michelle Morehouse (morehousem@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	We will strengthen our attendance problem solving process to address and support the needs of students across all tiers on an on-going basis, to include positive incentives.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We want to ensure we are diligent and follow our problem-solving process by calendaring out our CST and having an identified flow chart on supporting our students and families so that students come to school regularly (when they are not ill). Part of this process will include educating families on the importance of attendance.

Action Steps to Implement	
During preschool, and under the guidelines of the district, health department, and CDC, the Child Study Team will convene to review the 19/20 attendance plan and tweak it based on the guidelines.	
Person Responsible	Michelle Morehouse (morehousem@pcsb.org)
If appropriate, we will continue to incentivize all students who come to school each week with no tardies and no early releases (Tier 1).	
Person Responsible	Michelle Morehouse (morehousem@pcsb.org)
Implement Tier 2 and Tier 3 plans for individual students as appropriate with the CDC.	
Person Responsible	Michelle Morehouse (morehousem@pcsb.org)
The CST will hold parent conferences and administer home visits more frequently based on the attendance needs during the CST meetings.	
Person Responsible	Michelle Morehouse (morehousem@pcsb.org)
Office staff will call all L35 students when they are not at school on time each day.	
Person Responsible	Renee Kelly (kellyre@pcsb.org)

#9. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Parent Involvement	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	According to our Title 1 Parent Survey, the following challenges prevent them from being more involved at the school: Work Schedule: 64% Lack of Transportation: 22% No ChildCare: 24% Language Barrier: 17% Don't feel welcome: 17%
Measurable Outcome:	80% of all students will have had a parent/teacher/student conference a minimum of one time during the 20/21 school year.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Camilla Collins (collinscam@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Effectively communicating and building relationships with families about their students' progress and school processes/practices including academic tools that support family involvement at home, with the ideas that we are a partnership and encourage their involvement. Parents can't support their student if we don't communicate strengths and areas of concern, as well as, learn about the culture of the family.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	We found during the Covid 19 closure, that we were able to make contact with 100% of our families through phone calls, virtual meetings, and/or home visits. For this reason, we are no longer using "lack of communication" as a barrier for family communication. The challenges parents have provided in the Title One Survey will be addressed by asking each parent in their "first day" packet to provide information regarding: date/time convenience, type of conference (remote, in-person, on phone), language interpreter, and childcare needs.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide a survey in the first day packet asking each parent to fill out when conferences can be held for their child based on the schedule and/or limitations of the family.

Person Responsible Camilla Collins (collinscam@pcsb.org)

Teachers will schedule conferences with all families of students who are below grade level in ELA by October 15th to build relationships and develop a partnership to fill the achievement/behavior gaps.

Person Responsible Camilla Collins (collinscam@pcsb.org)

Student led conferences will be held with all grade 3 - 5 students during January and May for grades PreK - 2.

Person Responsible Camilla Collins (collinscam@pcsb.org)

Educate families of all school-wide events through flyers, the marquee, school messenger, and agenda books in both English and Spanish.

Person Responsible Camilla Collins (collinscam@pcsb.org)

All classroom teachers will make a positive, personal phone call to each family to begin a positive rapport. It will be tracked in Focus on the Parent Call Log.

Person Responsible	Camilla Collins (collinscam@pcsb.org)

#10. Other specifically relating to Healthy Schools	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	1. Our current level of performance is 6 out of 6 modules in bronze, as evidenced in the Healthy Schools Alliance, Generation, Healthy Schools Program Framework. . 2. We expect our performance level to be 6 out of 6 modules eligible for bronze/silver/gold by May 2020. 3. The problem/gap is occurring because the school fund raiser options and food sold in the cafeteria does not adhere to smart snack guidelines. 4. If the sale of our healthy school team can monitor the implementation of administrative guidelines for wellness would occur, the problem would be reduced and our level of performance will increase to Silver.
Measurable Outcome:	Our school will be eligible in 6 out of 6 modules for bronze/silver/gold recognition by May 2020 as evidenced by the Alliance for a Healthier Generation's Healthy Schools Program Framework.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Ramona Rubino (rubinor@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Ensure all school fundraisers include useful and/or healthy products. Sell food in the cafeteria that adheres to smart snack guidelines.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	The obesity rate of children in America has gone up over the years andis at close to 20%. This program's goal should be to build the skills and knowledge that all students need to foster lifelong habits of healthy eating and physical activity.

Action Steps to Implement	
Assemble a Healthy School Team made up of a minimum of four (4) individuals including, but not limited to: PE Teacher/Health Teacher, Classroom Teacher, Wellness Champion, Administrator, Cafeteria Manager, Parent, and Student.	
Person Responsible	Ramona Rubino (rubinor@pcsb.org)
Attend district-supported professional development.	
Person Responsible	Ramona Rubino (rubinor@pcsb.org)
Complete Healthy Schools Program Assessment.	
Person Responsible	Ramona Rubino (rubinor@pcsb.org)
Complete the SMART Snacks in School Documentation.	
Person Responsible	Ramona Rubino (rubinor@pcsb.org)
We will have a Girls on the Run club.	
Person Responsible	Ramona Rubino (rubinor@pcsb.org)

#11. Culture & Environment specifically relating to Equity & Diversity	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	As the result of equity-centered problem solving within an MTSS framework, we have developed an equity goal to build relational capacity, empower student voice, and hold high expectations. This was determined from equity work from the previous school year and discrepancies in the data for both academics and behavior, specifically of black students. Our current level of performance (18/19 FSA) is 26% of black students proficient in ELA and 37% proficient in math. While our referral rate is appropriate, our administrative support calls to classrooms was not. According to the 19/20 Winter MAP cycle grades 1 - 5, 36% of black students are proficient in ELA (with 41% making gains) and 40% are proficient in math (grades 1 - 5) with 55% making gains. 87% of the calls for support were for black students, yet only 30% of our population is black. We expect our proficiency in ELA for our black students to be at least 50% in ELA and 70% in math. Our administrative support calls should be closer to 30% calling for black students to match the percentage of race demographic percentages. For the 20/21 school year, we will increase staff awareness of equity, implicit bias, and cultural sensitivity by providing monthly professional development on culturally relevant teaching practices and monitor their usage in the classrooms.
Measurable Outcome:	To address the mindset shift for the adoption of equitable practice, we will participate in whole school, equity-centered professional development. We will measure progress by recording the number of PD sessions and the number of teachers who attend. We will use a CRT classroom walk through tool to measure changes in teacher practice. The data points below will be tracked for academics and behavior. The percent of black students achieving ELA proficiency will increase from 26% to 50% as measured by MAP/FSA. The percent of black students achieving Math proficiency will increase from 37% to 50% as measured by MAP/FSA. The percent of black students having an administrative call will decrease from 88% to 30% as measured by the call log data.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)
Evidence-based Strategy:	Using the Racial Equity Analysis Protocol (REAP), we will focus on equitable practices specifically culturally relevant teaching and restorative practices.
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	These strategies and practices were identified using the Racially Equity Analysis Protocol (REAP).

Action Steps to Implement	
Once a month professional development will be provided at staff meetings by our Equity Team, centered around equity, implicit bias, restorative practices, relationship building, and/or culturally relevant teaching practices.	
Person Responsible	Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)
The Restorative Practices questions are an added step that will be completed prior to turning in a discipline referral.	

Person Responsible	Kelly Austin (austink@pcsb.org)

Increase culturally relevant books to classroom libraries so black students see themselves in the characters of the literature and they see success stories of black individuals.

Person Responsible	Renee Kelly (kellyre@pcsb.org)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

After choosing your Area(s) of Focus, explain how you will address the remaining schoolwide improvement priorities.

We will cluster our students that are ELL, ESE and Gifted to better increase the services for these students. Teachers of ELL and ESE will be co-teaching with the general education teachers in order to stay focused on standards-based instruction, with specialized accommodations based on individual student needs. Collaborative planning will be necessary for seamless instruction to occur and therefore, will be planned a unit at a time with guidelines on best practices. Learning boards will be in every room that shows the standard being taught, the learning target that is derived from the standard, the student task, and the evidence to show the student mastered the target. Formative assessment will be used daily during lessons in order for teachers to take action within the lesson. With Covid 19, we are also working on how to address the learning loss and provide social/emotional supports. In addition, we are embedding online learning for all students and staff.

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 ensuring all stakeholders are involved.

A positive school culture and environment for all stakeholders is the heart of a school. The administration at Belleair believes in valuing all stakeholders by being a listener and allowing all voices to be heard. While decisions should align to the school's mission and vision, this can only happen with a shared voice. With our mission of each and every student gaining a minimum of one year's academic growth, it takes the student, teachers, staff, family, and community members to achieve this mission. The SBLT, CST, and SAC always begin with the vision and mission of Belleair and then move to the action plan of the school improvement plan (SIP) for monitoring and problem-solving. Maintaining the focus on the SIP allows all stakeholders to stay aligned to the school's vision in order for real positive change to occur.

Parent Family and Engagement Plan (PFEP) Link

The school completes a Parental Involvement Plan (PFEP), which is available at the school site.

Part V: Budget

The approved budget does not reflect any amendments submitted for this project.

1	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**				**$1,500.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0371 - Belleair Elementary School	School Improvement Funds	500.0	$1,500.00
			Notes: These monies are to be spent on planning and implementing the school improvement plan.			
2	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**				**$1,000.00**
	Function	Object	Budget Focus	Funding Source	FTE	2020-21
			0371 - Belleair Elementary School	School Improvement Funds		$1,000.00
			Notes: These monies will be spent on hiring substitutes for teachers to do learning walks.			
3	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Science**				**$0.00**
4	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Other: Bridging the Gap & African-American ESSA subgroup**				**$0.00**
5	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: Students with Disabilities**				**$0.00**
6	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: ESSA Subgroup: English Language Learners**				**$0.00**
7	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Other: Climate and Conditions for Learning**				**$0.00**
8	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Student Attendance**				**$0.00**
9	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Parent Involvement**				**$0.00**
10	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Other: Healthy Schools**				**$0.00**
11	**III.A.**	**Areas of Focus: Culture & Environment: Equity & Diversity**				**$0.00**
					Total:	**$2,500.00**