Belleview Elementary School

2020-21 Schoolwide Improvement Plan

Table of Contents

Belleview Elementary School

5556 SE COUNTY HIGHWAY 484, Belleview, FL 34420

[no web address on file]

Demographics

Principal: Victoria Thomas

Start Date for this Principal: 7/19/2016

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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: D (35%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: C (44%)
2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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 Marion 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

Belleview Elementary School

5556 SE COUNTY HIGHWAY 484, Belleview, FL 34420

[no web address on file]

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	39%

School Grades History

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

School Board Approval

This plan is pending approval by the Marion 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.

Belleview Elementary School will provide a quality learning environment where students will learn and become responsible, self-sufficient citizens, who will be willing and able to become contributing members of our democratic society.

Provide the school's vision statement.

Ensuring all students are learning to 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.**:**

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Varner, Stacey	Principal	To provide the visionary leadership necessary to design, develop, and implement a comprehensive program of instructional and support services which optimize available resources and to provide successful high quality experiences for students in a safe and orderly environment. Supervises all Administrative, Instructional, and Non-Instructional Personnel assigned to the school.
Clifford, Marty	Dean	To implement disciplinary procedures and policies to ensure a safe and orderly environment. In addition work with students and parents in creating educational plans for students that ensure improved academic success.
Finnie, Jasmine	Instructional Coach	The Content Area Specialist serves as an academic coach for teachers and paraprofessionals utilizing effective coaching practices to build capacity and support student learning. Additionally, the Content Area Specialist serves as an intervention specialist for targeted students, based on need, for the specific area of content.
Boireau, Ernestine	School Counselor	To provide students with educational, personal, and vocational counseling and to identify and coordinate all available resources to empower students to reach full potential.
Portalatin, Teresa	Teacher, K-12	To provide an educational atmosphere in which students will move toward the fulfillment of their potential for intellectual, emotional, physical, and psychological growth and maturation in accordance with District philosophy, goals and objectives.
Newton, Tracey	Teacher, K-12	To provide an educational atmosphere in which students will move toward the fulfillment of their potential for intellectual, emotional, physical, and psychological growth and maturation in accordance with District philosophy, goals and objectives.
Caro, Sonia	Instructional Coach	The Content Area Specialist serves as an academic coach for teachers and paraprofessionals utilizing effective coaching practices to build capacity and support student learning. Additionally, the Content Area Specialist serves

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
		as an intervention specialist for targeted students, based on need, for the specific area of content.
Henry, Lindsey	Assistant Principal	The Assistant Principal assists the Principal in providing a common vision for the use of data-based decision-making, assists in the development of a strong infrastructure of resources for the implementation of high yield instructional strategies, further assists the principal in the assessment of school staff, assists with the monitoring of implementation of intervention and necessary documentation, assists with the delivery of professional development for effective instructional delivery. The assistant principal carefully monitors the additional academic support schedule to ensure all personnel are serving in their specified areas.
Rogers, Ingrid	Teacher, K-12	To provide an educational atmosphere in which students will move toward the fulfillment of their potential for intellectual, emotional, physical, and psychological growth and maturation in accordance with District philosophy, goals and objectives.
	Teacher, K-12	To provide an educational atmosphere in which students will move toward the fulfillment of their potential for intellectual, emotional, physical, and psychological growth and maturation in accordance with District philosophy, goals and objectives.
Headley, Shannon	Teacher, K-12	To provide an educational atmosphere in which students will move toward the fulfillment of their potential for intellectual, emotional, physical, and psychological growth and maturation in accordance with District philosophy, goals and objectives.
Levandowski, Cynthia	Instructional Coach	The Content Area Specialist serves as an academic coach for teachers and paraprofessionals utilizing effective coaching practices to build capacity and support student learning. Additionally, the Content Area Specialist serves as an intervention specialist for targeted students, based on need, for the specific area of content.

Name	Title	Job Duties and Responsibilities
Andrade, Andrea	Teacher, K-12	To provide an educational atmosphere in which students will move toward the fulfillment of their potential for intellectual, emotional, physical, and psychological growth and maturation in accordance with District philosophy, goals and objectives.
Karr, Barbara	Teacher, K-12	To provide an educational atmosphere in which students will move toward the fulfillment of their potential for intellectual, emotional, physical, and psychological growth and maturation in accordance with District philosophy, goals and objectives.

Demographic Information

Principal start date
Tuesday 7/19/2016, Victoria Thomas

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.*
5

Total number of teacher positions allocated to the school
40

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 Multiracial Students White Students Economically Disadvantaged Students
School Grades History	2018-19: C (43%) 2017-18: D (35%) 2016-17: C (46%) 2015-16: C (44%)

2019-20 School Improvement (SI) Information*	
SI Region	Northeast
Regional Executive Director	Cassandra Brusca
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	58	105	106	93	110	94	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	566
Attendance below 90 percent	0	47	43	47	63	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	246
One or more suspensions	15	33	18	36	26	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	155
Course failure in ELA	0	2	16	2	23	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	46
Course failure in Math	0	2	14	2	19	10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	47
Level 1 on 2019 statewide ELA assessment	0	0	0	0	14	21	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	35
Level 1 on 2019 statewide Math assessment	0	0	0	0	12	27	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	39

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	4	10	6	27	14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	61

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	2	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	10
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 8/10/2020

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	116	98	124	126	93	125	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	682
Attendance below 90 percent	75	59	81	69	43	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	401
One or more suspensions	6	7	11	16	12	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
Course failure in ELA or Math	12	16	51	47	11	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	95	53	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	240

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	14	15	43	27	9	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133

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	0	0	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
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	116	98	124	126	93	125	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	682
Attendance below 90 percent	75	59	81	69	43	74	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	401
One or more suspensions	6	7	11	16	12	28	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	80
Course failure in ELA or Math	12	16	51	47	11	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	162
Level 1 on statewide assessment	0	0	0	95	53	92	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	240

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	14	15	43	27	9	25	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	133

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	0	0	0	19	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	19
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	36%	47%	57%	42%	52%	55%
ELA Learning Gains	46%	56%	58%	47%	57%	57%
ELA Lowest 25th Percentile	38%	52%	53%	49%	53%	52%
Math Achievement	42%	51%	63%	44%	52%	61%
Math Learning Gains	58%	58%	62%	49%	54%	61%
Math Lowest 25th Percentile	47%	49%	51%	43%	43%	51%
Science Achievement	36%	47%	53%	48%	51%	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	35%	44%	-9%	58%	-23%
	2018	35%	46%	-11%	57%	-22%
Same Grade Comparison		0%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	35%	49%	-14%	58%	-23%
	2018	39%	43%	-4%	56%	-17%
Same Grade Comparison		-4%				
Cohort Comparison		0%				
05	2019	33%	45%	-12%	56%	-23%
	2018	31%	46%	-15%	55%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
Cohort Comparison		-6%				

MATH						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
03	2019	39%	49%	-10%	62%	-23%
	2018	33%	48%	-15%	62%	-29%
Same Grade Comparison		6%				
Cohort Comparison						
04	2019	52%	54%	-2%	64%	-12%
	2018	41%	47%	-6%	62%	-21%
Same Grade Comparison		11%				
Cohort Comparison		19%				
05	2019	32%	45%	-13%	60%	-28%
	2018	35%	50%	-15%	61%	-26%
Same Grade Comparison		-3%				
Cohort Comparison		-9%				

SCIENCE						
Grade	Year	School	District	School-District Comparison	State	School-State Comparison
05	2019	33%	44%	-11%	53%	-20%
	2018	31%	49%	-18%	55%	-24%
Same Grade Comparison		2%				
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	27	29	11	27	43	35	22				
ELL	14	35		33	35						
BLK	25	47		29	40						
HSP	20	35	20	38	50	42	10				
MUL	38			20							
WHT	42	49	43	45	64	52	42				
FRL	31	37	30	37	51	35	38				
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	23	46	36	13	24	25	7				
ELL	29	38		24	15						
BLK	41	64		41	29						
HSP	29	35	29	32	26	8	43				
MUL	47	33		40	33						
WHT	39	42	44	40	38	15	27				
FRL	36	41	38	38	32	17	32				
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	14	24	20	18	26	24	25				
ELL	22	53		28	47						
BLK	19	40		19	35	30	18				
HSP	30	45	60	44	60		50				
MUL	69			63							
WHT	48	46	48	46	46	47	49				
FRL	39	50	51	41	50	43	41				

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	43
OVERALL Federal Index Below 41% All Students	NO
Total Number of Subgroups Missing the Target	6
Progress of English Language Learners in Achieving English Language Proficiency	42
Total Points Earned for the Federal Index	345
Total Components for the Federal Index	8
Percent Tested	98%

Subgroup Data

Students With Disabilities	
Federal Index - Students With Disabilities	28
Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Students With Disabilities Subgroup Below 32%	2
English Language Learners	
Federal Index - English Language Learners	32
English Language Learners Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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	35
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	32
Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Hispanic Students Subgroup Below 32%	0
Multiracial Students	
Federal Index - Multiracial Students	29
Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
Number of Consecutive Years Multiracial Students Subgroup Below 32%	1
Pacific Islander Students	
Federal Index - Pacific Islander Students	

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	48
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	37
Economically Disadvantaged Students Subgroup Below 41% in the Current Year?	YES
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 our data from FSA our ELA component performed the lowest. The noticeable trend is our students are coming to us with a deficiency (majority in phonics). While we are working through the phonics continuum to meet the individual needs of the students, attendance and language barriers often time becomes a challenge to our systematic, explicit instruction.

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

ELA showed the greatest decline from the previous year. ELA decreased by 1 percentage point with the number of students being proficient and 5 percentage points of students making learning gains in our lowest quartile. Many of our students in grades 3rd through 5th are missing the foundational components of reading, so by the time they are in upper elementary, they are struggling with reading to learn/master their grade level standards.

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.

ELA had a 23 point difference from the state. Many of our students in grades 3rd through 5th are missing the foundational components of reading, so by the time they are in upper elementary, they are struggling with reading to learn/master their grade level standards.

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

Math made the most improvement. Our Math and Science Content Area Specialists provided modeling, as well as analyze data with admin and teachers to address student weaknesses in their

subject areas. Our Instructional Paras supported struggling students with additional resources throughout the day. Additional afterschool support was offered to selected students based off of their IReady Diagnostic AP2 data and resources were provided to them to meet their individual needs.

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

Our most potential area of concern is our attendance and mobility rate. Our School Counselor is planning HERO initiative to get students excited about being here.

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

1. Closing reading gaps in ELA
2. Building a strong reading foundation in K-2
3. Building Rigor with a focus on Higher Order Questioning
4. Additional support to our students in our subgroups for ELA
5. Additional support to our students in the lowest quartile for ELA

Part III: Planning for Improvement

Areas of Focus:

#1. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	If students know their goals/standards, are engaged in learning, and understand their individual data while teachers infuse rigor into their curriculum/instruction; students in all of our ESSA subgroups will be able to master grade level expectations throughout the year. With this practice being implemented 3rd - 5th grade will increase from 46% to 51% in learning gains and 36% to 41% in proficiency.
Measurable Outcome:	If we provide teachers with professional development focused on setting clear expectations, and infusing rigor into their instruction then learning gains of students in grades 3rd - 5th will increase from 46% to 51% in learning gains and 36% to 41% in proficiency as measured by district data analysis, QSMA, CSMA and FSA.
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Lindsey Henry (lindsey.henry@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The following strategies will be used to used support teachers; 1. collaborative planning 2. Ongoing data disaggregate 3. Co-teaching/ modeling by our CAS 4. Professional Development
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	If teachers are well prepared and understand how to instruct with rigor and, disaggregate data to meet the individual needs of students, then students will see an increase with students mastering grade level standards as measured by QSMA and FSA. Providing PD/ modeling in these areas will help our teachers and students be prepared during their ELA instruction block.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide teachers with professional development to increase student engagement and rigor of instruction. The PD would include standards focus board, text complexity, collaboration, standards-based resources, item specs, and FSA blueprint. CAS will also provide coaching, co-teaching, modeling and data analysis support to effectively develop and implement standards-based instruction based on student needs and aligned with state standards. During early release days, provide PD for our paraprofessionals, with standards-based resources and data analysis. As measured by the QSMA and IReady diagnostic, we will be able to determine if students' needs are being met.

Person Responsible Lindsey Henry (lindsey.henry@marion.k12.fl.us)

#2. Instructional Practice specifically relating to ELA	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Foundational skills are acquired developmentally during K-2 grades. Once they are acquired then full language literacy can be achieved. ESSA data showed in all areas for ELA were not met or barely met, if we provide students instruction based on their deficiency this will help close the gap and allow more students to be able to read on grade level.
Measurable Outcome:	If we provide teachers and paraprofessionals with coaching, modeling and data analysis support to effectively develop and implement standards-based instruction based on students' needs and aligned with state standards then 70% of our students will be reading on grade level by the end of 20-21 SY as measured by IReady (growth and stretch goals).
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Cynthia Levandowski (cynthia.levandowski@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The following strategies will be used to support teachers; 1. Collaborative Planning 2. Ongoing data disaggregate 3. Co-teaching/ modeling by our CAS 4. Professional Development
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Literacy is to read for knowledge, write coherently and think critically about printed and orally presented material. The key to all literacy is reading development. This includes a progression of skills which moves from understanding spoken words to decoding/encoding written words and culminates into a deeper understanding of text. Reading development is the platform for reading fluency and comprehension. Once foundational skills are acquired then full language literacy can be achieved. The above strategies we will be using will give our students a stronger reading foundation as measured by IReady, DRA, and standards checks.

Action Steps to Implement

Provide teachers with professional development to increase student engagement and rigor of instruction as well as the beginning steps on teaching students to read. The PD would include standards focus board, foundational skills, collaboration, and standards-based resources. The CAS will also provide coaching, co-teaching, modeling and data analysis support to effective development and implementation of standards-based instruction based on student needs and aligned with state standards and foundational skills. Provide PD for paraprofessionals to include foundational skills, standards-based resources and data analysis. IReady diagnostic and growth monitoring data will help determine if students' academic needs are being met and reassess if they are not.

Person Responsible	Stacey Varner (stacey.varner@marion.k12.fl.us)

#3. Instructional Practice specifically relating to Math	
Area of Focus Description and Rationale:	Belleview are of focus for the 2020-21 SY is improving Number Sense within our students and assuring that our staff understands the different components of Number Sense: (a) fluency in estimating and judging magnitude, (b) ability to recognize unreasonable results, (c) flexibility when mentally computing, (d) ability to move among different representations and to use the most appropriate representations. Number sense is the foundation of our math skills as it refers to our ability to understand numbers and their relationships. Number sense and problem-solving are a big component of elementary Math because students need both skills to be able to answer questions that focus on quantitative problem-solving and algebraic problem-solving. Kindergarten - +6 First - +18 Second - +25 Third - +21 Fourth - +2 Fifth - +31 Each subgroup as determined by ESSA will focus on improving in Number Sense by 41% or higher.
Measurable Outcome:	If we provide teachers with opportunities to participate in high quality collaborative planning focused on developing students' number sense through data analysis, hands on learning, small group instruction, and informal classroom assessments then the IReady proficiency scores will increase to 75-80%
Person responsible for monitoring outcome:	Jasmine Finnie (jasmine.finnie@marion.k12.fl.us)
Evidence-based Strategy:	The following strategies will be used to support our teachers; 1. Collaborative Planning 2. Professional Development 3. Disaggregate Data 4. CAS Modeling/ co - teaching
Rationale for Evidence-based Strategy:	Research has proven that student scores improve when teachers collaborate and use data to drive instruction. According to article by Joellen Killion: High Quality collaboration benefits teachers and students www.https://learningforward.org/docs/default-source/jsd-october-2015/high-quality-collaboration-benefits-teachers-and-students.pdf, results of the study suggest that teacher collaboration has positive effects on teachers and their students.

Action Steps to Implement

We will focus on students Number Sense activities and strategies at grade level collaboration and small group instructions during centers, We will also provide PD on Number Sense Strategies and continue to monitor data through IReady progress monitoring, informal checks through classwork and QSMA to determine is students' academic needs are being met and reassess if they are not.

Person Responsible	Lindsey Henry (lindsey.henry@marion.k12.fl.us)

Additional Schoolwide Improvement Priorities

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

All of our areas are identified in "Areas of Focus".

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.

Our primary mission at Belleview Elementary School is to find ways of enhancing each child's learning opportunities. We strive to work collaboratively with parents and families to nurture a love for learning and to help our students become lifelong learners. We believe that each child should be given opportunities to achieve and be successful and understand active participation by parents and family will help promote this success. We will work together to establish effective family-school partnerships. School and home must also work together to help ensure our students will achieve and succeed.

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**	$0.00
2	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: ELA**	$0.00
3	III.A.	**Areas of Focus: Instructional Practice: Math**	$0.00
		Total:	**$0.00**